



Ives S. Loukson

POST- APARTHEID CRITICISM

Perceptions of Whiteness, Homosexuality,
and Democracy in South Africa

[transcript] Lettre

From:

Ives S. Loukson

Post-Apartheid Criticism

Perceptions of Whiteness, Homosexuality, and Democracy in South Africa

November 2020, 282 p., pb., Klebebindung

50,00 € (DE), 978-3-8376-4919-2

E-Book:

PDF: 49,99 € (DE), ISBN 978-3-8394-4919-6

South Africa's post-apartheid narrative is one of democracy and equality – but its flaws run deep, argues Ives S. Loukson. Disclosing prejudices about whiteness, homosexuality and democracy in the »staged society«, he claims the concept of relation as an adequate framework for the embodiment of »profane democracy« understood in Agambian terms. Its fluidity is equated to openness and transparency that are relevant dimensions for profane democracy. A demonstration of literary criticism practiced as a fecund interdisciplinary activity, Loukson's study lays the foundation for post-apartheid criticism different from post-colonial criticism.

Ives S. Loukson (PhD) was born in 1981. He holds degrees from the Universities of Yaoundé 1/Cameroon and Bayreuth/Germany. His research interests include cultural studies, post-colonial studies, Francophone and Anglophone literary studies, creative writing, and German as foreign language.

For further information:

www.transcript-verlag.de/en/978-3-8376-4919-2

Contents

Acknowledgements	9
List of Abbreviations	11
Abstract	13
CHAPTER ONE: Introduction	15
I-1- Operationalization of key concepts	17
I-1-1- Democracy	17
I-1-2- Whiteness	20
I-1-3- Homosexuality	24
I-1-4- <i>Relation</i>	26
I-2- Literature review	29
I-2-1- On South African literature	29
I-2-2- On the narratives selected	37
I-2-3- On key concepts of the topic	41
I-3- Research hypothesis and research questions	44
I-4- Theory and methodology	45
I-5- Structure of the work	50
CHAPTER TWO: Form and Signification: Idiosyncrasy of South African Post-Apartheid Narrative	53
II-1- Character: an incursion into the idiosyncrasy of South African post-apartheid narrative	56
II-1-1- Distribution of the characters in post-apartheid narrative	57
II-1-2- Interior life prompting characters to performance	67
II-2- Spatialization in post-apartheid narrative as a deconstruction of post-apartheid South Africa	79
II-2-1- Fictional post-apartheid South Africa as a transposition of modern (democratic) South Africa	81
II-2-2- Johannesburg in post-apartheid narrative: a cue toward <i>Relation</i> ?	85

II-3- From fictional to autobiographic narrative	91
II-3-1- <i>Memoirs of a Born Free</i> as a tangible attempt to embody "Project Infinity"	92
II-3-2- Perceptions of whiteness (white race), homosexuality and democracy as obstacle to <i>Relation</i>	97

**CHAPTER THREE: South African post-apartheid Hegemony. *Discourse* as Negation of
Relation and Social Representations**

III-1- <i>Discourse</i> and <i>Relation</i> : theoretical and historical springs of South African post-apartheid hegemony	101
III-1-1- <i>Discourse</i>	103
III-1-2- <i>Relation</i> as diffuser of hegemony	107
III-2- Roots of the portrayed post-apartheid hegemony	111
III-2-1- Portrayed post-apartheid South Africa as embodiment of <i>discourse</i>	111
III-2-2- Symbolic resources of Johannesburg and embodiment of <i>discourse</i> in portrayed post-apartheid South Africa	114
III-2-3- Obstacles to the embodiment of <i>Relation</i> : authenticity, transparency, racism in reverse	120
III-3- How do social representations relate to <i>discourse</i> and <i>Relation</i> ?	128
III-3-1- Manifestations of social representations through ideology and common sense	131
III-3-2- Social representations and the fictional narrative	135

**CHAPTER FOUR: Extricating Democracy, Whiteness, and Homosexuality from Social
Representations for the Embodiment of *Relation* in post-apartheid Narrative**

IV-1- Post-apartheid hegemony as shaped by the perceptions of homosexuality in <i>The Quiet Violence of Dreams</i>	140
IV-1-1- Social exclusion	142
IV-1-2- Social antagonism	148
IV-2- Post-apartheid hegemony as shaped by the perceptions of whiteness in <i>Coconut</i>	153
IV-2-1- Multiplication of misunderstandings in the portrayed post-apartheid society ..	157
IV-2-2- Whiteness desired by the victim	167
IV-3- Post-apartheid hegemony as shaped by the perceptions of democracy in <i>Dog Eat Dog</i> and <i>Memoirs of a Born Free</i>	171
IV-3- 1- Perpetual state of euphoria in substitution of a truly and inclusive democracy	176
IV-3- 2- Perceptions of democracy and legitimization of fundamentalisms and hegemony	184

**CHAPTER FIVE: *Relation* as aesthetics Intervention of Post-Apartheid Narrative for a
truly and inclusive (profane) Democracy**

V-1- Figures of <i>Relation</i> in the post-apartheid narrative	196
V-1-1- Polyphony of the post-apartheid narrative "surface"	201

V-1-2- Multi-perspectivity of the post-apartheid narrative as a metaphor of a profane and inclusive democracy	208
V-1-3- Hybridity/fluidity of the character and space	211
V-2- Stakes of <i>Relation</i> in post-apartheid narrative	221
V-2-1- Alleviation of rigid barriers curbing mutual improvement	224
V-2-2- Enforcement of autonomy and culture of “perpetual peace”	231
V-3- Challenges of <i>Relation</i> for post-apartheid South Africa to come	235
V-3-1- Resistance from conservative logics	236
V-3-2- Utopian and chaotic nature of <i>Relation</i>	242
 CHAPTER SIX: Conclusion. Toward Post-Apartheid Criticism	 247
 Works Cited	 263
Primary Sources	263
Secondary Sources	263
A / Narratives, Plays and Poetry	263
B / Works on South Africa and South African Literature	264
C / Works on Literary Theory	265
D / Theoretical works	267
E / Articles	272
F / Dissertations Consulted	276
G / Internet Sources	276

Abstract

This study seeks to examine the contribution of post-apartheid narrative to the building of an effectively democratic and multicultural South Africa. The study develops from the central hypothesis that post-apartheid narrative appears to be an adequate site for archetypal features enlightening about the adjustments of hegemony and its expressions in post-apartheid South Africa. Concretely, the book attempts to show how true (profane) democracy is flawed by perceptions of whiteness, homosexuality and democracy. The study contends that democracy seen from its profane perspective (Agamben, 2007), continuously improves living conditions of each and all in society. This is the case in respect to four selected South African post-apartheid narratives.

The pleasure of literary text (Barthes, 1973) which tends to establish literature simply as a pleasurable, nonrational, thus a futile object is relativized through a careful and multidisciplinary examination of literary categories displayed in the selected narratives. Form is considered in its relationship to the content of the post-apartheid narrative and vice versa such a way that a credible sense of literature's possibilities is at hand.

The book shows how, irrespective of the various and significant political improvements observed in South Africa since 1994, the majority of the people continue to be marginalized and to feel so. The study claims that *Relation* is the adequate framework for the embodiment of a profane democracy in South Africa. It discloses prejudices about whiteness, homosexuality and democracy and their psychological consequences on the people in the society. It is argued that *Relation's* fluidity is the realistic foundation for openness and transparency that are relevant dimensions of profane democracy. Attempting to build an applied field for the complex notion by Glissant, the book finally lays the basis for post-apartheid criticism distinct from post-colonial criticism from which it however derives its relevant methodological stances.

Also, in focusing essentially on South African post-apartheid narrative, the book perhaps enunciates general rules applicable to all literatures. Good libraries in the USA, South Africa, England, and Germany will not regret to distribute it. The public at large gains from reading the book because it helps to discover

how literary criticism turns into a fecund interdisciplinary activity and speaks to human condition.

Key words: Narrative, South Africa, Post-Apartheid Criticism, Democracy, Relation

CHAPTER ONE: Introduction

South Africa is a cultural exemption in Africa. More obviously than any other African country does, South Africa involves conflicting ideologies, cultural and racial diversity on a national scale. Culturally, South Africa is a microcosm of, if not the whole world, the whole Africa. Whites, blacks, children born of black and white parentage, Indians, Asians, Muslims, Christians, former slaves and former masters partake in the construction of South Africa engaging the country in a challenging quest for a truly multicultural, democratic, and inclusive society in its post-segregation era. In their diversity, South Africans are engaged in a challenging quest for an open society that welcomes “all into the house of Africa, (...) breaking down (...) social walls and (...) expurgati [ng]¹ (...) the pathologies of Apartheid” (Giliomee, 1996, p. 95). *Post-Apartheid Criticism. Perceptions of Whiteness, Homosexuality, and Democracy in South Africa* seeks to contribute to the debate about how an inclusive, multicultural, and fully democratic South Africa can be sustainably achieved in its actual constellation. Coined that way, my topic, *prima facie*, poses the problem of why it works to relate whiteness, homosexuality along with democracy in post-apartheid South Africa?

As far as I remember, it was almost at the end of my research that this title imposed itself as topic to my work. Before then, I thought it my obligation to fill what I considered a racial gap left void in my previous endeavors with South African post-apartheid literature. By then, my main interest in literature had always been the complex notion of aesthetics that I valued due to its potential to keep human intelligence alert and alive. Many literary studies I read made me uncomfortable with how they used literature to fulfill either anthropological, societal, ethnographic, nationalist or nationalistic aims. Only few, particularly in African literary studies, addressed literature as a discourse *per se*. My dissatisfaction remained firm until I came across *The Opacity of Narrative* by Peter Lamarque in which he makes the point stronger by writing that “literary critics on the whole show a marked reluctance to acknowledge the relevance of aesthetics to literature” (Lamarque, 2014, p. 169). It is then that I began to think about dealing with complexities, which would

1 My emphasis.

replicate that of aesthetics, highlighted by Strawson as follows: “there can be no general descriptive criteria for aesthetic assessment” (Strawson, 1974, p. 186). I began to look for the more elaborate aesthetic features in my corpus that could drain my concerns and discontents. Whiteness, homosexuality, democracy, and *Relation* finally emerged in the final analysis as the satisfactory answer to my preoccupations. Literature being not a mere mirror of society, but also a shapeshifter thereof, connecting these concepts gives me the opportunity to experience this ontological reciprocity about literature in post-apartheid narrative.

My study dealing with literature from the African continent, it would not appear redundant to bear in mind that narratives by Camara Laye and Mongo Béti have helped pose the question of African literature's axiology. Far from being an art that portrays an exotic Africa as Béti criticized Laye's *Black Boy*² of doing, or an exotic site of *difference* as George Yancy puts it in relation to black American literature (Yancy, 2008, p. 43), African literature aims at enabling deeper understanding of African problems. It simultaneously serves as *miraculous weapons*³ aiming to challenge African impasses. Véronique Tadjo observes in line to this that, like any other work of art, the African literary text aims not to reproduce the world but to offer it a different vision:

The literary text is really essential today. Like any other work of arts that goes deeply into the matters, the literary text aims not to replicate the world, but to give it a different vision. Literature is thus a space of liberty where it is possible to take risks. The light it carries to our being enables us to access to an alternative reality. Though fictional it is capable to make us better understand our past and the path we are walking on. It is a meditation, an invite to think. The narrative is a way to grasp our world. / Le texte littéraire véritablement reste plus que jamais essentiel. Comme tout travail artistique en profondeur, il a pour objectif de donner une autre vision du monde et non de le reproduire. La littérature est donc un espace de liberté où il est possible de prendre des risques. Et la lumière qu'elle jette sur notre existence permet d'avoir accès à une autre réalité, fictionnelle certes, mais capable de nous faire mieux comprendre notre passé et vers où nous nous acheminons. Elle est une méditation, une invitation à la réflexion. Le roman est une manière d'appréhender le monde (Tadjo, 2011, pp. 261-262).

