"The armour of civilised conduct would crumble rapidly if, through changes in society, insecurities broke in upon us again, if dangers became as incalculable as before... fears would soon burst the limits..."

– **Norbert Elias,** *The Civilizing Process,* **p. 532.**

University of Alberta

Cleaning the Nation: Anti-African Patriotism and Xenophobia in South Africa

by

David Mário Matsinhe

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Sociology

© David Mário Matsinhe
Fall 2009
Edmonton, Alberta

Examining Committee

Dr. Amy Kaler, Sociology

Dr. George Pavlich, Sociology

Dr. Malinda Smith, Political Science

Dr. Philomena Okeke, Women's Studies

Dr. Marc Epprecht, Global Development Studies, Queen's University

Abstract

The shifting of asymmetric power balances in South Africa – e.g. the acceleration of apartheid disintegration in the 1980s that brought to power the first black majority government in 1994 – precipitated an unprecedented rise of antiforeigner attitudes and practices. Since then, spurts of aggression and violence against foreign nationals have occurred regularly. The latest outbreak in May 2008, whose images shocked many people around the world with reminiscences of ethnic cleansing, was not an isolated abnormality but a characteristic phenomenon of post-apartheid figurational trends. While xenophobia is a worldwide phenomenon, South African antiforeigner attitudes have specific cultural and historical contingencies. While all non-citizens are generally viewed negatively, African foreign nationals are more likely than other foreigners to be victims of aggressive antiforeigner attitudes and practices. This dissertation explores as a sociological problem the construction and mobilization of the figure of *Makwerekwere*, that is, the African foreigner through established-outsider nationalistic discourse and practices in post-apartheid South Africa. The study is based on a number of methods of investigation carried out during ten months of fieldwork between October 2006 and August 2007: Focus-group and individualized interviews; participant observation; analysis of nationalistic antiforeigner narratives from media; analysis of data from other scholars, research organizations, and human rights organizations. Figurational sociology, particularly the theory of the established and the outsiders, is the informative analytical orientation of the study. The study is organized around three sets of analysis: (1) the construction and mobilization of the figure of *Makwerekwere* by citizens (state agents and civil society agents); (2) the construction and mobilization of the figure of

i

Makwerekwere as it is understood and experienced by those who are arrogated this figure and its characteristics; (3) and the concomitant structural atmosphere of the life-worlds and social spaces populated by those who are assigned the figure of *Makwerekwere*. These figurational dynamics suggest that although apartheid has been largely dismantled, it has left its imprints on South Africa's social habitus. Thus the conclusion of the study situates post-apartheid antiforeigner sentiments and practices, particularly the anti-African orientation of the ideology of *Makwerekwere*, in the shadows of apartheid.

Acknowledgments

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. SOUTH AFRICAN XENOPHOBES
INTRODUCTION

In 2003 I flew from Canada to South Africa. On landing at Johannesburg International Airport (now O. R. Tambo International Airport), the immigration officer examined my passport, after which she immediately ordered me to step out of the queue and stand aside. I was startled. Meanwhile, she scanned the visa-barcode. The scanner rang in recognition of the visa. "Oh, thank God everything is fine!" I sighed in silent relief. The officer, however, was not satisfied. She interrogated me anyway.

"Where did you get this visa?"

"In Ottawa. It's written right there on the visa."

"But how did you get it there?"

"Because I applied for it there?"

"No. I mean, how come you applied for it there?" she probed, now looking increasingly meaner.

"Because that's where I was when I needed it. But officer, are there any problems with it? Your computer scanned it just fine," I said.

Annoyed and dissatisfied with my answers, she disappeared with my passport without a word. Thirty minutes later she returned. She gave me back my passport. No explanation and no apology for making me appear suspicious. As this happened, the other travellers, mostly white, were let in seamlessly. No questions asked. That half an hour was the longest stretch of time I had yet experienced and certainly the most humiliating in my adult life. For half an hour I was a spectacle, a free show for the crowd that subjected me to the gaze that I could almost feel on my skin. About five hundred heads and a thousand eyes staring at this black body of mine probably convinced I was surely up to no good at all. Or else why would I be "carefully" selected by the officer?

 Now why was the immigration officer unwelcoming towards me but not to others? What made me suspicious in her eyes? And why, in her imagination, did I not deserve an apology even after her suspicions were (hopefully) shuttered?

I am an African. I am black. I am Mozambican. I carried a Mozambican passport. The immigration officer was an African. She was black. She was South African. Yet her

blackness and the history of blackness in South Africa did not prevent her from questioning my moral integrity on the basis of my blackness. What was going on?

A friend of mine, who is white, was travelling from South Africa to Zimbabwe. When he arrived at the Zimbabwean border-gate, he found a very long queue under the scorching heat of the sun. Along with other travellers he found himself drawn into the inefficient, time-wasting bureaucracy of Zimbabwean custom services. Standing in front of him, on the same queue, were two black South African young men. "Welcome to Africa!" they shouted sarcastically in show of annoyance. At the Zimbabwean border, the South Africans felt they stood on the margins of civilization, face to face with the threshold of Africa's backwaters. This happened in 1998. What does it mean when these young South Africans feel as if they are slipping into darkness or descending into hell when they travel from South Africa to another African country?

The above mentioned incidents speak to the central sociological problem that I hope to address in this project. The attitudes of the immigration officer and the travellers to Zimbabwe represent a widespread sentiment that Robert Davies described incisively as:

> [The] notion that South Africa is part of the First World and that its future lies in developing its relations with the countries of the North…. Concomitant with this is a view of Africa as an economic graveyard. The only lessons to be learnt are negative ones, overtures to become part of regional or continental integration or cooperation programmes should be resisted as diversion.[1]

****

2

INTRODUCTION

Since early 1800s thousands of Africans flocked to the Cape, Natal and Transvaal from the hinterlands of southern Africa in pursuit of masculinity projects.[2] Southern Africa – particularly Lesotho and Mozambique – functioned as a reserve of cheap labour for the South African colonial industry.[3] The plantation and manufacturing industries of Natal and the mining industry of Transvaal relied heavily on cheap labour from the region. During this period and later during Apartheid, black South Africans' aversion to immigrants from elsewhere in the continent remained concealed, perhaps for two reasons. (1) The politically charged racial polarization inherent in white suppression of all Africans, regardless of nationality, overshadowed fear and hatred between and among Africans. (2) The colonial situation stimulated feelings of anti-white African solidarity rendering aversion to Africans by Africans dormant. In this case, solidarity and/or unity/disunity are not conceptualized as absolutes. The ANC and Pan-African Congress had disagreements as to what liberated South Africa ought to be, yet these disagreements existed in the context of a Pan-African orientation that characterized the political air at the time. The trade unions were able to unite different social groups against white privilege. A shared opposition to white privilege and domination, which was the apartheid state and other colonial states, united the various liberation movements. However, with the end of crude colonial rule, notably the disintegration of apartheid since 1980s, these tendencies toward African solidarity also disintegrated to a considerable degree. As a result, the anti-immigrant mood has been spreading and intensifying, fuelling struggles over South African identity and belonging.

A year or less after the first democratic elections – in 1995 to be precise – the Southern African Bishop's Conference declared in no uncertain terms: "There is no doubt that there is a very high level of xenophobia in our country.... a variety of people have been lumped together under the title of 'illegal immigrants', and the whole situation of demonising immigrants is feeding the xenophobia phenomenon."[4] In the same year the Southern African Migration Project (SAMP) conducted a survey on citizens' attitudes to immigrants and immigration, the results of which were to shock the researchers. Sixty-five percent of citizens wanted strict limits to, or complete ban on, immigration.[5] The

survey found that anti-immigrant sentiments cut across all social groups: "Importantly, these attitudes cut across income groups, age groups and groups with very different levels of education."[6] Two years later, in mid-1997, SAMP followed up with another survey. The proportion of citizens who wanted strict limits or complete ban on immigration had increased to 70 percent. The researchers went on to compare South African anti-immigrant attitudes to those in other countries worldwide. Again, the revelations were shocking: "South Africans are more hostile to immigration than citizens of any other country for which comparable data is available."[7]

In 1999 SAMP followed up with another survey, perhaps hoping the anti-immigrant mood may have diminished. If that was indeed what they hoped to find, they could not have been farther from the truth. The desire for strict or complete ban on immigration was now consuming 78 percent of citizens.[8] The latest SAMP survey on citizens' attitudes toward non-citizens – conducted in 2006 – found that the proportion of citizens wishing for strict or complete ban on immigration had somewhat decreased to 75 percent. But the authors note that the exact percentage of those who wanted complete ban on immigration had increased progressively from 16 in 1995 to 25 in 1997, then from 25 in 1999 to 37 in 2006. They also found that the percentage of those who wanted the borders electrified had increased from 66 in 1999 to 76 in 2006. The percentage of those who wanted non-citizens to carry their personal identity documents at all times had remained at 72 from 1999 to 2006. The survey found that South Africans were still the least tolerant in the world to non-citizens.[9]

There are 44.8 million citizens in South Africa, of whom 79 percent are black, 9.6 percent white, 9.4 percent coloured, and two percent Asian/Indian. Obviously not all of them are anti-immigrants. There is a proportion of the citizenry that is genuinely tolerant to non-citizens. In fact, the SAMP surveys revealed that the percentages of citizens who favoured letting "anyone in who wants to enter" or letting "people come in as long as there are jobs" were 35 in 1995, 23 in 1997, 14 in 1999, and 25 in 2006.[10] But given the depth, breadth and intensity of the anti-immigrant problem, this proportion of the citizenry is exceptional, for "[t]he anti-immigrant sentiment is not only strong, it is extremely widespread, and cuts across virtually every socioeconomic and demographic

4

group."[11] The tolerant section represents a deviation from the standard/normal behaviour of hate, loathing, fear, suspicion, hostility, vilification, aggression and outright violence toward those perceived as outsiders. The standard/normal mood of the citizenry, not the exceptional sentiments within it, is the central concern of this study.

Spurts of anti-immigrant aggressiveness have occurred regularly since 1990s, with the aggressors displaying an apparent zeal. There are indications suggesting that the anti-immigrants may in fact delight in seeing their victims in pain:

> A *Mail and Guardian* (18 April 1997) story on the activities of the South African Narcotics Bureau [Sanab] headlined 'Searching for a "guilty" Nigerian…' described how a group of Sanab police celebrated a colleague's birthday by endeavouring to arrest as many Nigerians as possible in the Hillbrow area.[12]

The latest violence broke out in May 2008. Spreading nationwide, it was so far the deadliest and most destructive. Suren Pillay's comments on the joy and shock with which some civilians and police experienced it are worth citing at length:

> It's hard to disown a photograph, as much as I try to do so, looking at the image that stared out at us this past Monday morning in the *Cape Times*. It is of weakness displaying itself in the false guise of strength. An image of African disunity, as South Africans attack foreign African refugees, on the eve of Africa Day celebrations. In the picture, an outline of a human form is visible, engulfed in raging flames. A lone black policewoman attempts to save the victim.
>
> Behind the mirage, the policewoman's two black male colleagues look on at the pyre. It's not clear if one of them is smiling. A man at the shop in Cape Town where I purchase my paper thinks so, as he shows the image to white clientele in horror, as if to further underscore, without the need to even whisper, the barbarism unfolding in the centre.
>
> At this point I don't know the fate of the figure in the fire. The caption, and the accompanying story, are silent on what happened after. A reporter recalls a panicked resident warning police that "Shangaans are being attacked". She tells us that "one plump woman could not contain her laughter and regaled her audience with details of the event". Will it be possible to make collective meaning of this divisive event, which brings laughter to some, and horror to others?[13]

This problem has been a topic of concern and debate in South Africa and around the world, notably after the anti-immigrant violence of May 2008.[14] Its manifestation appears in two interrelated and almost indistinguishable functions: (1) as a surveillance mechanism with which the citizenry polices its borders and social spaces (closing ranks

against outsiders); and (2) as a method and criteria for identifying and removing suspected outsiders.

This study will explore as a sociological problem the processes with which black South Africans police their social spaces and borders against perceived foreign threats and how, through these practices, they in turn imagine and produce themselves as one with each other. Of particular interest is the process by which African foreign nationals from elsewhere in the greater continent are othered and excluded, construed as threats to citizens' lifestyles, and experienced as competitors over the means of power, prestige and survival. It will examine the construction and mobilization of the figure of *makwerekwere* (the African foreigner) by citizens as experienced by those who are thus imagined, including the social effects of this categorization. An invisible surveillance mechanism and discourse enable citizens to construct and police their borders and social spaces to keep the outsiders at a distance. A set of criteria has been invented for identifying suspected outsiders for abuse and purging. These practices are predicated on imagined citizenship and non-citizenship. And through these imaginations and practices the established constitute themselves as patriots. Finally, the concomitant structural atmosphere of the life-worlds and social spaces populated by those who are assigned the figure of *makwerekwere* will be considered.

Lest I give the impression that xenophobia is exclusively a South African problem, before I precede it is necessary to take note of the politics of autochthonous citizenship and citizenship-based discrimination in the African continent in order to situate South African xenophobia in continental context.

CITIZENS AND STRANGERS IN AFRICA

In varying degrees, the struggle over citizenship and means of survival and self-preservation, along with the anti-immigrant sentiments that fuel it, has animated group relations in postcolonial Africa often with devastating consequences.[15] In 2004, Open Society Justice Initiative brought together in Dakar, Senegal, activists from eleven African countries – Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Egypt, Ethiopia, Mauritania, Morocco, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Zambia and Zimbabwe – to launch its African Citizenship and Discrimination Audit. The participants indicated that exclusionary

citizenship and discrimination on the basis of citizenship have been on the rise in the continent. Thus, for example, in the DRC, foreign-born lawyers may not be licensed to practice – this is after denying them citizenship. In Egypt, refugees are denied access to employment; allowed limited access to health, education and justice services; their children are denied access to education beyond primary schooling. In Ethiopia, landownership is denied to non-citizens; in business and travel non-citizens pay twice as much as citizens; Ethiopian citizens are discriminated on the basis of regional affiliation wherein they may be denied work and access to courts in regions where they are classified as outsiders. In Mauritania, the border and citizenship laws have been tightened to bring nationality beyond the reach of immigrants; thousands of black Mauritanians were not only striped of their citizenship but were also deported to Senegal. In Morocco, women cannot transmit nationality to their children or husbands; children of unmarried women are denied citizenship and education; Subsaharan Africans have been expelled as asylum seekers. In Nigeria, citizens are subject to unequal rights across different states: a citizen cannot stand for election in a state where he/she is not considered native; he/she may be expelled from the state not of his/her "origin" even after decades of residence and may have his/her property confiscated; thanks to customary law, women who enter interstate marriages become members of their husbands' states and lose their home state membership. In Sierra Leone, Liberians and other foreign nationals were subject to discrimination; when the forces of the Economic Community of West African States Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) were stationed in the country in 1999, Nigerians were mutilated or killed on the basis of their nationality; non-citizens cannot own land; customary law is reserved for exclusive governing of women, which discriminates against them. In Zambia, while the laws have historically granted citizenship to foreign spouses of Zambian men, these laws have denied the same rights to Zambian women with foreign spouses. In Zimbabwe, the Citizenship Act of 2002 required dual citizens to renounce the foreign citizenship or lose the Zimbabwean citizenship.[16]

Ironically, the democratization process of the 1990s – when African states were under pressure to abandon the mono-party systems – was accompanied by undemocratic manipulations of citizenship in order to exclude or limit political competitors. The growing popular indignation with the effects of structural adjustments – growing

7

unemployment, increasing poverty, falling wages and declining buying power – provided the necessary socioemotional conditions of possibility for the stimulation of anti-immigrant sentiments. Thus, fearful of political competition, the political establishments did exactly that. They exploited popular dissatisfaction in order to construct exclusionary citizenship. As a result, people who had been citizens throughout their lives, most notably powerful political opponents, lost their citizenship.[17] In turn, this created political unrest, which in extreme cases such as Ivory Coast escalated into wars of citizenship.[18]

The manipulative definitions of citizenship in the DRC since the times of Mobutu have denied citizenship to people of Tutsi and Hutu heritage, labelling them as *allochthones* (outsiders) as opposed to the *autochthones* ("sons of the soil"). This exclusionary construction of citizenship has motivated the excluded groups to take up arms and wage bloody wars that have so far claimed about four million lives.[19] In Cameroon, the Baka have been subject to the same political manoeuvres, for although they are regarded as among Africa's most indigenous peoples, they are excluded from the state's construction of citizenship: they have no rights to identity documents, voting or standing for office in elections.[20] This is also the case in central Africa where the "self-styled autochthons… seem to accept that the true 'first people' of the region are the now dwindling pygmoid populations [such as] the Twa in Rwanda, Burundi, and the Kivus; the Mbuti farther north."[21] Yet these groups continue to be excluded in the imagination of citizenship. In Rwanda and Burundi, the ethnic cleavages fuelled by the discourse of autochthonous citizenship have tragically given rise to genocidal uprisings of groups against other groups.[22]

Postcolonial South Africa appears to be following on the footsteps of its older postcolonial counterparts across the continent. This continental context offers a comparative basis for citizen/stranger relations afoot in postcolonial South Africa. At the same, however, South Africa, as we shall see, has specific historical contingencies that give its anti-immigrant aggression and violence unique political, psychosocial and spatiotemporal configuration.