In working at the junction between the reflected South Africa and an alternative South African society idealized in the post-apartheid narrative, my study articulates a conception of African literature in the face of performances, challenges and merits of literature in general.

2 Cf. Mongo Béti, “Afrique Noire Littérature Rose”, *Présence Africaine*. Nr. 1-2. (1955).

3 Aimé Césaire, *Les Armes Miraculeuses* (Paris : Gallimard, 1946).

I-1- Operationalization of key concepts

If according to Jean Michel Adam any text carries the risk of being misunderstood (Adam, 1999, p. 23), it is because words or concepts that structure it are generally polysemous. Above all, concepts are generally perceived differently according to the context of utterance, or according to the utterer. In order to avoid any confusion, a preliminary operationalization of key terms in this study is required.

I-1-1- Democracy

Paul Edwards writes about democracy that:

“Democracy” is difficult to define, not only because it is vague, like so many political terms, but more importantly, because what one person would regard as a paradigm case another would deny was a democracy at all. The word has acquired a high emotive charge in the last hundred years; it has become good tactics to apply it to one’s own favored type of regime and to deny it to rivals”.

According to Edwards, democracy is a controversial notion. Democracy is a tool that seeks for better living conditions in society. It stresses on liberty which it considers as a fundamental value. Democracy is a political form based on the commitment to self-government, to give oneself one’s own laws and to follow those self-given laws. Under this appealing perspective, democracy is working in the majority of countries in the world as evident in the following statement by Christopher Meckstroth:

If democracy is not the only live political creed left in the twenty-first century (advocates of theocracy and undemocratic liberalisms also survive – so often pitted against each other), it nevertheless remains far and away the most powerful, and by now it must be admitted that it has proved its appeal to peoples on every continent and of every major cultural and religious tradition on earth (Meckstroth, 2015, p. 2).

South Africa did achieve its democracy with the first multiracial elections organized on 27th April 1994. Thereafter, Nelson Mandela (ANC) was inaugurated as South Africa’s first democratic president on 10th May. Nevertheless, many people feel excluded as they still face poverty on the daily basis. In *After Tears* by Niq Mhlongo (2007) for instance, a character appositely puts the debate on the discussion table when he points out that:

If you’re black and you failed to get rich in the first year of our democracy, when Tata Mandela came to power, you must forget it, my bra. The gravy train has passed you by and, like me; you’ll live in poverty until your beard turns grey. The bridge

between the stinking rich and the poor has been demolished. That is the harsh reality of our democracy⁴.

This is evidence that the official South African democracy has not yet succeeded in meeting peoples' expectations. Democracy being a tool, it did in the case of South Africa obviously serve for an increase in people's freedom though they continue to do and suffer what they were pre-viously coerced to do (Bowring, 2015, p. 157). The official democracy in South Africa matches liberal democracy predominantly structured by what Isaiah Berlin terms "negative freedom" (Berlin, 1969, p. 21). For, that "democracy is not incompatible with some kinds of autocracy, or at any rate with the absence of self-government. Liberty in this sense is principally concerned with the area of control, not with its source (Berlin, 1969, p. 21).

Thiven Reddy dedicated his recent book entitled *South Africa, Settler Colonialism and the Failures of Liberal Democracy* to the deconstruction the official South African democracy from the same perspective as in this book. Referring to Ken Owen⁵ who blames 'the deplorable state' of official South African democracy on the low self-esteem of the black leadership, Reddy argues that:

'We are dealing with a generation of black leaders who were severely damaged, men more than women, by the terrible humiliations of Apartheid'. As a result, the black political elite are prone to express insecurity, desperate greed, excessive concern for status and appearance, a sad re-liance on paper qualifications, dishonesty, abuse of the weak, especially women and children, vain displays of wealth, and pomposity. Bodyguards, expensive cars, huge mansions, expensive whiskeys, business class flights - the symptoms of a sense of inferiority are everywhere'. By contrast: 'White South Africans are writing books, producing plays, defending causes, mending machines, teaching, even helping to govern badly like A-lec Erwin and Jeremy Cronin' (Reddy, 2015, p. 1).

Reddy's argument is a clear indication that democracy in South Africa still has a long way to go before it effectively becomes a profane one and serves all and sundry. To achieve that aim, great and groundbreaking efforts have to be made. Reddy's description is also an evidence of the extraordinary misunderstanding on which South African democracy is built. Reddy's work portrays the concept of democracy as a strange tool that can excellently serve desolation and happiness.

4 Mmusi Maimane, "If you are a racist, don't vote DA". This speech was delivered by Mmusi Maimane, the leader of Democratic Alliance (DA) at the Apartheid Museum in Johannesburg on the 19th January 2016 at 10:58 am. Cf.: <http://www.timeslive.co.za/politics/2016/01/19/If-you-are-a-racist-dont-vote-DA---Mmusi-Maimanes-full-speech-on-race>, consulted 19th January 2016 at 23:38 pm.

5 Ken Owen, "Excesses of a damaged generation". *Business Day Live*. Online. (2009).

Nevertheless, democracy remains an appealing political system, even if its accomplishment is never easy going. In this respect, Gerard Rosich and Peter Wagner have dedicated a notable academic work to the paradoxes of democracy. In *The Trouble with Democracy*, they outline three fundamental views of democracy which elucidate the prospects and the challenges of democracy in the 21st centuries: 1. the affirmative narrative, 2. the critical narrative and 3. the conundrum narrative.

Affirmative democracy refers to soothing and protective accounts about democracy with insistence on its breakthroughs and setbacks. The consequence of this dogmatic perspective is that it reduces any critique of existing democracies to being “only possible from an instrumental or technical perspective, not from a normative one – from a reformist, not from a radical one” (Gerard Rosich, 2016, p. 268).

In relation to critical narrative about democracy, Rosich and Wagner explain that it:

Assumes that what is commonly understood as democracy is only a technique of government which conceals that the real constitution of political power is, in fact, non-democratic: reality and ideality are always in conflict. The critical task is to unveil in any allegedly democratic institution its anti-democratic element due to the imbalance of power relations or violence, be it symbolic or material. (...) Contemporary theories on biopolitics or governmentality are forms of this narrative. A wide variety of answers is given to the question of what it is that is concealed: class struggle, gender domination, racial supremacy, bare life, national domination, etc. (Gerard Rosich, 2016, p. 269).

According to Rosich and Wagner, critical narrative about democracy is defensive and fixist rather than radical. It is never about what distinguishes democracy from other political systems. This is because, democracy from this perspective does nothing to turn the awareness of the electors towards the choice of policies but it confines their participation exclusively in either the choice of governors whom they trust to deal fairly and efficiently with problems as they emerge, or in the search for new governors when they are disillusioned. Critical narrative of democracy, thus, emerges as a dogmatic narrative of the same nature as affirmative narrative. This classification of narratives about democracy enables Gerard Rosich and Peter Wagner to conclude that:

If the affirmative narrative reifies democracy and is unable to accommodate change or crisis, the critical narrative is in its optimistic version idealistic and messianic, and in its pessimistic version dystopian and apocalyptic. It understands stability as the sedimentation of power relations that hampers any democratic aspiration (Gerard Rosich, 2016, p. 269).

Conundrum narrative of democracy is referred to as the narrative that proposes to leave aside the irreconcilable opposition between the two previous narratives. This last perspective “states that democracy is a conundrum in itself. In this view, democracy’s essence is paradoxical or aporetic; its institutionalization is phenomenologically unfeasible or would turn out to be self-destructive” (Gerard Rosich, 2016, p. 269). From this perspective, democracy becomes a political instrument in the hands of liberal individualism, which sees it as a way of safeguarding and reconciling individual and group interests (Edwards, 1972, p. 340). Finn Bowring talks of the liberal tradition of democracy (Bowring, 2015, p. 157) because it pillars upon the notion of negative freedom (Bowring, 2015, p. 156) which to a certain extent is similar to the critical narrative of democracy as discussed by Rosich and Wagner.

Reddy, Rosich and Wagner’s framework guides my discussion of democracy in the post-apartheid narrative in this study. I will particularly be attentive to the perceptions that young South Africans have about democracy as portrayed in post-apartheid narratives. In fact, one of the *raison d’être* of my study is to identify these perceptions and to show how they work either paradoxically or symphonically to the automation of hegemony in democratic South Africa.

In addition, I will be particularly attentive to the challenges of a truly and inclusive democracy in South Africa as suggested in the post-apartheid narrative. True and inclusive democracy in this study refers to Christopher Meckstroth’s idea of “the [perpetual] struggle for democracy”⁶ by which democracy does not only pertains to the fight for the achievement of a positive democracy but, also to acknowledging all the stakeholders “the right to decide what democracy will mean” (Meckstroth, 2015, p. 2). It is so to speak an openly participative democracy by which stakeholders are fully aware of their interests and freely offer them to sane contradiction expecting to benefit from its curative and non-barbaric power. It is this sense of democracy that I refer to as a truly and inclusive democracy. It is achieved in society through justice, transparency, sane contradiction between individuals or groups for its curative implications and incessant multidimensional improvements. Not only the polysemy or complexity of democracy itself as evident above flaws its full accomplishment in the post-apartheid society but, equally whiteness as the study aims to show.

I-1-2- Whiteness

In her influential book entitled *The End of Whiteness. Satanism and Family Murder in Late Apartheid South Africa* Nicky Falkof (2016) addresses cultural dynamisms and subtleties that favored the rise of what she calls “apartheid mentality” in South

6 My emphasis.

Africa. She blames everything on whiteness, which gave way to a sordid propaganda nurtured by two compatible aspects of thoughts. The first aspect evidencing the economic ties of whiteness refers to “the concept of separate nations, to save the Afrikaner “nation” from being swamped and to protect its members from black economic competition. The second aspect is “the crudely racist belief in black genetic inferiority” (Falkof, 2016, p. 8). Joseph Conrad’s *Heart of Darkness* has depicted genuinely how the sense of belief Falkof talks about in this relation works in its victim’s psychology pressurizing them to devotedly wanting to set the said belief up, bow down before it and offer a sacrifice to it (Conrad, 2010, p. 8).

The merit of Falkof in this relation is to disclose whiteness as an ideological category of power constructed over time. She argues in this regards that:

The human categories that we place within the term race are not unchanging, biological truths. We often imagine race to be something obvious, determined by genes that people are born with. But research has shown that race, like other identities, is socially and historically constructed. Race is “profoundly and in its very essence ideological”, and this applies as much to whiteness as to blackness. Being thought of as white does something. Whiteness affects people’s experiences, their senses of themselves and their opportunities in and engagements with the world, but it is neither consistent nor permanent. This is borne out by the fact that there are changes over time in who is thought of as white. As numerous studies have shown, both Jewish and Irish people only acquired their white identities in the early 20th century. Before this, Jews were allied to ‘Orientals’ in the European imagination, while Irish people were seen to have more in common with Africans than with Europeans. Afrikaners, who are a pivotal part of this story, were not always considered properly white by their pre-apartheid colonial masters: the British Lord Kitchener once called the Boers ‘uncivilized Afrikaner savages with a thin white veneer’. A national identity that was tied so tightly to its whiteness, and that became globally symbolic of white supremacist politics, was once considered suspect and not civilized enough to be ‘properly’ white (Falkof, 2016, p. 6).