RACE, RACISM AND XENOPHOBIA

There is an illusive border between racism and xenophobia so that on closer scrutiny one takes on the image of the other. The materials presented in this study are representations of social process that to some would be racism, and xenophobia to others. This calls for a few remarks at the outset about the two and how they might be related.

According to the Oxford Dictionary, racism consists of "the belief that some races… are superior to others" and "unfair treatment or dislike of somebody because they are of a different race". This definition appears to be predicated on a taken for granted given*ness* and self-explanatory nature of "race". Does this assumption stand if we take a closer look at "race"? What happens to this assumption when the question "What is 'race'?" is asked? "Race", the Oxford tells us, is "any of the groups into which humans can be divided according to their physical characteristics, e.g. colour of skin, colour and type of hair, shape of eyes and nose"; "a group of people who have the same culture, history, language, etc."; "any of the main species, breeds or types of animals or plants"; and "family origins; ancestry".[23]

It is of no little significance that the Oxford "race" repertoire covers all the meanings "race" acquired in modern history. Beginning from the sixteenth century, Banton demonstrates the evolutionary trajectory of "race", showing how it repeatedly absorbed varieties of meanings in Western languages.[24] This trajectory shows an idea marching wildly to its own eventual destruction. "Race" was initially used to designate lineage, e.g. "the race of Abraham", and to describe survival units, e.g. Gauls, Franks, Normans, or Saxons. To the idea were added, at the end of the eighteenth century, categories of creatures with common characteristics, thus baptizing it with the same meaning as species or subspecies in modern classifications. In the nineteenth century, anthropologists added to it yet another layer of meaning so that it also graded human beings at different levels of development in The Great Chain of Being. Talent and intelligence reflected the relative positions or stations of "races" vis-à-vis each other in the Great Chain. Geographies of the world determined their respective "races". Thus, Blacks, Indians, and Whites, for example, were distinctive "races". The difference between blacks and whites flowed from the harsh African environment that endowed blacks with their "racial" inferiority. This categorization equated people's "differences

with those between lions, tigers, and leopards, different species within the genus *Panthera*, each with its peculiar capacities and behaviour patterns". This categorization, however, was problematic because "unlike lions, tigers, and leopards" when people from supposed different "races" "came into contact they mated with one another".[25] The "race" argument was thus frustrated and undermined. Consequently, while writers continued to use "race", they stripped it off its biological significance, equating it instead with ethnicity and culture.

If anything, the Oxford "race" definitions are ramblings of confusion rather than clarity as to what "race" constitutes. Can "race" be all these attributes at once – biological, botanical, zoological, cultural, historical and ancestral? Which of these sets of attributes constitute "race"? This lack of clarity highlights the incredibility of slicing and dicing humanity into "races". "Race" has failed to endure the rigour and vigour of scientific scrutiny. The latest scientific knowledge indicates that there are no "races". Genetics, one of the most penetrative and invasive sciences to date, has yet to find "race".[26] Science discredited "race" as lacking any biological basis:

> It is now uncontroversial fact in genetic theory that any grouping (be they defined in terms of race, ethnicity, or culture) will be found to share approximately 15 per cent of their genes… it is theoretically possible to find a pattern which will be made up of about 15 per cent of the genetic material, which can be used to differentiate *this* grouping from others. But what this means is that 85 per cent of the genetic material is unremarkable and similar to that of the rest of humanity… why does the other 85 per cent not overwhelm the 15 per cent?[27]

So far no one knows what "race" is or what it means. No one has seen, touched or measured it. There is no evidence that it exists. Yet, despite its ambiguity, absurdity, confusion, illusiveness, fictitiousness, ooziness and meaninglessness, as a habit of thought "race" persists in its domination of scholarly and everyday imagination of the social world.[28] In this study, I seldom use it or its derivatives because of its illusiveness.

Most scholars agree that "races", contrary to being innate natural objects, are socially constructed through racialization.[29] The fact that blacks or browns or reds or whites or yellows were not always designated and cathected as such – e.g. it was not so long ago that the Irish and Jews came to be constructed as white[30] – means that differentiation and identification are psychosocial historical processes of subjectification

within shifting asymmetric power balances between groups. As Dalal writes, indices of differentiation and exclusion of groups by other groups "are not internal possessions, but ongoing psycho-social processes that emerge out of larger socio-historic processes", which means that "there are power relations inevitably at play between 'us' and 'them', and this means that sometimes the identification appears to be self chosen, and at other time inflicted from the outside."[31]

There are indications suggesting that some proponents of racist ideologies also acknowledged the illusiveness of "race". For example, while championing one of the deadliest racisms of the twentieth century, Hitler said: "I know perfectly well, just as well as all those tremendously clever intellectuals, that in the scientific sense there is no such thing as race…" However, he added:

> I as a politician need a conception which enables the order which has hitherto existed on historic bases to be abolished and an entirely new and antihistoric order enforced and given an intellectual basis. . . . With the conception of race, National Socialism will carry its revolution abroad and recast the world.[32]

The apartheid regime in South Africa also did its best to distance itself from the discredited idea of "race". Meanwhile, however, the regime perfected and perpetuated race*less* racism. Discrimination against non-white groups and monopolization of means of violence and survival by whites were to continue – now not animated by overt superiority feelings of "the white race" over the rest of the "races" but by the new ideology of ethnic cultural differences, i.e. "equal but separate development".[33]

Despite the conclusive inexistence of "race", the idea itself endures. It has mummified into a defiant reality of its own in the social imaginary wherein it structures everyday life. It is real without being actual or material. Despite its immateriality it has material consequences for those who endure its painful effects and those who enjoy its pleasurable sensations. This is racism without "races", which constitutes an anomaly in which racism is "anything – thought, feeling or action – that uses the notion of race as an activating or organizing principle" or "the manufacture and use of the notion of race".[34] This anomaly represents what Gilroy views as "the crisis of raciology", which arises precisely because the very thing ("race") that sustained "race" thinking – by constructors or destroyers of "race" – has evaporated into nothingness. Gilroy argues that these

11

reality-incongruent habits of thought, that persistently dominate academic and popular discourse, call for an urgent liberation from raciology.[35]

What is the relation between racism and xenophobia? Can one be distinguished from the other? There appears to be confusion and difficulty in distinguishing between racism and xenophobia, at the root of which, it seems, is the fictitiousness of "race". Institutions charged primarily with fighting against discrimination find it impossible to spell out the exact distinction between the two. The Open Society Justice Initiative[36] acknowledges that "[r]acial discrimination and discrimination on the grounds of citizenship often overlap such that distinguishing between the two can be difficult."[37] In the end Open Society does not bother to pursue further this distinction. The United Nations Conference on Racism assumes the difference between racism and xenophobia without being clear as to what such difference entails. In the 2001 UN Declaration against racism and xenophobia, reference to one refers to the other and to both as related intolerances, which in the end regards one as the other:

> [R]acism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, where they amount to racism and racial discrimination, constitute serious violations of and obstacles to the full enjoyment of all human rights and deny the self-evident truth that all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights, are an obstacle to friendly and peaceful relations among peoples and nations, and are among the root causes of many internal and international conflicts, including armed conflicts, and the consequent forced displacement of populations.[38]

There is an apparent lack of wish and effort to deliberate on the difference between racism and xenophobia. This, I suspect, is an implicit acknowledgement that such an undertaking would be a hopeless exercise since no one knows what "race" is. Defined in the Oxford as "an intense dislike or fear of strangers or people from other countries,"[39] xenophobia constitutes a form of discrimination, and the definitions of racism often include xenophobia in their scope. Like xenophobia, racism positions its target groups as strangers, outsiders, and allochthones. Racist or xenophobic groups create the others onto whom they project what they despise and fear about themselves; they exclude, disgrace, stigmatize and vilify the out-groups such that, in extreme cases, e.g. where the power asymmetry is too great, both victims and offenders become socially and psychologically

debilitated.[40] Those who speak in such binary ways essentialize and naturalize the we/they, in/out, here/there differences. Both racism and xenophobia enable the in-groups to justify their control over the means of power, prestige and survival. They are both ideological rationales for intergroup aggression, violence and mass exterminations. The fear and hatred with which in-groups racialize out-groups are not qualitatively different from the fear and hatred with which the predatory predisposition to strangers is consummated. Racism and xenophobia have characteristic features of *established-outsider relations* described by Elias, the analytical framework used in this study (see next chapter). As we shall see, in South Africa the discrimination against foreign nationals is predicated on exactly the same discredited ind1ces of "races". From this point of view, whatever difference is left between racism and xenophobia it is of little consequence.