In other words, Afrikaners who became the global symbol of white supremacist politics during Apartheid in South Africa were once considered not civilized enough to be ‘properly’ white (Pieterse, 1992, p. 104). They simply happened to be enrolled into whiteness, obviously after going through passing rituals. Falkof’s argument above parallels that of Garvey and Ignatiev when they refer to the whiteness as “a club that enrolls certain people at birth, without their consent, and brings them up according to its rules” (John Garvey, 1997, p. 347). Whiteness in this sense appears to be a sort of ideological norm given as the center. Its existence depends on its power to level all cosmetic variations around it. Put this way, whiteness exposes itself rather as a vulnerable category. In fact, whiteness is nothing but a device about economic power. Understanding whiteness as such is a great step toward

challenging it on condition that one truly wills to do so. It is in this relation that whiteness did emerge in academic and theoretical frameworks contesting racism. These frameworks unanimously resort in so doing to Derridean deconstruction with which Glissant concurs when he postulates that “to dismantle the apparatus is already to challenge the discourse” (Glissant, 1981, p. 14).

Bunnin and Yu define racism as “the claim that there is a biologically determined hierarchy of capacity or value among different races and that allegedly inferior races should be ruled by allegedly superior races” (Nicholas Bunnin, 2009, p. 583). Racism is generally driven by fear and hatred (Memmi, 1994, p. 14). Compared to racism that encompasses broader features, whiteness has the particularity to accommodate the allegedly superior race, in the cosmetic sense of the term, in the *white* race while concealing the allegedly inferior race in its opposite *black* race.

Whiteness is also a troublesome topic that engenders protective agencies aiming to keep the superior and dominant race *unseen* by the minority from the perspective of “bare life” (Agamben, 1989). Relating whiteness to whiteness studies, Steve Garner elucidates this idea in *Whiteness. An Introduction* when he writes that:

Thinking about whiteness as a *system* of privilege is a huge source of anxiety for individuals who consider themselves white. The often-venomous media coverage of ‘whiteness studies’ in America testifies to the profound defensiveness that shifting the gaze onto white privilege engenders. The message is clear: scrutiny of the dominant rather than minority racialized group is invalid. One commentator expresses his understanding thus: The essence of the discipline can be summed up in two words: Hating Whiteness. This representation of the thrust of whiteness studies willfully displaces the argument from the complexity of group relations to the focus on responses to racism (Garner, 2007, p. 5).

Whiteness in this respect unsettles or adjourns any possibility of *seeing* - or admitting - oneself as dominant while providing the dominant group with new impetus and new strategies for domination. In her article entitled “Mythen von Afrika. ‚Rasse‘ und Rassismus in der deutschen Afrikaterminologie”, Susan Arndt discusses how whiteness works through words in order to keep racial domination unquestioned forever in the German context. Arndt shows that whiteness operates by avoiding questioning racism directly. Whiteness instead loads itself with convenient -or so-called neutral- terminologies that even the updated versions of the German dictionary validate. The words used are as varied as: „Buschmänner“, „Hottentotten“, „Schwarzafrika“, „Schwarzer Kontinent“, „Eingeborene“, „Farbige“, „Stamm“, „Häuptling“, „Primitive“, „Kannibale“, „Naturvölker“, „Pygmäe“, „Rasse“ etc. (Arndt, 2006, p. 265). In the end, what Arndt rejects is, to use the phrasing by Frankenberg, “-as location of privilege, as culturally normative space -, whiteness remains secured and reproduced” (Frankenberg, 1993, p. 243).

The discussion of whiteness by both Arndt and Garner shows that whiteness sometimes works as a concept that invents its own methods to perpetuate racial domination. Nevertheless, whiteness also works as a skillful theoretical and methodological apparatus that capacitate individuals to efficiently challenge racism. John Hartigan posits in this relation that:

Whiteness is a concept honed by academics and activists (...). Whiteness asserts the obvious and overlooked fact that whites are racially interested and motivated. Whiteness both names and critiques hegemonic beliefs and practices that designate white people as “normal” and racially “unmarked” (Hartigan, 2005, p. 1).

Whiteness in Hartigan’s statement here refers to critical whiteness studies as coined by many scholars (Maureen Maisha Eggers, 2005). It is an oppositional program that scholars and activists set against ongoing racial dominations in the United States and in Germany predominantly. To connect it back to my concept of democracy, whiteness from this perspective bears prospects towards accomplishment of a truly inclusive democracy in the democratic South Africa as portrayed in the post-apartheid narrative.

Nevertheless, although Hartigan and other westerner scholars of critical whiteness studies provide useful impetuses in the conceptualization of whiteness and in the struggle against racism, they overlook⁷ its performances by its black victims who went through its conditioning processes. Because of this specific reason, their theoretical agency against racism, though pertinent, is partial and thus, illusive toward effectively overcoming racial domination.

In my study, whiteness refers to both its agencies as articulated by the allegedly superior race to perpetuate domination in the democratic South Africa and its exasperating performance when internalized by the allegedly inferior race. In fact, I address whiteness from a double but complementary perspective. First of all, I consider whiteness referred to as subject position in power as the very triggering structure from which South African semiotics is derived. This essential stream of power evolved over time and went through contextual updates and revisions. Its dynamism, its constant renovation and its cohabitation with its obvious victims end up restructuring the victim’s psychology, turning them into whiteness’ agent embodied in black complexion. I address black skin, white masks (Fanon, 1969) as cultural devices produced by whiteness for its perpetuation. This complex condition Bhabha refers to as colonial hybrid impacts the fight against racism negatively because this very complex narrative of racism is generally left aside in majority of accounts against racism. The second perspective consequently refers to my personal dissatisfaction with critical whiteness studies for, it tends to leave unquestioned the fact that fighting against racism is not efficient enough when it is limited to

7 Maybe also that they are simply unable to address them.

its white perpetrators and its explicit black victims, leaving aside its other implicit black victims on whom the integration into whiteness has been accomplished⁸. In the formally democratic South Africa portrayed in the selected narrative, it is stimulating to address the question whether black victims of whiteness who vote for their first time are really working for the accomplishment of a profane democracy. Alternatively, are they not simply working for the establishment of the liberal tradition of democracy (Bowring, 2015, p. 157)?

How homosexuality is broadly perceived and social exclusion that homosexuals face in the portrayed democratic South Africa also merits to be seen as another major cultural aspect which bear witness that, how this issue is dealt with in South Africa does not enable the aesthetics idea-lized in the narratives selected to materialize.

I-1-3- Homosexuality

In a conversation with the scholar Roger Copeland, Susan Sontag comments on beauty as follows: “it would be imbecilic simply to defend beauty or to contend that there is something called beauty which exists absolutely apart from any kind of historical coloring or ethical mandate” (Sontag, 1995, p. 190). With this comment that pertinently highlights the epistemological complexity of the idea of beauty, Sontag calls upon the responsibility of the subject to freedom from cultural, historical or ethical constraints preceding or surrounding our lives. The so-called constraints contribute in “killing subjects” socially (Taylor, 2005, p. 8) by the means of habituation and levelling.

Conceived of as an erotic relationship between persons of the same sex, homosexuality surfaces in this context as an attempt to survive social killing of subjects, referred to by the sociologist Orlando Paterson as the “social death” of slavery (Taylor, 2005, p. 8). Orlando Paterson equates slavery to social death because its procedures tarnish rationality and integrity in the slave and in the master’s inner life as well. It pertains to a decay of human responsibility for autonomy and longing in the sense that human disposition to self-determination is violated and substituted by principles that they could not have necessarily approved. To relate it to the idea of whiteness, homosexuality in this relation is a rejection of whiteness in the sense that it declines the enrollment of certain people at birth to the club, without their consent, and their conditioning according to its rules (John Garvey, 1997, p. 347). With reference to Roger Sneed’s terminology, homosexuality finally appears as a

8 This is very obvious for instance in *Mythen, Masken und Subjekte: Kritische Weißseinsforschung in Deutschland* by Maureen Maisha Eggers, Grada Kilomba, Peggy Piesche, and Susan Arndt. Münster: UNRAST-Verlag, 2005.

radical rejection of the “either-or” dichotomy⁹ (Sneed, 2010, p. 2) for a responsible assertion of oneself. “One has already assumed a subject position, if one identifies himself as gay” (Sneed, 2010, p. 7), Sneed concludes.

Introduced this way however, homosexuality does not prevent one from turning it to a fertile soil for the formation of new clubs of socially killed identities (Taylor, 2005, p. 8) or their conservation as such. This sense of homosexuality does not for instance prevent politically leading social classes from its instrumentation through homophobia in the society in order to maintain the status quo ratifying in doing so almost the same social killings Taylor talks about. An example is how African political elites in general, Cameroonian ones in particular, to hide the flaws of a system that they are unable to make work well, instrumentalize homophobia against homose-xuality by solemnly staging either repression or exile of gays who are made to look like pariahs (Gueboguo, 2006, p. 22). Bunnin and Yu stress this argument by Gueboguo and even go a step further to make a general statement about how gays have been perceived as pariahs in the world both chronologically and diachronically. Homosexuality, the two scholars conclude “has historically been generally regarded as immoral, for it is disapproved of by the majority of social customs and the majority of population” (Nicholas Bunnin, 2009, p. 310).

Out of fear of repression or exile, homosexuals resort to pseudonyms in post-apartheid narrative. This is a clever barometer enabling to assess the state of democracy or individual rights in the democratic South Africa. In democratic South Africa where the protection of LGBT rights is based on section 9 of the Constitution, and which forbids discrimination on the basis of sex, gender or sexual orientation, homosexuals do not need to vanish under pseudonyms. The fact that they hire *nomen falsum* (Agamben, 1990, p. 62) evidences homosexuality as a practice still considered an offense by some in a so-called democratic society, who claim to be *normal* human beings. In this respect, male homosexuals are usually referred to as gays and females as lesbians. In global academic contexts, terms such as same sex relationships, queer or LGBTIQ-community or folks are used. In the South African everyday life, both gays and lesbians are labeled as *moffies* (Mikki Van Zyl, 1999, p. 51).

I consider the use of *nomen falsum* by homosexual characters as a clear indication that the ongoing South African democracy is unable to give birth to “the beautiful ones” to borrow Ayi Kwei Armah’s famous phrasing (Armah, 1989). LGBT rights being into force constitutionally in post-apartheid South Africa, the deliberate choice to disguise characters under pseudonyms becomes a clever accusation of democracy as a void concept in relation to homosexuality. My use of homosexuality

9 The either (homosexual) or (heterosexual) dichotomy is a Manichean one in the sense that it transforms the subjects of these two sexual orientations to cruel opponents.

in this respect accuses South African democracy as a discriminatory concept because it does not extend equal rights to persons with different sexual orientations. It does not include homosexuals as forming an entity that partakes of the cultural diversity of South Africa. Because of its exclusionary orientation, South Africa exterminates its very DNA for democratic accomplishments. From the perspective of the ostracized homosexual, South African democracy corroborates the idea that it is as a device to safeguard and reconcile individual and group interests (Edwards, 1972, p. 340).

While whiteness works in this study as the practical angle from which the identification of the hegemonic mechanic is at hand, homosexuality operates for its part as both a methodological and metaphorical tool to accuse and expose the irrationality of whiteness in particular, and hegemony in general. They both highlight flaws in democracy in the portrayed post-apartheid South Africa. Whiteness and homosexuality build a sort of dialogical dichotomy that impacts democracy replicating it as a cold monster, who does not hesitate to side with either justice or despotism.

In dealing with the notion of *Relation* and how this relates to democracy in my study, the next section introduces to academic discussion the idea of post-apartheid criticism by suggesting the paradigm as precursor of better futures for all in society.

1-1-4- *Relation*

Relation claims that everything is related, temporalities, spatialities, textualities. One is because another is – or is not. *Relation* is both a vision of conviviality and a claim that power generates hierarchies and respective patterns of discrimination that enable true conviviality. *Relation* challenges historical projections that legitimize totalitarian monolithisms such as slavery, departmentalization, colonialism, capitalism, racism, apartheid, and so forth. Celebrating “opacity”, it envisions and even shares futures that host “unity in diversity”, complexity, and fluidity of identities. Thus tuned, *Relation* envisions the local performances of global encounters as rhizomes and thus diverse and unpredictable.

Relation disrupts the power relationship that governs global and local histories, insisting on the utopia of “unity in diversity”. In this sense all would profit from *Relation*, both culturally and in terms of freedom. *Relation* does not, however, exist but in the realm of textualities and the respective narrations. Glissant has it as follows: “*Relation* connects, relays and relates” (Glissant, 1990, p. 187). In the *Caribbean Discourse*, Glissant eminently points out that the ultimate way to embody *Relation* is through deconstruction of *discourse* (Glissant, 1981, p. 14).

Schematically, *Relation* pertains to the continuous process when the gaze on the epics of origins (The One) common to almost all cultures is defused from its habituation to intolerance and its subsequent zest to suppress or level other cultures

and identities. Since *La Lézarde* (Glissant, 1958) the constant endeavor by Glissant to narrate the Caribbean memory washed out by the ocean during slavery days brought him to a new philosophy of space in the sense referred to by John Berger as “the prophetic dimension that hides consequences from us”¹⁰ (Barnard, 2007, p. 18). While the linear nature of history (epics) crosses space in order to enrich a fix center thanks to its multidimensional achievements, the open nature of space, seen from a profane point of view, vibrantly exposes all consequences of such space-crossing. Instances are many either in literature or in the world to ascertain this idea. For example, the contrast between the appalling condition of South-Tanga and the wealthy and quiet North-Tanga as spaces in *Ville Cruelle* by Mongo Béti exposes all consequences of colonialism in the world. The gap between the abyssal living conditions of Sowetans and the quietness of Cape Town replicated in the narrative under study also exposes the consequences of racism in South Africa.

Glissant committed his academic life to looking for a theoretical approach that would bring about more justice in such constellation of the world. His understanding of space as a metaphor that speaks out consequences of history brought him to the necessity for a radical redefinition of boundaries between spaces. Based on the consequences of history (epics) that he experienced in France and in the Caribbean, Glissant was able to redefine space in a way that diffuses the Manicheism which previously designed spaces as fundamentally antagonistic to each other. Glissant writes in this respect that:

boundaries between spaces that have been built (...) do not suppose walls, but passages, passes, where the sensibilities of the peoples are constantly renewed, where the universal becomes the consent to the impenetrable values one in the other harmonized, each valid one to the other, and where the thoughts of the world (...) finally circulate in the air¹¹ (Glissant, 2011, p. 59).

With this philosophy of boundaries Glissant postulates *Relation* as a procedural device that deconstructs and defuses any residual site of subjugation or power and pleas for true acceptance of the other as a same but, different (“diversality”). *Relation* in this sense speaks for fairer inclusion in society irrespective of all existing differences. When considered as embodiment of *Relation* in society each individual or group of individuals are marked by fluidity, which gives them the aptitude to momentarily detach themselves from their single angle from time to time and view or experiment things from the perspective of others. It is then that they are strongly immunized against any kind of charm from either superiority or inferiority complex.

¹⁰ Quoted by Rita Barnard.

¹¹ My translation.

An archetypal instance of *Relation* in *The Quiet Violence of Dreams* is Tshepo. He is staged under as various identities as black African, homosexual, heterosexual, marginalized, student, work seeker, sick patient in a psychiatric hospital, or poor sex worker alongside with rich clients. Because of his aptitude to momentarily detach himself from one single identity since he had experienced the conditions of other identities in society, Tshepo's ontological fluidity features him as an ever-ordinary singularity that is immunized against any magnetism to exceptionality or to purity. Tshepo is as rhizomic, impure and fluid as Gibreel Farishta and Saladin Chamcha in Rushdie's *Satanic Verses*. If embodied in the making of society, Tshepo's condition can become undeniably a model for the achievement of a truer democracy, in the sense that the democracy achieved serves all people. Fixity, which taps its legitimacy from epic (heroism, history) or exceptionality (prejudice about one's purity) and crosses space around such as to offer back all forms of its feats to the center is paradoxically the fuel for Tshepo's dynamism to evade it. Conceived as such, Tshepo is nothing but a representative instrument for relativity and the figurative emblem of justice as well.

Relation parallels Agamben's idea of profanation, which consists of returning to the use and property of men something that was once sacred or religious (Agamben, 2007, p. 73). With its fluid potential, *Relation* that defuses and challenges power constellations, becomes a strong device for inclusion and fairness that any true democracy yearns for. In relation to democracy, *Relation* differs for instance from what Rosich and Wagner's have previously discussed as conundrum or self-destructive narrative of democracy because *Relation* guarantees a permanent unpredictable negotiation of stakeholders and a continuous search for the meaning of democracy.

In relating these notions my study hypothesizes concepts associated to whiteness, homosexuality and democracy as working in the portrayed post-apartheid society to making the post-apartheid hegemony convenient. The postulate of the study is that, a truly inclusive democracy can be achieved only when domination in all forms is identified and challenged in the society. Relating these concepts or at least their perceptions along with *Relation* is also an innovative enterprise. In effect, *Relation* does not only hypothesize post-apartheid criticism as an approach that works "for" and "against" post-colonial criticism, but it also envisions post-apartheid criticism, due to *Relation's* utopian nature, as an appropriate approach that relevantly addresses issues that all societies, beyond the portrayed post-apartheid society, go through.

How my thesis does differ from previous studies carried out either on the field of South African literature, South African post-apartheid literature, or on the concepts of whiteness, homosexuality, *Relation* and democracy in South Africa? What is innovative in my study? How my thesis does contribute to research on literary

studies in general, post-apartheid literary studies in particular? The following section deals with these questions.

I-2- Literature review

The method adopted to address the literature review consists of starting from a general point of view to a particular one. General point of view pertains to answering the question how my thesis differs from existing studies on the field of South African literature, and on the narratives selected. The particular point of view refers to dealing with how my study differs from works carried out on South-African post-apartheid culture from the perspective of the concepts founding my topic.

I-2-1- On South African literature

Considerable works have been carried out in the field of South African literature from its early origins to recent days. Christopher Heywood has dedicated his *History of South African Literature* to the isolation of chronological boundaries in the field. In his study, he points out salient periods from which South African literature could be pertinently appraised. Christopher Heywood has it as follows:

South African literature emerges in two main phases: (a) a white dominance before 1960, accompanied by emerging black self-discovery and literary achievement. The literary movement culminated in the publication of the magazine *Drum* as a vehicle for literary writing. (b) The period after 1960 saw the emergence of blacks as literary leaders after the later 1950s, with white writers joining in a general protest against apartheid (Heywood, 2004, p. 20).

Following Heywood, South African literature deserves to be regarded as an initial product of white civilization. Heywood, in so doing, overlooks existing African oral cultures and literature, which are said to have originated in 1000 BC; many centuries before Westerner colonizers set foot to the Cape of Good Hope (Sévry, 2007, p. 9).

Contrary to Heywood; Elmar Lehmann, Erhard Reckwitz, and Lucia Vennarini argue for a pluralistic genesis of South African literature. For, they believe that as diverse as South Africa is, each cultural group has its literature which deserves to be valued as such. They state their conviction when discussing the purpose of their book as follows:

The particular purpose of this [book] on the subject (...) was to find a viable as well as sustainable method of somehow devising an approach that is adequate for representing the diversity of the literatures in the country's various languages

without losing sight of whatever unifying features there may be—both in thematic, formal, generic and pragmatic terms (Elmar Lehman, 2000, p. 7).

Working from the same deconstructionist perspective, Peter Horn goes as far as to condemn denial of non-alphabetic sign, the name “writing”, as a ‘colonialist and ethnocentric gesture’ of the same nature ‘like the one which denies any culture other than the one resembling one’s own the name of “human” (Horn, 2015, p.22). In the same line as Peter Horn, Elmar Lehmann et al., David Attwell and Derek Attridge refuse to overlook South African diversity by introducing their *Cambridge History of South African literature* with the chapter entitled: “Oratures, oral Histories, Origins”. In this opening chapter, Hedley Twilde, Russell H. Kashula, Nlanla Maake, Mbongiseni Buthelezi, Manie Groenewald and Mokgale Makgopa are given the floor to discuss evidence of Bushmen’s, Xhosa’s, Lesotho’s, Zulu’s, IsiNdebele’s, siSwati’s, Sotho’s, Tshivenda’s and Xitsonga’s literature and cultures in South Africa respectively (David Attwell, 2012, p. 15.111).

Despite the ambition of the scholars above to give back each specific literature from South Africa the place they deserve, Jean Sévry notes in *Littératures d’Afrique du Sud* that reception of the South African literature is marked by an explicit ambiguity. For, South African literature happens to be both well-known and overlooked. South African literature is well-known because internationally, it refers to names like André Brink, Alan Paton, and Athol Fugard as well as to Nobel Prize winners such as Nadine Gordimer and J.M. Coetzee. On the other hand, writers such as Thomas Mofolo, Sol Plaatje, Mazisi Kunene, Es’kia Mphahlele or Njabulo Ndebele are rarely evoked despite the significant role played by these other South African writers in featuring both thematically and formally the field (Sévry, 2007, p. 5). The study by Sévry shows that reception of South African literature undergoes a contradictory situation which probably replicates colonial logics of apartheid to which South Africa has been subject for centuries.

In a different study which Jean Sévry dedicated to the interweavement of apartheid and literature, the scholar argues that, all existing South African literary voices met in the struggle against the regime of disgrace. Sévry reveals an unanimity in the writings during apartheid between black, Afrikaner, white Anglophone, mixed-raced, and Indian voices as well. Using literature as medium for sensitization and for action, all South African voices merge together in the ambition to defeat Apartheid system in South Africa. Sévry writes in this line that :

Il ne s’agit pas que d’esthétique. Il s’agit aussi de réveiller des consciences endormies. En cela, toutes les littératures de la République se rejoignent. L’écrivain est celui qui invite ses lecteurs à ouvrir les yeux sur le monde qui les entoure, et à protester. (...) Tous tentent d’accéder à une communication interdite. Il est intéressant de remarquer en passant, qu’une société qui censure toute communication entre les groupes sociaux en présence a donné naissance à une littérature véritable-

ment obsédée par ce thème de la rencontre, qui est alors vécue dans l'imaginaire comme un rêve impossible. C'était déjà le cas de la littérature russe du temps de Tolstoï (Sévry, 1989, pp. 17-22).

The unanimity which South African writers showed by siding all together against Apartheid did however, esthetically damage South African literature. Sévry observes, in this relation for instance that :

Si la littérature peut se définir comme un système de représentations de la réalité, il faut ajouter, dans le cas de l'Afrique du Sud, que la fiction finit par constituer un écho pour des réalités socio-économiques très concrètes. Les écritures, souvent, s'en retrouvent écrasées et comme aplaties de réalisme (Sévry, 1989, p. 9).

Sévry regrets in this relation the fact that South African literature became somehow void aesthetically. South African literature became a sort of concurrent discipline to sociology. In such circumstances, there was no need for sociologists anymore to carry field works because literature was a faithful reflection of South African society. Fictional -imagination- prospects which distinguishes literature from any other discipline were, so to speak, killed off due to the emotional rendition of the racial segregation that was taking place in the country.

Not at ease with the potential loss of aesthetic commitment South African literature was recording during apartheid, Mazisi Kunene went far as to prophesize the death of the South African literature with the end of the regime of racial segregation. Kunene writes in this respect that:

The trouble with South African writing about apartheid is that these people write about apartheid and one day it won't exist and they'll have nothing to write about¹².