THE PECULIARITY OF SOUTH AFRICAN XENOPHBIA

South African xenophobia has attracted a number of scholars, activists and journalists alike, all of whom offered explanations for its occurrence. In this section I will briefly give an overview of scholarly interventions on this topic. Among the first to turn their attention to this issue is Morris who puts forward the escape-goat theory, according to which the multitude of unemployed, poor, South Africans use immigrants to express their anger and frustration with the current state of affairs, blaming them for social ills such as unemployment and crime.[41] Another who argues in like manner is Tshitereke:

> In the post-apartheid epoch, while people's expectations have been heightened, a realisation that delivery is not immediate has meant that discontent and indignation are at their peak. People are more conscious of their deprivation than ever before … This is the ideal situation for a phenomenon like xenophobia to take root and flourish. South Africa's political transition to democracy has exposed the unequal distribution of resources and wealth in the country.[42]

Morris also puts forward the theory of isolation which holds that South Africans, particularly the blacks, have been isolated from the rest of the continent for decades. The isolation deprived them of contact with Africans beyond South Africa's borders. The consequential unfamiliarity with the continent and its people is expressed in xenophobic

sentiments toward Africans from elsewhere. With the demise of apartheid, South Africa is open and South Africans find themselves under siege by unknown Africa and Africans.[43]

But these theories do not explain why South African xenophobia is selective. The anti-immigrants display a great deal of white supremacy (I will elaborate on this point later). Not all foreign nationals and immigrants are equally targeted. The hostility is not evenly distributed among foreign nationals. For example, African foreign nationals are the most frequent victims of anti-immigrant attitudes and practices.[44] Why is this?

According to Harris, the 'biocultural theory' of xenophobia has been put forward to explain this uneven targeting of black Africans. This theory centres on the African immigrants' visibility: "The biocultural hypothesis locates xenophobia at the level of visible difference, or otherness, i.e. in terms of physical biological factors and cultural differences exhibited by African foreigners in the country."[45] For example, in the case of Nigerians and Congolese, Morris argues that they "are easily identifiable as the 'Other'. Because of their physical features, their bearing, their clothing style and their inability to speak one of the indigenous languages, they are in general clearly distinct and local residents are easily able to pick them out and scapegoat them."[46] The selection of immigrants for arrest, detention and deportation is predicated on biocultural assumptions. Here Minaar and Hough describe the methods used by the Internal Tracing Units of the South African Police Service:

> In trying to establish whether a suspect is an illegal or not, members of the internal tracing units focus on a number of aspects. One of these is language: accent, the pronouncement of certain words (such as Zulu for 'elbow', or 'buttonhole' or the name of a meerkat). Some are asked what nationality they are and if they reply 'Sud' African this is a dead give-away for a Mozambican, while Malawians tend to pronounce the letter 'r' as 'errow' … . Appearance is another factor in trying to establish whether a suspect is illegal -- hairstyle, type of clothing worn as well as actual physical appearance. In the case of Mozambicans a dead give-away is the vaccination mark on the lower left forearm … [while] those from Lesotho tend to wear gumboots, carry walking sticks or wear blankets (in the traditional manner), and also speak slightly different Sesotho.[47]

To say that black Africans are targeted because they are visible is not sufficiently helpful. The biocultural theory does not explain why, of all the visibilities in South Africa, this

perceived black African visibility should be the one that matters. Why does the visibility of other foreign nationals, notably white foreign nationals, matter less than that of black Africans?

Harris has put forward a different theory in explaining the asymmetrical targeting of African immigrants. Her theory "situates xenophobia within South Africa's transition from a past of racism to a future of nationalism during the transitional period." Harris analyzes "the role of broad social institutions, such as the media, in generating specific images of African foreigners in the country," and "the mechanisms of nationalism and the ways in which xenophobia itself has been represented"[48] during this transitional period. In the media she finds negative representations of Africa and Africans.

> Africa and the foreign African are represented negatively. 'Africa' appears as a homogeneous, undifferentiated place. There is no recognition that this is a large continent comprised of many different interests and nations, including South Africa. Rather, it is seen as 'the troubled north', a vague space marked by wars, woes and poverty. In this way, South Africa is divorced from the rest of the continent. Africa appears as a negative space 'out there', totally separate from the space 'in here'. This affords an interesting link back to the scapegoating hypothesis and the notion of the 'unknown', because Africa is portrayed as a negative collective force without specific form or identity thereby representing an easy object of blame and anxiety.[49]

According to Harris, the representations of Africa and Africans by state institutions such as the South African Police and the Department of Home Affairs fit hand in glove with media representations. The South African state's ideology of 'illegals,' 'illegal aliens,' 'illegal immigrant,' criminalizes and 'others' African immigrants.

Neocosmos recently put forward a compelling explanation of xenophobia in post-apartheid South Africa that is useful for the purposes of this study.[50] Post-apartheid xenophobia, he argues, issues from the anti-rural and pro-urban character of South African nationalism. He notes that through the group areas laws and sheer force, the apartheid state "ruralized" blacks and "urbanized" whites. With the end of apartheid the post-apartheid state simply shifted this rural/urban dichotomy to Africa/South Africa relations whereby Africa is positioned as rural and backward and South Africa as urban and modern. According to Neocosmos, this is possible thanks to the triumph of the urban-cantered over the populist construction of community and community membership

15

(nation and citizenship). While the urban-cantered stream constructed community membership (citizenship) on the basis of indigeneity or autochthony, the populist stream constructed community membership through active participation in the struggle against apartheid. Neocosmos insists that the triumph of the urban-cantered notion of nation and citizenship issues from an urban-biased post-apartheid state that has taken over the discourse on nation-building and citizenship.

Yet the fundamental question remains. Why should South Africans, particularly black South Africans, construct Africa and African immigrants in this way? Are they themselves not Africans who reside in Africa? Why should antiforeigner sentiments and attitudes be animated by an obsessive valuation of apparently visible differences such as accents, dress, and shades of skin colour? This question is left unexplored partly because rather than interrogating such visible differences, these scholars accept them as explanations for antiforeigner attitudes and behaviour. In addition, these scholars have to a considerable degree retreated into the present, tending to overlook the degree to which the South African social habitus bears the imprints of the history of South African established-outsider relations. Consequently, overlooked is the possibility that the imprints of the history of antagonistic group relations, notably the apartheid, on South African social habitus might be part of the conditions of possibility for these displays of anti-African attitudes and practices.

Although Neocosmos draws a great deal from history in his analysis, he does not go far enough in exploring the fundamental imprints of the history of white supremacy and violence on South Africans' "behaviour and feelings and social character – what sociologists now fashionably call 'habitus'."[51] All of these scholars fail to recognize that a fairly rounded understanding of the peculiarity of South African xenophobia requires an honest recognition of the long-term social and psychological impact of racial domination on the South African citizenry. This study recognizes both the sociogenetic and the psychogenetic processes of South African hatred and fear of outsiders as coloured by the history of racial domination.

16

STRUCTURAL ORGANIZATION

This study is modelled after fugurational sociology and the extended case method and as such it is organized as follows. Chapter 2 introduces and discusses the theoretical framework that informs the study. Specifically it discusses Elias' theory of group relations known as the established-outsiders theory. Within this framework the problem of self-formation in colonial contexts are considered. Included in the discussion is Foucault's idea of "technologies of self" in the production of patriotic self-images of the citizenry by means of in-group self-idealizations, on the one hand, and aversion, aggression and violence against foreign nationals, on the other hand. Finally, Elias' idea of "dyscivilization" and Turner's idea of "liminality" are considered as theoretical and metaphorical representations of spaces and life-worlds in which citizen-non-citizen relations take place. Chapter 3 discusses the methodological and philosophical points of departure that underpin the study. Drawing on Burawoy's concept of the extended case method and Elias' ideas on the nature of human societies, notably the relationship between individuals and their groups, the chapter discusses the methodological procedure in the production of the study. Chapter 4 opens the substantive part of the study with a discussion of the process of the establishment, specifically the expansion of citizenship to include the formerly excluded social groups, the shifting power balances between the groups, the accompanying psychosocial transformations within and between the groups, and how these transformations inform the relations between the citizenry and the outsiders. Chapter 5 details the ways in which both as state and civil society the establishment of the citizenry closes ranks against non-citizens, including the transformation of establishment fantasy into physical signs of strangeness on the bodies of the outsiders – how the figure of *makwerekwere* is (re)produced and mobilized in attitude and practice. This chapter maintains that the imagination of communities and construction of citizenship ultimately involve the imagination of ideal bodies of community members and citizens. Thus the chapter discusses how bodies are policed, inspected and classified as native or non-native, as autochthon or allochthon, as South African or *makwerekwere*. Chapter 6 discusses the mechanisms through which members of outsider groups experience and resist being categorised as *makwerekwere* (or outsiders), notably the things they do to remain invisible or retaliate against citizens.

Chapter 7 draws on De Swaan's elaborations on Elias's idea of dyscivilization and Turner's idea of liminality in a portrayal of spaces and life-worlds of the outsiders and their relations with the natives. Chapter 8 brings the study to an end.