Despite Kunene's pessimism about South African literature after apartheid, South African post-apartheid literature displays an interesting vitality instead as prominent scholars like Monica Popescu and Shane Graham elected to show. In *South African Literature beyond the Cold War*, Monica Popescu resorts to translational theoretical frameworks to translate her sense of optimism that derives from South African literature after Apartheid. She uses Nadine Gordimer's Jewish and British origins as a case study to point out the idea of mixity as the core socio-cultural feature of the post-Cold War South Africa. Popescu coins South African literature beyond the Cold War as a field of "intellectual bridge in a world fractured by the Cold War binaries". Her study reveals post-Cold War South African literature as pleading for a bridge that would connect disenchanting leftist intellectuals who, like

12 Mazisi Kunene, cf. Jean Sévry, *Nouvelles du Sud. Littérature d'Afrique du Sud* (Ivry-sur-Seine : Éditions Nouvelles du Sud, 1993) 38.

Gordimer had witness and sometimes acknowledged the disappointing failures of both capitalism and communism to provide a human society (Popescu, 2010, p. 153). Under Popescu's study, post-apartheid literature is postulated as a rallying category that invites for a new start for better futures.

In *South African literature after the Truth Commission*, Shane Graham discusses for his part, how the hearing of Duma Kumalo, a wrongfully convicted as one of the "Sharpeville Six" and death sentenced deserves to be considered as a metonymy of South African post-TRC's culture and literature. In his readings from the perspective of memory – the connecting tissue between the body and the physical places it has occupied, providing at least the perception of a stable basis for identity and sense of community (Graham, 2009, p. 2)- Shane Graham finally states in this relation that:

Kumalo's testimony and his dramatic work share much in common with South African culture and literature at large in the aftermath of apartheid and the Truth and Reconciliation Commission: it exhibits a collective sense of loss, mourning, and elegy, as well as a sense of disorientation amid rapid changes in the physical and social landscape (Graham, 2009, p. 1).

The fate of Kumalo in this respect is regarded as a metaphor of the issues that the post-apartheid literature deals with. It is a literature that is concerned with issues as varied as the psychological consequences of being unjustly accused and convicted, revenge, memory, and strive for the accomplishment of justice. Graham also notes that not only the theme of loss is iteratively displayed in the South African literature after TRC, but also that of the perpetuation of racism and the exposure of the new South Africa to global economy's trend. Shane Graham lists these other themes recurrent in South African literature when he writes that:

Yet the racial legacy of apartheid is perpetuated by the remains of its built environments and by conservative elements in the society that struggle to limit wealth and privilege to those (white and black, now) who already possess it. Moreover, the production of space and the inscription of social memory on that space is problematized and contested by the forces of economic globalization and neoliberalism (Graham, 2009, p. 2).

From the study by Graham one is forced to conclude that, aesthetic in the sense of Sévry and Kunene, remains more or less overlooked. Graham is more concerned with the inventory of the themes at the center of South-African post-apartheid literature. The structuralist approach by Graham leads him to address the South African literature after TRC from a thematic perspective postulating that the South African literature is a sort of mirror of social realities. Graham in so doing neglects the potentials of the post-apartheid literature in terms of expectation over unsat-

isfactory social conditions. Njabulo Ndebele has tried to rectify the partiality in Graham's approach.

In his readings of Zakes Mda, Phaswane Mpe, and many others, Njabulo Ndebele points out how the abolition of apartheid parallels what he terms the "rediscovery of the ordinary". In fact, according to Ndebele, the end of apartheid did free the imagination of South African writers. The evidence is, they became able to write on love, the need of a man or the need of a woman, or on comic issues, rejecting by so doing "a tragic denial of life" (Ndebele, 1994, p. 160) which characterized writings during Apartheid.

The study by Ndebele deserves to be seen as a complement to the important contribution of Graham to the field of South-African post-apartheid literature. In fact, while Graham emphasizes on the thematic, Ndebele insists on the aesthetic of post-apartheid literature, which should protect life among South Africans against "denial of life". Though Ndebele insists on the aesthetic aspect of the South African post-apartheid literature his descriptive approach favors a sort of methodological compromise with the existing order than it challenges. This is a paradox that Rita Barnard tries to avoid in her study of the South African post-apartheid literature.

Rita Barnard highlights to what extent historical projection, which used to be the favored approach to the "denial of life" Ndebele talks about, is no more valid in the current world to which the new South Africa also belongs (Barnard, 2006). Focusing on J.M. Coetzee's *Michael K* and *Disgrace*, Nadine Gordimer's *World of Strangers* and *The House Gun*, Zakes Mda's *Heart of Redness* and *Ways of Dying*, and many writings by Athol Fugard, Barnard illustrates how post-apartheid writing instead of dying as Kunene did prophesize, moved from historical to geographical projection. Quoting John Berger, Barnard observes in this relation that:

Prophecy now involves a geographical rather than historical projection; it is space and not time that hides consequences from us. To prophesy today it is only necessary to know men [and women] as they are throughout the whole world in all their inequality. Any contemporary narrative which ignores the urgency of this dimension is incomplete and acquires the oversimplified character of a fable¹³.

While a descriptive approach similar to that of Ndebele comforts the agencies of historical projections in the sense of Berger, Barnard hypothesizes a different approach to South African post-apartheid literature that takes into account the consequences of historical projections. It is an approach that shares the commitment to life's protection by Ndebele. But, contrary to Ndebele, it is an approach which postulates that the politics of place is the principal methodology that will bring about more justice in the post-apartheid South Africa. It is the politics of place

13 John Berger. Cf. Rita Barnard, *Apartheid and Beyond: South African Writers and the Politics of Place* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006) 18.

that will effectively protect life is in the new South Africa. Geographical projection guarantees so to say, a peak of imagination which is life sustained. Methodologically, Barnard introduces her essay with the discussion of the pastoral in works by JM Coetzee, Athol Fugard and Nadine Gordimer in order to show how space does hide the consequences of injustice in post-apartheid context. She ends her essay by discussing space in *Ways of Dying* and succeeds to show how the novel prophesizes the necessary protection of life wherever it is found.

Though Rita Barnard, like Ndebele, addresses the potentials of the South African post-apartheid literature, she remains too abstract in her suggestion. Barnard elects a messianic posture which transform the stakeholder into a Messiah whose work is to prophesy. Barnard seems to overlook the eventuality of each individual to embody the Messiah who will simply prophesize, but who contributes concretely to the achievement of better social conditions which she wishes. The contradiction that is encompassed between her noble wishes and the alternative she offers, weakens Barnard's seminal contribution to the South African post-apartheid literature. It has the potential effect of diverting the South African post-apartheid literature from radical cultural transformations. Sarah Nuttall and Cheryl-ann Michael try to overcome the paradox comprised in the approach by Rita Barnard by showing what is required in the post-apartheid society for a fundamental improvement of social conditions.

In *Senses of Culture* Sarah Nuttall and Cheryl-ann Michael defy the complaisant approach by Barnard by paralleling the concept of "rainbow nation" with "polite proximities" and "containment" (Sarah Nuttall, 2000, p. 6). By so doing they castigate what they perceive as a forged "new" order, which Mandela's notion of "rainbow nation" did advertise for the new South Africa. In their suggestion Nuttall and Michael draw attention on the requirement for more complex studies on diversity in post-apartheid South Africa. Only these sorts of complex studies will help the post-apartheid South Africa improve social and cultural conditions of the people. The more complex cultural studies required for the post-apartheid society could also maybe provide Mandela's ideal with a more potent substance. Nuttall and Michael state in this respect what follows:

More complex studies of affinities, and how they are made are now needed, particularly in South Africa. The theoretical possibilities of the term "creolization" need to be drawn on not to bring about erasure - an erasing of difference - but underwrite a complex process of making connections (Sarah Nuttall, 2000, p. 10).

Anton Krueger has attempted to address the concept of "creolization"¹⁴ in an influential study dedicated to the South African post-apartheid drama. His study entitled *Experiments in Freedom: Explorations of Identity in New South African Drama*

14 Here in the sense that creolization is a concrete or empirical aspect of *Relation*.

is a notable attempt to deal with what Nuttall and Michael term “more complex studies of affinities” in the post-apartheid context. However, Krueger’s predilection for “syncretic identities” (Krueger, 2010, p. 143) which paradoxes “should all be accepted as such” (Krueger, 2010, p. 225) is the main flaw in his study. In sustaining that the paradoxes of his model (“syncretic identities”) be accepted as such, Krueger fails to invent “a new language, (...) a new culture and a new social organization” in a society where “individuals of different cultures, languages, and religions are thrown together” (Verges, 1999, p. 2). Shortly said, Krueger fails to attain effective “creolization” which his study seeks however to achieve.

In fact, Krueger’s notion of “syncretic identities” instead borrows identities from different existing cultures and juxtaposes them with the dominant model. With the notion of “syncretic identity”, central or peripheral identities undergo what Édouard Glissant terms “the shocking coagulations of the ‘Being’”¹⁵ (Glissant, 1997, p. 25) simply because syncretism does not allow a fundamental questioning of one’s allegedly superior or inferior identity. Syncretism simply juxtaposes one’s fixed¹⁶ identity on new different fixed identities. It does not involve a radical questioning of the ‘self’ that justifies the framing of oneself as superior and of the other as inferior. Syncretism legitimizes fluidity in adjusting static identities to the same scope. It finally perpetuates the same injustices which it initially claims to challenge.

Contrary to Anton Krueger who advocates “syncretic identity” as the model for a better cohabitation of different identities and cultures in the post-apartheid South Africa, this study articulates an alternative identity model that is free from all forms of the seductions that lead to segregation, hegemony, and domination. This alternative identity is inspired by consequences of fixed identities in whose ruses all white and black South Africans have fallen as it is evident in the following statement by Mmusi Maimane:

Apartheid may be history, but the racism that nurtured and sustained it continues to this day. Racism demeans us. All of us, Black and White. It opens the wounds of its victims and exposes the ignorance of those who perpetrate it. It robs us of the dignity that so many fought for. And racism divides us. Just look at us. At the very moment, we need to be standing together, we are being torn apart. It doesn’t have to be this way¹⁷.

This study shows why black and white South Africans are unable to stand together in the democratic South Africa and how they could challenge this regrettable sit-

15 My translation.

16 In the sense that the process of its construction as superior or as inferior is achieved.

17 Speech delivered by the Leader of the Democratic Alliance Mmusi Maimane at the Apartheid Museum in Johannesburg on the 19th January 2016.

uation which haunted Kruger in his study. Perhaps Krueger could have reached different conclusions more complex than his “syncretic identity” if he did not orientate his survey on writers like Athol Fugard, and Zakes Mda, two ideologically opposed South African play writers. My thesis avoids the mistake Krueger did in opting to deal with the generation of writers whose writings were inevitably obsessed with evils of the apartheid system. The study deals with a generation of writers, who witness and take part in the “rediscovery of the ordinary” Ndebele talks about. It is a generation whose narratives are chronologically disconnected from the struggles for or against apartheid inevitably at stake in the creative works by Fugard or Mda.

Opting to deal with works by writers from such a generation also enables the present study, to closely assess to what extent the post-apartheid writers fulfill their mission as outlined by Njabulo Ndebele. The South African novelist and literary critic thinks in fact that:

The task of the new generation of South African writers is to help to extend the range of intellectual and imaginative interest as far as the subject of life under oppression is concerned. It is to look for that area of cultural autonomy and the laws of its dynamism that no oppressor can ever get at; to define that area, and, with purposeful insidiousness, to assert its irrepressible hegemony during the actual process of struggle. That hegemony will necessarily be an organic one: involving the entire range of human activity. Only on this condition can a new creative, and universally meaningful, democratic civilization be built in South Africa (Ndebele, 1994, p. 161).

In other words, the task of the generation of South African writers which my thesis deals with, is by no means, not to avoid hegemony. On the contrary, these writers have the provocative assignment to extricate entanglements of seemingly dissimilar practices, which however operate to reinforce hegemony by splitting and relocating it. Its task for instance is to construct plots which unveil hegemony as proceeding by “self-affirmation through self- erasure” (Barnard, 2006, p. 32). Or, like the main character in *Michaël K* puts it, their task is to carve plots that reveal hegemony as proceeding by “wiping its imprint off of the stone”¹⁸ (Coetzee, 1985, p. 120). Maybe also the conclusion of Kruger is due to the fact that he overlooks that hegemony updates its operations continuously.

The present study innovates as compared to the works mentioned so far in the field of South African post-apartheid culture and society to some extent. Firstly, my study isolates modalities of the post-apartheid hegemony because its disassembly is the prerequisite for the staging and the achievement of a truly and inclusive democracy favorable to all. Secondly, it relates stereotypes about homosexual-

18 My translation of “effacer l’empreinte de ses pas”.

ity, whiteness, and democracy to the hegemony in the post-apartheid society and shows how stereotypes are being captured in the post-apartheid era for the empowerment of hegemony. Finally, in unveiling modalities of the post-apartheid hegemony in selected narratives, my study ends up identifying archetypal traits that single out the South African post-apartheid narrative in general. The traits that my study identifies from the selected narratives could function in fact as operational framework for the study of any other genre that the post-apartheid narrative could adopt.

I-2-2- On the narratives selected

The selection of the narratives which build the primary sources of this study was guided by the assumption that these fictional and factual texts more or less meet Ndebele's above expectations. Though completeness cannot be claimed about the choice made over the narratives selected, they do however play as archetype for their thickness, both in size and contents, which gives South African post-apartheid literature its exceptionality. These narratives are precisely the novels *Dog Eat Dog* by Niq Mhlongo¹⁹, *Coconut* by Kopano Matlwa²⁰, and *The Quiet Violence of Dreams* by Kabelo Sello Duiker²¹, as well as the autobiography *Memoirs of a Born Free: Reflections on the Rainbow Nation* by Malaika Wa Azania²².

Also, among a variety of writings by South African post-apartheid writers, these four narratives, bridging novel and autobiography, are preferred because of the optimistic interest each of them caught among literary critics in South Africa and internationally as well²³. It means that these narratives are not void of some attested genuine artistic features. This last observation emphasizes why the narratives se-

19 Niq Mhlongo, *Dog Eat Dog* (Cape Town: Kwela Books, 2004). All parenthetical references follow this edition.

20 Kopano Matlwa, *Coconut* (Johannesburg: Jacana Media, 2007). All parenthetical references follow this edition.

21 Kabelo Sello Duiker, *The Quiet Violence of Dreams* (Cape Town: Kwela Books, 2001). All parenthetical references follow this edition.

22 Malaika Wa Azania, *Memoirs of a Born Free: Reflections on the Rainbow Nation* (Johannesburg: Jacana Media, 2014). All parenthetical references follow this edition.

23 Kopano Matlwa won the European Union Literary award with *Coconut* and the book has been re-impressed on several times: 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011. Kabelo Sello Duiker won the Herman Charles Bosman Prize for English Literature with his novel in 2001 and *The Quiet Violence of Dreams* has been re-impressed on several times: 2004, 2006, 2008, and 2011. The publication of Niq Mhlongo's *Dog Eat Dog* was supported by the National Arts Council of South Africa and was re-impressed in 2006 by the same editor. Malaika's *Memoirs of a Born Free* is preceded with a foreword by the famous singer and song-writer Simphiwe Dana who won the South African Music Award (SAMA) and AVO Session Basel Award in 2005.

lected deserve to be deemed as archetypal in the narration of post-apartheid South Africa.

Choosing to work on narratives by contemporary well-known South African writers is, therefore, significant for two main reasons. Firstly, it contributes in showing that, maybe deeper than other forms of art, literature is a medium that deals with the contemporary state of society. South Africa being painted in the post-apartheid narrative as a sick organ, the aesthetical means used in the fiction suggest in the same painting ways to overcome the South African pale condition. Thus, the second interest of my choice. For, it enables to disclose ideas that could help build a truly peaceful and inclusive democracy in the contemporary constellation of South Africa.

Johannesburg; “the big city of gold”, as the main character in *Dog Eat Dog* puts it²⁴, is a common scenery to all four narratives. They all portray post-apartheid South Africa, though with an emphasis on specific angles. *Coconut*, for instance, deals mainly with racism, its transformations and its manifestations in the post-apartheid South Africa. *The Quiet Violence of Dreams* abundantly deals with homosexuality, its fears, its challenges, and its prospects in the democratic South Africa. *Dog Eat Dog* and *Memoirs of a Born Free* deal with the contours and detours of democracy in the South African Rainbow Nation.

Autobiographic as it is, *Memoirs of a Born Free* plays a pivotal role among the narratives selected. Though it is dubious, as Phillippe Lejeune points out to clearly isolate autobiography from fiction, (Lejeune, 1986, 1996) the realistic stance of *Memoirs of a Born Free* helps the study epitomizes Nicholas Harrison’s argument about postcolonial theory which guides my reading, that “its deeper origins and many of its ends lie outside academic study” (Harrison, 2003, p. 9). Also, the realism of *Memoirs of a Born Free* in relation to the current South Africa helps evaluate the clairvoyance of the writers of the *kwaito*’s generation who started to condemn injustices in the post-apartheid era immediately after democracy was officially ratified in South Africa. I also take advantage of the same realism of the sole autobiography in my study to vary the register about the notion of narrative involved in my thesis. This is important because, as I will mention it later in the second chapter, the narrative includes diverse sort of (written, visual, oral, etc...) situations that narrate a story.

Since these narratives were published, they have recorded rich literary-critic experiences. Desiree Lewis, for instance, argues about *Memoirs of a Born Free* that this autobiographical narrative translates her author’s attempt to find the meaning of her existence in the post-apartheid South Africa, being born free as it is rhetorically alleged. She writes in this relation that:

Describing her restless journey to find ethical platforms that resist ANC corruption, as well as the duplicity of leaders using populist rhetoric for their own ends, the author dwells on her use of Facebook, Twitter, visual representation, and the printed word. Her sense of the struggle for freedom is therefore strongly linked to her sense of a struggle with and through language²⁵.

For his part, Ives S. Loukson points out a similarity in the call for caution towards edicts generally taken for granted. The critic argues that this vigilance which emanates from *Memoirs of a Born Free* is of similar nature with the call for caution which compelled Mongo Béti to air his autobiography entitled *Lettre Ouverte aux Camerounais ou La Deuxième Mort de Ruben Um Nyobe*. For, as Loukson explicitly observes :

Comme Mongo Béti, Malaika Wa Azania invite à la vigilance quant aux préceptes dont on ne maîtrise pas les intentions ou dont on n'a pas l'initiative qui sont pourtant diffusés dans la société²⁶.

It is to the attempt to find the meaning of Malaika's existence through language that attention merits to be paid to this narrative as my thesis does. In fact, the necessity for all to take part in the battle for notions or edicts' meaning that my thesis mediates for a true and inclusive democracy in South Africa. It is an attitude analogical to the necessity of people to partake in the choice of policies which is the prerequisite for a true and inclusive democracy.

In his discussion of Niq Mhlongo's books, Michael Titlestad identifies archetypal motives in his narratives. According to him, Mhlongo's books predominantly deal with the meaning of being young and black in a transforming South Africa. They also address democracy and the pro-mise of the first democratic election in South Africa. Titlestad writes in this respect that:

Often described as 'the novelist of the kwaito generation', Mhlongo's works confront the realities of being a young black man in a transforming South Africa. His first, *Dog Eat Dog*, set in 1994, describes the daily challenges faced by a Johannesburg university student for whom the financial pressures of studying are as real as the promise of the first democratic election (Titlestad, 2012, p. 685).

Whereas *Coconut* is considered in this thesis as dealing predominantly with racism, Rita Barnard merges it with *Dog Eat Dog* because she reads both narratives as

25 Desiree Lewis, "Another University Is Possible: Thoughts on Student Protests and Universities in Postcolonial Africa", published online on the 9th December 2015 by *Los Angeles Review of Books*.

26 Ives S. Loukson. "Memoirs of a Born Free: Un livre à feuilleter et à méditer", originally published in the cultural magazine *Mosaïques*, Yaoundé, 2015.

matching each other not only for their ironic stance but also in their intentions and perlocutionary interventions. Barnard thus concludes that:

Emerging black middle-class subjectivities, assertive and ironic, savvy about the self-making potentialities of affirmative action, have been articulated by younger writers like Niq Mhlongo in *Dog Eat Dog* (2007) and Kopano Matlwa in *Coconut* (2007). These ethnically particular fictions have cumulatively – perhaps against their best intentions – exceeded or fractured a unified (or even a prismatically encompassing) South Africanness (Barnard, 2012, p. 666).

This disintegration of what Barnard terms South Africanness which *Coconut* and *Dog Eat Dog* mediate, is felt by Jean Sévry as dramatic for a prosperous Africa he tries to find back in its past as evident in the last sentences of *Littératures d'Afrique du Sud*:

Mais la vieille Afrique (...) attend toujours que l'on s'occupe véritablement d'elle, qu'on lui réserve un sort plus juste, dans ce pays tenaillé par la peur qui se nourrit autant de folles espérances que d'amères désillusions (Sévry, 2007, p. 422).

Sévry represents Africa as something static whose beauty did arise once forever at a certain point in the past and which needs to be found back, and taken care of. His model of South African prosperity consists of making the past of the black folks of South Africa alive in the present days. Sévry's model of a better South Africa rehearses, if not, epitomises the method which fuels colonial practices Homi Bhabha discusses as “re²⁷-articulating the archaic” (Bhabha, 1994, p. 123).

My study parts with the static model by Sévry in the sense that it rejects the idea of fixity. Fixity constitutes the core element which blocks an effective social cohesion in the post-apartheid South Africa. Sévry's model of South African prosperity is to a certain extent account-able for “racism in reverse” which the character displays in *Dog Eat Dog* as I will discuss in the course of this study.

More abundantly discussed among these narratives is *The Quiet Violence of Dreams*. Though using very different lenses, Shane Graham and Rita Barnard unanimously see in this narrative the post-apartheid literary book which will count in the making process of a more inclusive South Africa. The Marxist reading of *The Quiet Violence of Dreams* by Shane Graham pushed her to write in this relation that:

Indeed, if Duiker sees any promise in the new South Africa, it lies not in the political transition and the embrace of neoliberal capitalism - the book repeatedly rails against the corruption and opportunism of the new government - but in the shifting and opening up of spaces so that people can reclaim a space for their own

27 My emphasis.

communities and work together to forge new provisional, nonexclusionary identities (Graham, 2009, p. 127).

According to Graham in this respect, *The Quiet Violence of Dreams* does not only castigate the opportunism of new government. Rather, it predominantly emphasizes the prospects the democratic South Africa represents in terms of spreading the trend that forced the country to democracy to all individuals, all South African spaces and groups so that, in the end, all South African voices be heard. It is so to speak a narrative that if well appraised will count in the shaping of a truly inclusive democracy in South Africa.

From her psychosocial perspective, Rita Barnard also comes to almost the same conclusion as Graham. Barnard discusses *The Quiet Violence of Dreams* as the book which more obviously than many other post-apartheid books does, helps grasp challenges the society have to face towards achievement of true inclusivity and openness. Barnard writes in this respect that:

The Quiet Violence of Dreams is able to trace out vulnerable but more affirmative personal trajectory in South Africa's newly fluid urban spaces. (...) With this vision of a tenuous belonging among outsiders, Duiker's harrowing *Bildungsroman* suggests how post-apartheid fiction might not only be sundered from the bonds – real and symbolic – of the hetero-normative family but how these may be transcended in favor of a radical new openness and inclusivity (Barnard, 2012, p. 665).

My study rehearses the prospects of a radical new openness and inclusivity Graham and Barnard point out about *The Quiet Violence of Dreams*. My book draws from inclusivity the necessity to protect each and all existing cultures and identities. At the same time, inclusivity does not aim to prevent from the emergence of new radically different identities. On the contrary, it fosters their rise in unpredictable processes as Glissant would say when talking about *Relation*.