NOTES

[1] R. Davies 1996, "South Africa's Economic Relations with Africa: Current Patterns and Future Perspectives", p. 148.

[2] This is not to deny the exploitative nature of South African migrant work. However, going to South Africa in many cases was an act of resistance against oppressive colonial regimes. African men were indeed conscripted but one must qualify this conscription, for the decision to go South Africa was often made due to the inability to pay head and hut taxes on local wages, including the inability to embody respectable masculinity by relying on local means. In the case of Mozambique, for example, why did the Portuguese colonial administration, under pressure by Portuguese planters, try to stop or reduce the exodus of men to South Africa? Why did these men prefer the South African exploiter to the Portuguese one? The answer might be that with South African wages the men could pay *lobolo* for at least two wives (in cases where polygamy was part of one's dream), buy ploughs and oxen, pay both head and hut tax, not to mention buying all kinds of coveted commodities. Going to South Africa eventually became an indispensable part of one's masculinity repertoire. By the time I was born, boys were admonished to eat well to grow up to go to South Africa to become men. Going to South Africa was indeed in pursuit of a dream (See Junod 1935[1912]).

[3] S. Katzenellenbogen 1982, *South Africa and Southern Mozambique: Labour, Railways and Trade in the Making of a Relationship.* Manchester: Manchester University Press; T. Moodie and V. Ndatse 1994, *Going for Gold: Men, Mines and Migration.* Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.

[4] Quoted in V. Williams 2008, "Xenophobia in South Africa: An Overview and Analysis", *Perspectives* 3(8). Www.migration-boell.de/downloads/migration/HBS_Perspectives_03.08.pdf.

[5] R. Mattes at al. 2000, "South African Attitudes to Immigrants and Immigration", p. 201.

[6] Ibid. p. 199.

[7] Ibid. p. 200.

[8] R. Mattes et al. 1999, *Still Waiting for the Barbarians: South Africans' Attitudes to Immigrants and Immigration* – SAMP.

[9] J. Crush 2008, *The Perfect Storm: The Realities of Xenophobia in Contemporary South Africa.*

[10] The holding, from 21 August to to7 September 2001, of the United Nations' World Conference Against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance in Durban, South Africa, is a historical testimony to the seriousness of the problem.

[11] F. Nyamnjoh 2006, *Insiders and Outsiders: Citizenship and xenophobia in contemporary southern Africa*, p. 38. Hereafter, *Insiders and Outsiders.*

[12] A. Morris 1998, "'Our Fellow Africans Make Our Lives Hell': The Lives of Congolese and Nigerians Living in Johannesburg", p 1130. Hereafter, "Our Fellow Africans".

[13] S. Pilley 21 May 2008, *Mail & Guardian.*

[14] See www.queensu.ca/samp; www.allafrica.com/stories/200408300448.htm

[15] P. Geschiere and S. Jackson 2006, "Autochthony and the Crisis of Citizenship: Democratization, and the Politics of Belonging", *African Studies Review* 49(2): 1-14.

[16] Open Society Justice Initiative 2004a *The Africa Citizenship and Discrimination Audit Preparatory Meeting.* Report of a conference held in Dakar, Senegal, on July 19-20, 2004. Http://www.justiceinitiative.org/db/resource2/fs/?file_id 1/4 14358. See also Open Society Justice Initiative 2004b *Racial Discrimination and the Rights of Non-citizens.* Http://www.justiceinitiative.org/db/resource2?res_id 1/4 101639.

[17] B. Whiteker 2005, "Citizens and Foreigners: Democratization and the Politics of Exclusion in Africa", *African Studies Review* 48(1): 109-226.

[18] P. Geschiere and S. Jackson 2006, "Autochthony and the Crisis of Citizenship: Democratization, and the Politics of Belonging", *African Studies Review* 49(2): 1-14.

[19] S. Jackson 2007, "Of 'Doubtful Nationality': Political Manipulation of Citizenship in the D. R. Congo", *Citizenship Studies* 11(5): 481–500; S. Jackson 2006, "Sons of which Soil? The Language and Politics of Autochthony in Eastern D.R. Congo", *African Studies Review* 49(2): 95-123; M. Young 2004, "Revisiting Nationalism and Ethnicity in Africa", UCLA International Institute, James S. Coleman African Studies Center. Http://repositories.cdlib.org/international/asc/jscmls/Nationalism.

[20] A. Leonhardt 2006, "Baka and the Magic of the State: Between Autochthony and Citizenship", *African Studies Review* 49(2): 69-94.

[21] S. Jackson 2007, "Of 'Doubtful Nationality': Political Manipulation of Citizenship in the D. R. Congo", *Citizenship Studies* 11(5), p. 113.

[22] A. Des Forges 1999, *Leave None to Tell the Story: Genocide in Rwanda.* New York: Human Rights Watch; R. Bhavnani 2006, "Ethnic Norms and Interethnic Violence: Accounting for Mass Participation in the Rwandan Genocide", *Journal of Peace Research* 43(6): 651-669; K. White 2009, "Scourge of Racism: Genocide in Rwanda", *Journal of Black Studies* 39(3): 471-481; M. Mamdani 2001, *When Victims Become Killers: Colonialism, Nativism, and the Genocide in Rwanda.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

[23] *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* (fifth edition) 1997. Oxford University Press.

[24] This tale of "race" is drawn from M. Banton, 2005 "Historical and Contemporary Modes of Racialization" in K. Murji and J. Solomos (eds) *Racialization: Studies in Theory and Practice.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 51-68. See also M. Banton 1998, *Theories of Race.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[25] M. Banton 2005, "Historical and Contemporary Modes of Racialization" in K. Murji and J. Solomos (eds) *Racialization: Studies in Theory and Practice.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 54.

[26] J. Graves, Jr. 2004, *The Race Myth: Why We Pretend Race Exists.* New York: Plume/Penguin Books; F. Dalal 2002, *Race, Colour and the Process of Racialization: New Perspectives from Group Analysis, Psychoanalysis and Sociology.* Hove and New York: Brunner-Routledge; P. Gilroy, 2000 *Against Race: Imagining Political Culture beyond the Color Line.* Cabridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

[27] F. Dalal 2002, *Race, Colour and the Process of Racialization: New Perspectives from Group Analysis, Psychoanalysis and Sociology.* Hove and New York: Brunner-Routledge, p. 19.

[28] P. Gilroy 2000, Against Race: Imagining Political Culture beyond the Color Line. Cabridge, MA: Harvard University Press; K. Murji and J. Solomos 2005, "Introduction: Racialization in Theory and Practice" in K. Murji and J. Solomos (eds) *Racialization: Studies in Theory and Practice.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 1-27; K. Montgomery 2005, "Banal Race-thinking. Ties of Blood, Canadian History Textbooks and Ethnic Nationalism", *Paedagogica Historica* 41(3): 313-336. A. Rattansi 2005, "The Uses of Racialization: The Time-spaces and Subject-objects of the Raced Body" in K. Murji and J. Solomos (eds) *Racialization: Studies in Theory and Practice.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 271-301; B. St Louis 2005, "Racialization in the 'Zone of Ambiguity'" in K. Murji and J. Solomos (eds) *Racialization: Studies in Theory and Practice.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 29-50.

[29] M. Banton 2005, "Historical and Contemporary Modes of Racialization" in K. Murji and J. Solomos (eds) *Racialization: Studies in Theory and Practice.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 51-68; M. Banton 1998, *Theories of Race.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; F. Dalal, 2002 *Race, Colour and the Process of Racialization: New Perspectives from Group Analysis, Psychoanalysis and Sociology.* Hove and New York: Brunner-Routledge; P. Gilroy 2000, Against Race: Imagining Political Culture beyond the Color Line. Cabridge, MA: Harvard University Press; D. Goldberg 2002, *The Racial State*. Oxford: Blackwell.

[30] N. Ignatiev 1995, *How the Irish Became White.* New York: Routledge; K. Brodkin 1998, *How Jews Became White Folks and What That Says About Race in America.* New Branzwick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press. See also G. Hage 2004, 'White Self-racialization as Identity Fetishism: Capitalism and the Experience of Colonial Capitalism' in K. Murji and J. Solomos (eds) *Racialization: Studies in Theory and Practice*, Oxford University Press.

[31] F. Dalal 2002, *Race, Colour and the Process of Racialization: New Perspectives from Group Analysis, Psychoanalysis and Sociology.* Hove and New York: Brunner-Routledge, p. 27

[32] Quoted in B. St Louis 2005, "Racialization in the 'Zone of Ambiguity'". In K. Murji and J. Solomos (eds) *Racialization: Studies in Theory and Practice.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 30).

[33] H. Gilliome 2003, *The Afrikaners: Biography of a People.* Charllotesville, VA: University of Virginia Press. Cape Town: Tafelberg Publishers Ltd.

[34] F. Dalal 2002, Race, Colour and the Process of Racialization: New Perspectives from Group Analysis, Psychoanalysis and Sociology. Hove and New York: Brunner-Routledge, p. 27.

[35] P. Gilroy 2000, Against Race: Imagining Political Culture beyond the Color Line. Cabridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

[36] Open Society Justice Initiative is an operational program of Open Society Institute. The program promotes law reforms and human rights and development of open societies worldwide. For more information see http://www.justiceinitiative.org and http://www.soros.org.

[37] Open Society Justice Initiative 2004, "Racial Discrimination and the Rights of Non-citizens".

[38] United Nations 2001, "Declaration on World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance". Www.unhchr.ch/pdf/Durban.pdf.

[39] *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* (fifth edition) 1997. Oxford University Press.

[40] F. Fanon 1967, *Black Skins, White Masks.* New York: Grove Press; N. Elias 1994, "Introduction: A Theoretical Essay on Established and Outsider Relations" in N. Elias and J. Scotson *The Established and the Outsiders.* London: Sage.

[41] A. Morris 1998, "'Our Fellow Africans".

[42] Quoted in B. Harris 2002, "Xenophobia: A New Pathology for a New South Africa?" Hereafter, "A New Pathology".

[43] A. Morris 1998, "'Our Fellow Africans".

[44] See Human Rights Watch (HRW) 1998, "Prohibited Persons: Abuse of Undocumented Migrants, Asylum-Seekers and Refugees in South Africa"; South African Human Rights Commission (SAHRC) 1999, "Report into the Apprehension and Detention of Suspected Undocumented Migrants."

[45] B. Harris 2002, "A New Pathology".

[46] A. Morris 1998, "Our Fellow Africans", p. 1125.

[47] Quoted in A. Harris 2002, "A New Pathology".

[48] B. Harris 2002, "A New Pathology".

[49] Ibid.

[50] M. Neocosmos 2006, *From 'Foreign native' to 'Native Foreigners'.*

[51] S. Mennell 2007, *The American Civilizing Process,* p. ix.

II. AFRICAN FIGURATIONS
THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS

While the phenomenon under consideration in this study has been studied from a variety of perspectives, as I discussed in the introduction, it has not, to my knowledge, been taken up from a figurational sociology perspective. This chapter introduces and explains the theoretical perspective within which the study is undertaken. Figurational sociology, its salient features, and its relevance and appropriateness for the sociological problem in question are discussed. Included in the discussion, first, are the questions of human figurations; assumptions of society/individual binary opposition; social processes and process-reductive habits of thought; and the image of the human being either as closed or open personality. Second, the chapter discusses the established-outsiders figuration theory, the mechanism through which this type of figuration is produced and reproduced. Third, the chapter deals with the question of technologies of self, the everyday practices and habits, through which relations between the established and the outsiders are constituted. The chapter discusses a type of technologies of self, i.e. colonial technologies of self through which colonial habitus and personalities are cultivated in colonial established-outsiders figurations. Finally, the ideas of "dyscivilization" and "liminality" will be introduced and discussed as theoretical and metaphorical representations of citizen-non-citizen relations and the spaces and life-worlds in which they occur.

HUMAN FIGURATIONS

This study is undertaken within the tradition of "figurational sociology" or "process sociology" spearheaded by Norbert Elias. Figurational sociology is concerned with "the connections between power, behaviour, emotions and knowledge in (to a greater or lesser extent) long-term perspective… bridging of the supposed 'macro-micro' divide to an extent that remains unusual in the social sciences today."[1] In this tradition, human figurations, as Van Benthem van den Bergh succinctly explains, are "networks of interdependent human beings, with shifting asymmetrical power balances."[2] Sceptic of disciplinary boundaries, figurational sociologists are interdisciplinary, drawing from history, anthropology, psychology, political science, biology, etc.

Elias remained suspicious of established concepts such as "society" and "structure" due to their tendency to reify and freeze social processes into states of rest. So he introduced the concept of "human figurations" which not only expresses interconnectedness and interdependence of individuals but also continual change, dynamism, flow, flux motion, power differentials, as inherent features of human associations. Drawing from his observations of dances, he illustrated the concept of "human figurations" in this way:

> One should think of a mazurka, a minuet, a polonaise, a tango, or rock 'n' roll. The image of the mobile figurations of interdependent people on a dance floor perhaps makes it easier to imagine states, cities, families and also capitalist, communist and feudal systems as figurations. By using this concept, we can eliminate the antithesis, resting finally on different values and ideals, imminent today in the use of the words "individual" and "society." One can certainly speak of a dance in general, but no-one will imagine a dance as a structure outside the individual or as a mere abstraction.[3]

This understanding of mobile figurations of people on a dance floor, argued Elias, "applies to all other figurations", he writes. And "[j]ust as the small dance figurations change becoming now slower, now quicker – so too, gradually or more suddenly, do the larger figurations which we call societies."[4]

Stephen Mennell and Johan Goudsbom sum up figurational sociology in four basic, interrelated, seemingly simple principles: (1) "Sociology is about people in the plural – human beings who are interdependent with each other in a variety of ways, and whose lives evolve in and are significantly shaped by the social figurations they form together;" (2) "These figurations are continually in flux, undergoing changes of many kinds – some rapid and ephemeral, others slower but perhaps more lasting;" (3) "The long-term developments taking place in human figurations have been and continue to be largely unplanned and unforeseen;" (4) "The development of human knowledge takes place within human figurations, and is one important aspect of their overall development."[5]

Elias viewed human societies as societies of individuals, which led him to reject the society/individual binary opposition. Going against the grain of the scientific establishment, he argued that societies are not forces external to human beings. This is

23

despite the fact that human beings, including sociologists, experience societies as alien coercive things. Contrary to these conventions of thought, Elias argues that society/individual binary is mythology turned into science:

> [W]e always feel impelled to make quite senseless conceptual distinctions, like "the individual and society," which makes it seem that "the individuals" and "society" were two separate things, like the tables and chairs or pots and pans. One can find oneself caught up in long discussions of the nature of the relationship between these two apparently separate objects. Yet on another level of awareness one may know perfectly well that societies are composed of individuals, and that individuals can only possess specifically human characteristics such as their abilities to speak, think, and live, in and through their relationships with other people – "in society."[6]

Elias also questioned process-reductive habits of thought in the social sciences and humanities through which processes are reduced to "states of rest." Process reduction not only detaches human actions from human actors but also objectifies, mystifies, reifies and personifies them. Actions become objects that exist independently of actors. Actions have taken on a life of their own. Process reduction is perhaps epitomized in the famous Durkhemian methodological rule of sociological investigation: *always consider social facts as things*. As Elias indicates, this habit pervades the everyday language used not by the population at large but also by the scientific establishment:

> The convention of speaking and thinking in terms of reifying substantives can gravely obstruct one's comprehension of the nexus of events. It is reminiscent of the tendency of the ancients, which has by no means entirely disappeared today, to personify abstractions. Just actions became the goddess Justitia. There are plentiful examples of the pressure which a socially standardized language puts on the individual speaker to use reifying substantives. Take such sentences as: 'The wind is blowing' or 'The river is flowing' – are not the wind and blowing, the river and flowing, identical? Is there a wind that does not blow, a river that does not flow?[7]

The modern idea and experience of individuality is a basic pillar of social sciences and philosophy. In the scientific establishment human beings are discrete, mutually exclusive and exhaustive self-contained entities. Elias opposed this idea and experience of individuality. Individuals are not "closed personalities," "windowless monads," "*homo clauses*, the thinking statues," he said.[8] Consistent with his visualization

24

of societies as figurations, he put forward the view of human beings as open personalities. Against "the image of the human being as a 'closed personality'", he proposed the "image of the human being as an 'open personality' who possesses a greater or lesser degree of relative (but never absolute and total) autonomy *vis-à-vis* other people and who is, in fact, fundamentally oriented towards and dependent on other people throughout his or her life." The view of the human being as an open personality goes hand in glove with his view of societies as multifaceted networks of interdependent human beings: "The network of interdependencies among human beings is what binds them together. Such interdependencies are the nexus of what is here called figuration, a structure of mutually oriented and dependent people." Thanks to this basic characteristic nature of being human, human beings form societies from the womb to the grave – they also can exist only in societies: "Since people are more or less dependent on each other first by nature and then through social learning, through education, socialization, and socially generated reciprocal needs, they exist… only as pluralities, only as figurations."[9]

The image of human beings as open personalities is crucial for understanding the figurational dynamics in which citizens and non-citizens in South Africa are caught. Without it, one cannot properly fathom their established-outsider relations in which apartheid discourse and practices of group charisma and group disgrace have found their way into the post-apartheid Rainbow Nation. With the idea of human beings as "closed personalities" it is impossible to envisage the process of internalization, of formation and crystallization of collective or social unconscious, through which members of outsider groups develop attitudes, practices and ways of thinking which are in tune with their stigma. It would be impossible to fathom the oppressed hating themselves and loving the oppressor, the group Stockholm's complex, or in Elias words, "identification with the established."