This work, finally rejects the kind of fixity Sévry, perhaps unwillingly, legitimates when he talks about Africa as something that is known already before its emergence. Africa is, or will be, the ongoing production of continuous struggles and contribution of each to make it a fairer place to all. In the specific case of South Africa, my study stands in accord with Fezokuhle Mthonti because it addresses South Africa as “a country that is not yet on the horizon. A country that can and should still be fought for” (Mthonti, 2014, n. pag.).

I-2-3- On key concepts of the topic

In combining perceptions of whiteness, homosexuality and democracy with *Relation* my study inaugurates in the field of South African post-apartheid literature. My study even claims to set the foundation for post-apartheid criticism by address-

ing the perceptions of such complex concepts, by relating them along with *Relation* and by giving itself methodologically as experimental field for such criticism. Nevertheless, scholars have attempted to deal with each concept separately or with two of them cumulatively. I have addressed previously Anton Krueger's *Experiments in Freedom: Explorations of Identity in New South African Drama* which sought to discuss *Relation*. I have also addressed how Krueger's remarkable work differs from mine.

Culture and Imperialism appears however as one of the studies similar to my study. In this book where Edward Said addresses the methods towards "freedom from domination in the future" in the world, the closeness of *Relation* to a truly inclusive democracy is suggested when he notes to regret the paucity of democracy as follows:

Democracy in any real sense of the word is nowhere to be found in the still "nationalistic" Middle East: there are either privileged oligarchies or privileged ethnic groups. The large mass of people is crushed beneath dictatorship or unyielding, unresponsive, unpopular government (Said, 1994, p. 300).

Like Said in this respect, my thesis suggests that *Relation* is the theoretical framework that effectively brings about a truly and inclusive democracy. My study parts however with the study by Said because it deals specifically with the South African post-apartheid narrative, while Said deals with the world broadly speaking.

In relation to homosexuality Graeme Reid for instance provides a remarkable inventory of life and courage of gays in hostile and violent surroundings of South African small-towns. His book shows that to be a homosexual in a democratic South Africa that constitutionally protects LGBT right is very risky and demands a lot of courage and creativity which his book celebrates (Reid, 2013, p. 11). Contrary to Reid who deals with gays in small-towns, Andrew Tucker elects to deal with their visibility exclusively in Cape Town. Tucker in so doing rehearses many facts about this city in relation to homosexuality (Tucker, 2009, pp. 25-26) as it is represented in *The Quiet Violence of Dreams*.

Likewise, Reid and Tucker, my study follows their path by sustaining the necessity among homosexuals to keep on being creative and struggling for their visibility in the democratic South Africa. However, my study adds to their perspective by seeking to orientate the courage and creativity that gays need to show toward their contribution to the meaning and the achievement of a truly inclusive democracy in South Africa. In fact, it is through their continuous commitment to their visibility that the various oppositions that homosexuals face could be challenged. In displaying a homosexual as main character, *The Quiet Violence of Dreams* contributes vibrantly to that struggle for visibility.

The question about *Representations of Homosexuality* within black liberation theology did also interest Roger Sneed in the United States context. In the same way as Sneed's examination of Blacks' homosexuality enabled him to radically revise

cultural criticism about black liberation theology in the US (Sneed, 2010, p. 25), my book looks at homosexuality as a semiotic battlefield in order to extricate hegemony from its refinements.

Researches have been carried out in large amounts about continuing racism in post-apartheid South Africa. Michael Brookes and Timothy Hinks for instance show in a remarkable article how racism instead increased on the job market from 1995 to 2002 in South Africa. While the political leadership were handed over to blacks, unemployment increased drastically among the black South African folks (Michael Brookes, 2004, p. 59). It is a paradoxical situation which Brookes and Hinks brilliantly describe although they forget to discuss ways of challenging racism.

In *Realizing the Dream. Unlearning the logic of Race in the South African School* Crain Soudien begins where Brookes and Hinks left their description in order to postulate education as an efficient way toward overcoming racism in the post-apartheid South Africa. Soudien believes that as a social construct 'race' is learned and therefore can be unlearned (Soudien, 2012, p. 244).

It is difficult not to agree with Soudien when he projects education as the powerful weapon that will challenge racism. But, Soudien seems to overlook the dynamics of a post-racial South-Africa he advocates for, in the establishment of a truly inclusive order. My study lays more emphasis on these dynamics by naming this inclusive order a truly inclusive democracy. I espouse the theoretical framework of Reddy in relation to democracy as mentioned previously. In fact, like Reddy would have said:

My critique draws attention to how we 'read' South African politics after Apartheid in a particular way, identifying the problem in the simple terms of a dominant party thesis or related to the latter, the culture and values of the political elite. This inconveniencing approach excludes the main actors and the structural conditions that produce particular behaviors from elites. Instead, I emphasize the configuration of settler colonialism as a central category to understand South African politics after Apartheid, a notion the conventional paradigm ignores or leaves marginalized (Reddy, 2015, p. 9).

The importance of emphasizing on colonialism (Apartheid) as a core category in my thesis is that it enables me to question the mechanism that justifies continuing exclusions in a multicultural and democratic South Africa. By interrogating the mechanism of colonialism as adjusted to sex, racism and liberal democracy in South Africa, approaches against hegemony and its terrible consequences on the peoples might indeed arise clearly. Édouard Glissant pertinently posits in this relation that : "démontez le mécanisme c'est déjà combattre le discours" (Glissant, 1981, p. 14).

One innovation of my study to mention at this stage is that it deals with both democracy in its liberal perspective and in its effectively emancipatory prospects. From the liberal perspective of democracy, my thesis innovates by unveiling how this hegemonic trend of democracy adjusts with sexualities and racism as displayed in the post-apartheid narrative. From the emancipatory perspective of democracy, my thesis also innovates by projecting democracy as synonymous with *Relation*. Truly inclusive democracy is viewed as something to continuously be kept on struggling for both its “achievement and for the right to decide what it will mean” (Meckstroth, 2015, p. 2).

I-3- Research hypothesis and research questions

My research reposes on four principal assumptions. The first assumption is that the selected narratives complement each other in such a way that they disclose paradigmatic traits of the post-apartheid narrative in general. The second assumption is that whiteness, homosexuality, and democracy in given interactions, are reliable topoi for the understanding of the fictional post-apartheid narrations. The third assumption is that the post-apartheid narrative displays the perceptions which the character has about these topoi as kind of *mise en abyme* that discloses domination in the post-apartheid South Africa in its convenient nature. Evidence of their mutual fecundity in reproducing domination is that irrespective of all significant political improvements achieved, the majority of the people continue to be marginalized in the post-apartheid South Africa displayed. The last assumption is that the post-apartheid narrative aesthetically mediates *Relation* as methodological framework for the achievement of an alternative and better South Africa. Post-apartheid narrative intervenes for more complex and inclusive frameworks and practices that will bring about sustainable peace, multiculturalism and true democratic culture in South Africa.

These central hypotheses can be subdivided into operational hypotheses which I reformulate as follows: Despite narratives fictional nature and apparent *inutility*, they feature societal dynamics and hence enable deeper understanding of the society and the world. The post-apartheid narrative negotiates whiteness, homosexuality, and democracy, exposing in doing so the concurrent discourses at work which structure the social malaise in the post-apartheid South Africa. The South African post-apartheid society composed in the post-apartheid narrative is one which is still subjected to racial and sexual discriminations as if those from the apartheid-era have simply been given a new look and new actors. The South African post-apartheid narrative mediates *Relation* as an alternative for a truly democratic and inclusive South Africa.

In order to pursue these assumptions, the study abides to answer the following research questions: What is conceived of as South African post-apartheid narrative? How the post-apartheid narrative is aesthetically organized? What makes the post-apartheid narrative original? What makes the displayed post-apartheid South Africa hegemonic? How do democracy, racism (whiteness) and homosexuality work in the post-apartheid narrative to unveil the post-apartheid hegemony and the generalized social malaise? What does the fictional post-apartheid narrative mediate that would make South Africa a truly democratic and inclusive society? The methodology adopted to answer these interrogations consist of a coherent adaptation of technical elements borrowed from narratology, post-colonial theory and social representations.

I-4- Theory and methodology

Originally coined by Tzvetan Todorov, narratology refers to a scientific examination of story (Todorov, 1969, p. 10). The concept benefited much from the 1960ths growth of structural analysis which provided narratology with a wider range of possibilities. From the enhancement of narratology by structuralism, narratology began to denote not only the scientific study of story but also the scientific analysis of narratives in general. Narratology became une “sorte de “poétique restraint” limitée au fait romanesque” [a sort of “restraint poetic” restricted to narrative details]²⁸ as Bernard Valette puts it (Valette, 1992, p. 10). This justifies why in this study character and space are considered as narratological categories. In fact, character and space like narration or perspective participate in the construction of meaning in the literary text.

As my thesis deals basically with narratives, I borrow from narratology its methodological concepts - space and character - to closely understand the organization of the post-apartheid narrative. These categories enable me to move from the pleasure any fictional story provides the reader with (Barthes, 1972) to the statement about the world, implicitly, but at times also explicitly articulated in any literary text (Mitterand, 1980, p. 5).

I borrow methodological frameworks from narratology about these selected categories which enables me to read space and character not only as isolated factual categories, but also as concepts partaking of the delivery of the story (Budniakiewicz, 1998, p. 10). It is important to sketch out briefly how the ambivalence which singles out narratological categories in general, the ones deemed relevant for the study in particular will be deployed in the assessment of the post-apartheid narrative. From an anthropomorphic perspective the character enables the study

28 My translation.

to hypothesize the story world as a microcosm, a miniaturised reflection of the referent society. From a linguistic perspective by which the character participates in delivering the story (Budniakiewicz, 1998, p. 10) as any word or sentence would have done in the sentence or a paragraph, the character enables the study to hypothesize the post-apartheid narrative as a delicate re-presentation of the post-apartheid society. Space or spatialization as used in the study enables it to address how the said microcosm is encircled and worked out by mercantile trends from worldwide multinationals and simultaneously to extricate what the aesthetical commitment in the post-apartheid narrative looks like.

The restriction I do on character and space take into consideration a variety of narratological categories basically due to the second approach used for my reading of the post-apartheid narrative. In fact, these narratological categories are compatible with the notion of social representations.

The concept of social representations was originally coined by Serge Moscovici in 1961 (Moscovici, 1961). It broadly stands for “the collective elaboration of a social object by the community for the purpose of behaving and communicating” (Moscovici, 1963, p. 234). Social representations, if well appraised, unveil significant clues to understand how society is formed and what keeps it durably as such. Social representations are easy to identify in a literary text. They are manifest for instance from statements by characters about themselves, or from descriptions they make about their adjuvants, opponents or about spaces surrounding them (Jodelet, 1989, p. 48).

Jean-Claude Abric addresses social representation as something ambivalent. It can lead either to alienation or emancipation of the peoples (Abric, 1994). In line with Abric in this relation, Jean-Pierre Deconchy reproaches the psychological sterilization that social representations generally impose on individuals transforming them into agents blindly executing thoughts and ideas by other individuals like them, without having to deliberate about their validity to them beforehand. Deconchy addresses this situation as vicarious ideology which, if transposed to concrete interactions in society, generally gives way to aggressions due to misunderstandings among individuals (Deconchy, 1984, pp. 340-341).

I appropriate from the notion of social representations its concision in dealing with mental operations in the psychology of the individual. The post-apartheid narrative featuring to a certain extent the post-apartheid society, my use of social representations permits me to carefully describe how these operations work to the automation of hegemony. Because the notion of social representations is ambivalent, my use of it also enables me to hint practical postures against hegemony from an individual perspective. While social representations enable to hint ways against hegemony from an individual perspective, postcolonial theory does it from a collective perspective.