THE ESTABLISHED-OUTSIDER FIGURATION

This study concerns itself with group relations in the context of post-apartheid South African nationalism. The groups under consideration – the newly established black citizens and the black non-citizen outsiders – coexist in multifaceted interdependences. This interdependent coexistence is simultaneously economic, social and psychological.

Although the studies on South African group relations tend to focus on economic interdependences of "racial" groups, reality shows that social groups are also bound in figurations through social and psychological interdependences.

Within the tradition of figurational sociology emerged an understanding of group relations known as the established-outsider relations theory, which was developed from Elias' and Scotson's study of an English working class neighbourhood in the 1950s. First published in 1965, the 1976 edition of *The Established and the Outsiders* comes with an introductory essay titled "A Theoretical Essay on Established and Outsiders Relations" in which Elias elaborated on a general theory of relations between the established and the outsiders. The most recent edition was published in 1994. Giving it the pseudonym of Winston Parva,[10] the neighbourhood was divided in two sections, The Village and The Estate. The Village residents had been established there for some generations. They could trace their ancestry and traditions back to nineteenth century. The Estate residents, by contrast, were relatively new, having arrived in the neighbourhood some twenty years before the study was conducted. The divide between the two groups was not based on physically visible differences or the so-called racial differences. There were no differences in accent, citizenship, education, ethnicity, habits, income, occupation, and skin colour. Members of both groups worked in the same factories. The only difference was that the Village group was older, having established itself in the neighbourhood for generations, while the Estate group was relatively newer. As Elias writes:

> There were no differences in nationality, in ethnic descent, in 'colour' or 'race' between residents of the two areas; nor did they differ in their type of occupation, their income and educational levels—in a word, in their social class. Both were working-class areas. The only difference between them was …: one group was formed by old residents established in the neighbourhood for two or three generations and the other was a group of newcomers.[11]

The villagers' oldness alone enabled them to categorize the newcomers, whom they viewed as outsiders from day one, with dehumanizing labels while adorning themselves with excellent human qualities. Given the depth and breadth of the divide, this was striking to Elias and Scotson. The ideology and practices on which the divide was predicated had remarkable resemblance with ideologies and practices of racism.

26

Praise gossip and blame gossip

According to Elias, in established-outsider figurations the social distance between the groups involved is constituted through a code of conduct that is sanctioned by "praise gossip" and "blame gossip." In their everyday gossip, the established praise themselves for being law abiding citizens, well-bred, honourable, respectable and virtuous. Complementary to praising themselves, they blame the estate residents for social ills, crime, noise and disorder. Among the established, the violators of the code are subject to "blame gossip," while the devotees are pleasured with "praise gossip." The two types of gossip are reproduced, kept alive, transmitted and spread through "gossip channels" which the established control thanks to their high degree of integration.

Integration

According to Elias, the established are more powerful than the outsiders because they are highly integrated and well connected socially. With this tighter social cohesion, they are able to control all strategic positions of power and status. In Winston Parva, this high degree of integration issued from the old families' long history together as working class in the neighbourhood. Having lived there for some generations, they had established a mode of living, code of conduct and hierarchy. The fear of losing their established way of life, order and hierarchy propelled them to avoid contact with the outsiders beyond absolute necessity. In contrast, the newcomers had not built up such type of cohesion. May's observations are an excellent representation of Elias' deliberations on integration of the established and how it functioned to exclude the outsiders:

> [S]ocial cohesion is reproduced through the potential advantages of being part of the established. The social cohesion of the established can be put to work as social capital in order to secure material and immaterial advantages. Because of tighter networks of help, the established can use their resources more effectively…. Furthermore, the established can rely on each other's help in order to monopolise the key positions in local organizations... On this basis, cohesion is created and becomes the main source of power differentials between the established and the outsiders of Winston Parva.[12]

Group charisma, group disgrace

27

The established mastermind and mobilize ideologies of exclusion to stigmatize the outsiders. The stigmatization of the outsiders by the established entails two interrelated processes of in-group charismatizing and outer-group disgracing. The established construct group charisma through self-idealizations, painting themselves with impressive characteristics and labels. At the same time, they construct group disgrace to humiliate the outsiders, painting them with not so impressive characteristics and labels. As Dalal comments about Elias' and Scotson's study: "The established accrued for themselves a charisma which was internalized by its members to become an integral part of individual identities; meantime the outsiders were 'painted' with stigma, which they too internalized and so tended to experience themselves through the eyes of the established."[13]

Minority of the best, minority of the worst

Stigmatization – group charisma and group disgrace – in established-outsider figurations involves constant comparisons between the established and the outsiders. In this ongoing practice, having the upper hand in setting the conditions and terms of relations, the established selectively and strategically use "the minority of the best" within their own group and "the minority of the worst" among the outsiders. The minority of the best among the established stand as representatives of the entire group of the established; their characteristics are represented as characteristics of the entire group. Meanwhile, the minority of the worst among the outsiders are positioned as representatives of the entire group; their characteristics are extended to paint the whole group of outsiders.

Power differentials

Elias maintains that the relations between the established and the outsiders are relations of power, more specifically of power differentials. Whether the charisma is effective, whether the stigma sticks on the outsiders, depends on the breadth and depth of power-differentials between the established and the outsiders. "[W]here power differential is very great, groups in an outsider position measure themselves with the yardstick of their oppressors."[14] In this case, the power differentials were so great that the established internalized their group charisma making it a salient feature of individual members' personal identities. On the other hand, the outsiders internalized their stigma making it a

salient feature of their individual personal identities, tending to experience themselves through the eyes of the established.

This theory is relevant in trying to understand the mechanisms through which multitudes of South Africans – the majority of whom consider themselves black and African – manufacture differences, to mark the perceived African outsiders, not just as non-citizens but as inferior human beings. The questions which animated Elias' and Scotson's study evolved into: "How do member of a group maintain among themselves the belief that they are not merely more powerful but also better human beings that those of another? What means do they use to impose the belief in their own human superiority upon those who are less powerful?"[15] The same questions animate this undertaking in a different context. How does it come to pass that Africans who were united in their struggle against external oppression actively manufacture differences among themselves, indulge in narcissism of minor differences, and subject each other to violent forms of inclusion and exclusion? Traditional explanations of racism in South Africa and indeed elsewhere in terms of differences in skin colour have been discredited as untenable, let alone for the phenomenon of black against black othering processes under consideration in this study. Where exclusion and stigmatization of the type Elias and Scotson observed occur between groups with visibly different skin colours, the word *racism* quickly comes to mind, thus perpetuating "the habit of explaining group relations such as described here as a result of racial, ethnic or sometimes religious differences. None of these explanations fit here."[16] The cart must come after the horse:

> In discussing "racial" problems one is apt to put the cart before the horse. It is argued, as a rule, that people perceive others as belonging to another group because the colour of their skin is different. It would be more to the point if one asked how it came to pass in this world that one has got into the habit of perceiving people with another skin colour as belonging to a different group.[17]

Later on Elias elaborates:

> What one calls "race relations"… are simply established-outsider relationships of a particular type. The fact that members of the two groups differ in their physical appearance or that members of one group speak the language in which they

communicate with a different accent and fluency merely serves as a reinforcing shibboleth which makes members of an outsider group more easily recognizable as such.[18]

Elias also goes on to point out that the antipathetic emotions of an established group toward an outsider group in one type of established outsider-relations are not different from antipathetic emotions of an established group toward an outsider group in another type of established-outsider relations. He writes:

> The aversion, contempt or hatred felt by members of an established group for those of an outsider group, and fear that closer contact with the latter may pollute them, are no different in cases where the two groups differ distinctly in their physical appearance and in others where they are physically indistinguishable, so that the low-powered outsiders have to wear a badge to show their identity.[19]

But even assuming that visible physical differences do exist, one may still ask why they should matter. The differences between citizens and non-citizens do abound also among citizens themselves. Why, therefore, are the differences among citizens collapsed whist those between citizens and non-citizens are exaggerated? The fact that 20 per cent of those incarcerated at Lindela repatriation camp west of Johannesburg were South Africans bears testimony to the fact that citizens and non-citizens have varieties of similarities.[20] This is what makes the inquiry interesting – the fact that victims of apartheid aggression turn out to be aggressors toward those who appear to be their kith and kin.

According to established-outsider relations theory, "[j]ust as established groups, as a matter of course, regard their superior power as sign of their higher human value, so outsider groups as long as the power differential is great and submission inescapable, emotionally experience their power inferiority as a sign of human inferiority."[21] Consistent with this theory, I expect non-citizens to accept in one way or another the inferior status to which they are assigned by the newly established blacks. Also consistent with this theory, I expect the lessening of power differentials between blacks and whites to have contributed for the emergence of a new we-image within both groups, with blacks feeling more or less empowered and whites feeling more or less robbed of their self-worth.