Postcolonial criticism is a very complex and systematized theory. It is a complex theory because of the difficulty to delineate its scope and to identify one foundational thinker to it. Nicholas Harrison underlines this complexity of postcolonial criticism when he argues that:

Postcolonial theory is not an identifiable "type" of theory in the same (limited) sense as deconstruction, Marxism, psychoanalysis or feminism on all of which it sometimes draws: it does not have foundational thinkers playing a role comparable to that of Marx or Freud. (...) Like Marxism and Feminism, though, it has evolved in response to political and historical issues of vast importance and scope, such as anticolonial militancy, and its deeper origins and many of its ends lie outside academic study (Harrison, 2003, p. 9).

The postcolonial theory is so to speak a theoretical ground carved by diverse thinkers from very diverse subjects. It is an interdisciplinary theory which demands interdisciplinary competence. Postcolonial theory is a systematized concept because it is impossible to define postcolonial theory without restricting its operational fields or its potentials. Moore-Gilbert argues in this respect that:

In my view, postcolonial criticism can still be seen as a more or less distinct set of reading practices, if it is understood as preoccupied principally with analysis of cultural forms which mediate, challenge or reflect upon the relations of domination and subordination (economic, cultural and political) between (and often within) nations, races or cultures, which characteristically have their roots in the history of modern European, colonialism and imperialism and which, equally characteristically, continue to be apparent in the present era of neo-colonialism (Moore-Gilbert, 1997, p. 9).

One thing Moore-Gilbert says here is how vast the scope of postcolonial theory is. The other thing he highlights is that the term is very dynamic and epistemologically operates just like a transitory stopover. Moore-Gilbert finally postulates postcolonial theory as a practice of reading that requires permanent adaptations because its object evolves and is ever operative.

In the same line with Moore-Gilbert, though more practical, Alexie Tcheuyap enumerates few essential principles of postcolonial theory which the present study espouses. One is the relationship between literature and the world which is central to postcolonial theory (Tcheuyap, 2011, p. 154). The other principle which derives from the former is that postcolonial theory deals with materiality. It means that it is an applied theory. Postcolonial theory finally consists of both deconstructionist and anti-canonic re-reading of narrations formerly advertised as canon (Tcheuyap, 2011, p. 163). Deconstructionist and anti-canonic re-reading imply the involvement of post-colonial theory with "discussion about experience of various kinds such as

migration, slavery, suppression, resistance, representation, difference, race, gender, place ...” (Bill Ashcroft, 1995, p. 2).

Coined by Édouard Glissant referring to theoretical studies by Saint-John Perse; Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari²⁹, *Relation* involves all these various kinds of experience Bill, Griffiths, and Tiffin talk about. Additionally, in being an abstract site for the achievement of creolization, *Relation* understands oppression. *Relation* draws its *raison d'être* from hegemony or oppression. In other words, hegemony and oppression made *Relation* imaginable so that it would not be hyperbolic to consider *Relation* as an accomplished weapon against all kinds of oppressions.

Celia M. Britton sustains this argument about *Relation* when she writes that:

Relation is in the first place a relation of equality with and respect for the Other as *different* from oneself. It applies to individuals but more especially to other cultures and other societies. It is nonhierarchical and nonreductive; that is, it does not try to impose a universal value system but respects the *particular* qualities of the community in question, in a movement of “degeneralization”. But this does not imply a defense of cultures that jealously guard their uniqueness by shutting out the rest of the world; particularity is valuable only as long as it is outward-looking and related other cultures and values. Thus, Glissant conceives of *Relation* as a system rather than as a number of separate, singular relations. It is, however, a fluid and unsystematic system whose elements are engaged in a radical nonhierarchical free play of interrelatedness (Britton, 1999, p. 12).

What Britton terms “nonhierarchical free play of interrelatedness” in the statement above is the exceptionality about *Relation*. In fact, *Relation* works by untying, beforehand, all sorts of boundaries which it hints as the key trigger of animosity in the human existence. After this first step is fulfilled, *Relation* engages the untied particles (cultures or identities) in free, permanent, dynamic, and fecund negotiations. *Relation* is a call to “valorize synchrony over diachrony” (Prabhu, 2007, p. 5) because diachrony – historical projection – (Berger, 2006, p. 18) is what keeps us away from prophesy in the sense of Berger. *Relation* is a call to reflect oneself as surrounded

29 Cf. Édouard Glissant, *Poétique de la Relation* (Paris: Gallimard, 1990).

by boundless space Glissant terms opacity³⁰. Metaphorically said, *Relation* secures life over death as evident in the following statement by Jean-Louis Joubert:

La *Relation* se noue dans la rencontre de l'autre, du différent, du divers, qui sont reconnus comme tels. Mais reconnaître n'est pas synonyme de comprendre. «Comprendre» implique l'idée de prendre avec, d'étendre les bras pour saisir et ramener à soi, donc de réduire à la transparence et refondre dans l'Un. La mise en relation suppose au contraire de consentir à l'opacité, c'est-à-dire à la reconnaissance que le monde existe dans les saveurs de la complexité multiple. «Nous appelons donc opacité ce qui protège le Divers». L'opacité est la condition nécessaire de la Relation. «Le consentement général aux opacités particulières est le plus simple équivalent de la non-barbarie» (Joubert, 2005, pp. 41-42).

Also coined hybridity by prominent post-colonial scholars³¹, *Relation* is implemented in this thesis as synonymous with postcolonial theory. The reason is that while postcolonial theory remains academically sophisticated *Relation* incorporates in a very practical way all the diverse concerns of post-colonial theory. I consider *Relation* sort of meiosis to the vast and sophisticated field of post-colonial studies in this study.

I borrow the various methodological categories Glissant elaborates in his attempt to make *Relation* viable in order to appreciate the post-apartheid semiotics as displayed in the post-apartheid narrative. It is a society that finds itself in the era of the automation of the hegemony which the transition from Apartheid to democracy failed to challenge. *Relation* enables me for instance to deem the generation of South Africans in the post-apartheid narrative which Reddy would have referred to as “severely damage by the terrible humiliations of apartheid” (Reddy, 2015, p. 1) as transparent subjects working for the perpetuation of hegemony. Likewise, *Relation* helps me to deem the attitude of some other characters tempted with the obsession to avenge all the bad deeds of Apartheid on them by displaying sort of racism in reverse (Mhlongo, 2004, p. 170) as “a kind of self-mutilation” (Duiker, 2001, p.

30 Glissant makes a clear and useful distinction between territory (territoire) and place (lieu). The first he says, is accountable of imperialisms or dominations which the world has gone through and which it still goes through nowadays. The second on the contrary makes us keep in mind that the otherness is not the enemy. The otherness is more of the sameness but different (opacity) who needs to be considered and protected as such because we protect ourselves when we protect them. Glissant points out a say he borrows from “the thought of the One” to illustrate why it is necessary to protect the opacity (otherness, different). “If you kill the river, the tree, the sky, or the soil, you are killing the human being”. *Relation* also acknowledges, but goes far beyond, this kind of simplistic understanding of intersections between human and environment. Cf. Édouard Glissant, *Introduction à une Poétique du Divers* (Paris : Gallimard, 1996) 30.

31 Homi K. Bhabha, Stuart Hall, Paul Gilroy for instance.

283). Revenge is in fact, equally rooted in “the thought of One”, because it leads to barbarity which *Relation* rejects.

On the other hand, my implementation of *Relation* in the framework of this study enables me to suggest ways that could lead to an effective dismantlement of the hegemony and its structures as they work in the post-apartheid narrative. The deconstructionist strategy of *Relation* enables me to hint at the necessity to replace simultaneously the functions played by those structures of hegemony by the culture of permanent negotiations or consensus between every stakeholder in the society as varied as they are. Such will be the way towards what I call a truly inclusive democracy: inclusive of homosexuals and heterosexuals, inclusive of blacks and whites, inclusive of women and men, youth and ageing and so forth.

I-5- Structure of the work

My theoretical and methodological frameworks coupled with the various questions raised in the course of this introductory chapter justify the following structure adopted for my thesis. At the beginning, I carry out a preliminary investigation on the post-apartheid narrative from a narratological perspective. The chapter attempts to isolate basic lineaments that grant the post-apartheid narrative its originality aesthetically. The chapter plays a double role in my study. Firstly, it discloses the body of post-apartheid narrative from the fictional angle, what Barthes would have called the “pleasurable” perspective (Barthes, 1972). In so doing, the chapter resorts to narratological notions of space and character. Secondly, the chapter identifies core frames of the statement (Mitterand, 1980, p. 5) that post-apartheid narrative utters about post-apartheid South Africa. The chapter points out whiteness, democracy, homosexuality and *Relation* as central frames of the said statement in the post-apartheid narrative. The chapter is entitled “Form and Signification: Idiosyncrasy of South African post-apartheid narrative”.

In order to meticulously address the notions of whiteness, homosexuality, democracy, and *Relation* from the perspective of my elected theoretical frameworks, a clear explanation of the interconnectivity between *Relation* and social representations is required. The next chapter deals therefore with their interconnectivity. The chapter discusses their relationship to the Foucauldian notion of *discourse*. The assumption is that *Relation* and social representations are linked to the notion of *discourse* as framed by Foucault in their procedural principles. *Discourse* is triggered by speech which is later converted to materiality. The gruesome manifestations of this materiality are, in fact, what made the idea of *Relation* possible. Likewise, it is this materiality of *discourse* that social representations authenticate as “reality” in the mind of the character. The chapter also discusses how *discourse* has been progressively converted to the post-apartheid materiality

which is given as diegetic in the post-apartheid narrative. The chapter identifies stages in the process of this conversion and describes them from a chronological perspective. In so doing, the chapter finally helps put into perspective what the nature of hegemony is which the post-apartheid narrative deals with. The chapter is entitled “South African post-apartheid hegemony. *Discourse* as negation of *Relation* and social representations”.

The following chapter deals with the outcomes from the previous chapters from the perspective of *Relation* and social representations. The chapter shows how in the post-apartheid narrative, the notion of *discourse* is appropriated in order to extricate democracy from its conventional charms, whiteness from its conventional denial, and homosexuality from its conventional discredit respectively. In relation to a truly inclusive democracy which my thesis seeks to contribute to the accomplishment, the merit of the chapter is to suggest the necessity to continuously reassess conventions to the benefit of everybody depending on them. To suggest this by providing evidence from the narratives under study is another merit of the chapter. For, it displays a particular view about fictional narrative. It is a perception accurately captured by Nadine Gordimer when she defines her literary works as follows:

As far as I am concerned, I have said that my fiction will always be truer than any of my factual writings or sayings. / En ce qui me concerne, j'ai dit que ma fiction sera toujours plus vraie que tout ce que je pourrai dire ou écrire de factuel³² (Gordimer, 1996, p. 159).

The chapter is entitled “Extricating Democracy, Whiteness, and Homosexuality from Social Representations for the Embodiment of *Relation* in post-apartheid narrative”.

Entitled “*Relation* as aesthetics intervention of the post-apartheid narrative for a truly and inclusive democracy in the post-apartheid society”, the last chapter shows that *Relation* is the aesthetic ideal mediated in the post-apartheid narrative. After showing how *Relation* arises as the aesthetics' commitment of post-apartheid narrative, the chapter addresses stakes and challenges of *Relation* for a truly inclusive democracy in the post-apartheid narrative. Appraising stakes and challenges of *Relation* in the narratives has the advantage of stressing more practically on what *Relation* in relation to democracy really is and on what it implies if it has to shape humans' life in general, South Africans' society in particular. Evaluating stakes and challenges of *Relation*, unveils possibilities about how to translate *Relation* from its theoretical postures in post-apartheid narrative to factual South Africa.

32 My translation.