The processes of exclusion in established-outsider relations as described by Elias have historically taken the form of 'narcissism of differences', a thesis Freud proposed to denote antagonistic relations between groups that resemble each other: '[E]very intimate emotional relation between two people which lasts some time – marriage, friendship, the relations between parents and children – leaves a sediment of feelings of aversion and hostility, which have first to be eliminated by repression.'[22] Thus, for example:

> Every time two families come together by a marriage, each of them thinks itself superior to or of better birth than the other. Of two neighbouring towns each is the other's most jealous rival; every little canton looks down upon the others with contempt. Closely related races keep one another at arm's length; the South German cannot endure the North German, the Englishman casts every kind of aspersion upon the Scot, the Spanish despises the Portuguese.[23]

The anthropologist Anton Blok developed Freud's thesis, demonstrating that in human history not only differences but also similarities have motivated groups to annihilate each other. According to Blok, a pattern exists in human history of groups undergoing reduction of differences and at the same time engaging in narcissism of minor differences, which often escalates into ethnic cleansings. Thus, for example, the discrimination against the Burakumin in Japan, the violence against blacks in the American South following the abolition of slavery, the violence between equals among the court nobility in France and Germany, the growth of anti-Semitism in Germany, the civil war in the Balkans, the ethnic cleansing Rwanda, issued from reduction of differences between groups which, in turn, gave rise to narcissism of minor differences.[24] While Blok shows that the Hutus had become Tutsified and the Tutsis Hutufied through sociocultural interpenetrations, De Swaan shows that the genocide was accomplished through the mobilization of fantasy.[25] Anti-Semitism grew and paved the way for the holocaust as Jews became increasingly indistinguishably German: there had been a reduction of differences between the haters and the hated wherein the hated were accused of 'sneaking about in disguise to hide subversive activities'; they were 'parasitic vermin… dangerous to the body politic if not watched'; they needed to 'be stamped out with vigilance and ideological protection'; therefore 'every right minded citizen has a duty to be as watchful as in the protection of individual health.[26] Historically, competition

for power, prestige and survival intensifies as differentials between the competing groups wane. In other words, as groups tend toward diminishing contrasts and less inequality, especially when the means of survival are scarce, they exert on each other greater competitive pressure tending toward ruthlessness.

The established-outsider relations theory is appropriated for this project for the following reasons. The theory emanates from a study of two groups of people interlocked in a power figuration. First, bioculturally and socioeconomically members of one group could not be distinguished from members of another group. And most importantly, skin colour cut across group barriers. To a greater or lesser degree, black South Africans and black Africans are interlocked in a power figuration of this type. Second, in their study, the authors remarked that segregation between the established and the outsiders was based on one single minor difference. The exclusion of the outsiders by the established was animated through similarities and narcissism of minor differences between the two groups. This applies in the case of South African xenophobia. Rather than following the conventional wisdom of blaming South African xenophobia on visible differences of foreign nationals, this study argues that similarities and reduction of differences between citizens and non-citizens is a fundamental component of the motive force of xenophobia.

THE ESTABLISHED-OUTSIDER FIGURATION IN OTHER CONTEXTS

The theory of the established-outsider relations has been extended to good effect in a variety of contexts. Thus my study is not the first but among the few extensions of established-outsider theory beyond its original context. To my knowledge, however, it is the first to extend it to citizen/non-citizen relations and identity politics in post-apartheid South Africa. The following four examples of extensions of the established-outsider relations theory are deceptively oversimplified summaries of otherwise complex, creative and nuanced scholarly work.

Among scholars who have extended the theory to other areas is Feiwel Kupferberg who took up the theory in his study of immigrant and women entrepreneurship in Europe.[27] Immigrants and women, he argues, are outsiders or newcomers, as he prefers to call them, for different reasons. Immigrants have to struggle for the right of residence, citizenship, which will predicate other rights and claims in the

32

future: e.g. social security; political, socio-economic and cultural rights. Even after these have been earned, immigrants live with a permanent suspicion that they are regarded as second-class citizens. As a result, they tend to be saddled by low self-esteem which can discourage entrepreneurship. However, he also notes that this can fuel immigrant entrepreneurship as a way of raising self-esteem. On the other hand, unlike immigrants, non-immigrant women entrepreneurs' citizenship is not at stake, and they belong to culture of the establishment. However, they might also feel like second-class citizens. Not only because they are late-comers in the democratic process and the labour market in western countries but also because of the everyday male chauvinism endemic in these societies that constantly exclude and remind women of their place. This relationship has the configuration of established-outsider relations which may account for women's low self-esteem, which in turn may also discourage their entrepreneurship. But this may also fuel their entrepreneurship to raise their self-esteem.

Stefanie Ernst explores the established/outsiders figurational dynamics between men and women in the professions, particularly in leadership and management.[28] With women being late comers in this domain they are positioned as outsiders who are invading male territory. They are subject to societal blame gossip which stigmatizes professional women by constructing them as unfeminine, neglecters of children's needs at home for selfish reasons. They carry the group disgrace of incompetence, filthiness, loss of manners, because of personal ambitions. This goes hand in hand with the insistence on women's traditional domestic skills – femininity, nurturing, caring, motherly instincts – at work places. As an example, she points to the literature which not only emphasises but endorses gender differences in managerial styles for men and for women. However, she also notes that from a long term figurational perspective, the increasing representation of women in the professions represents changing power balances and diminishing contrasts between men and women.

In his study of relations between Germans and immigrants in urban social spaces, David M. May extends the Established-Outsider relations theory to good effect. His study puts into focus three interrelated established-outsider figurations: one between the Germans and immigrants at national scale; another played out between one dominant section of the city and another isolated, marginal working class section; and the last

33

played out between the poor, working class Germans and immigrants within the latter section of the city. The exclusion and stigmatization of immigrants nationally are reproduced in the established-outsider figuration between the mainstream, affluent, section of the city and the poor, working class section. The exclusion and stigmatization of the working class section is finally reproduced in the established-outsider figuration between working class Germans and immigrants in the working class neighbourhood. All the three figurations are characterized by the exclusion and stigmatization of the outsiders (immigrants) by the established (Germans).[29]

Philip W. Sutton and Stephen Vertigans extend the established-outsider relations theory in their study of changing power balances between two Turkish groups, the established Secularists and the Islamic Praxisitioners outsiders.[30] The genesis of the establishment is situated in the collapse of the Islamic Ottoman Empire during the First World War giving way to a secularist state. In this shifting power balance the secularists took control of the state and institutionalised western democracy in the 1920s. This dynamic enabled the secularists to construct and propagate group charisma with which they positioned themselves as democrats, modernized, enlightened, educated and westernized. To complement their group charisma, they invented group stigma positioning the Islamic Praxisitioners as traditionalists, backward, barbaric, uncivilized and ignorant. Islam was also saddled with stigma. Religion was banned from the state and public institutions, thus confining it to private spheres where it could be taught and practiced. Sutton and Vertigans note that since 1950s coups by military regimes contributed for another spurt in changing power balance between the secularists and the praxisitioners, for although the military regimes were secular, they were more tolerant to religion than their predecessors. Religious education was reintroduced in the 1960s, and many religious schools were opened. Graduates from religious schools were allowed admission to universities. Eventually religious minded individuals gained access to the public institutions and government offices. Most importantly, the group stigma was not internalized by the praxisitioners. Instead, they developed a group charisma of their own and retaliated with group stigma against secularists. Sutton's and Vertigans' use of established-outsider relations is nuanced, and their extension of it in the study of

interweaving of history, politics, religion and secularisation ("forced civilizing process"[31]) is still unusual in social sciences.

Bram van Stolk and Cas Wouters study power differentials, including the concomitant psychological effects, between gay men and lesbians and heterosexuals, between women and men, as cases of established-outsider relations.[32] In his *Sex and Manners*, Cas Wouters studies the changing power balance between men and women in the west since nineteenth century.[33] In their article, "Sport as a Drug and Drug Use in Sport," Eric Dunning and Ivan Waddington suggest that relations between drug-users and members of society at large have many of the features of established-outsider relations as defined by Elias.[34]

COLONIAL RELATIONS AS A TYPE OF ESTABLISHED-OUTSIDER RELATIONS

Historical relations between whites and blacks, between the colonizer and the colonized, have many characteristic features of established-outsider relations defined by Elias. Du Bois' and Fanon's studies of these relations are classical expositions of established-outsider relations, notwithstanding the different enframing. They reveal exclusionary ideological processes, the construction and mobilization of group charisma and group stigma, in broader historical contexts. In the case under consideration in this study, their studies shed light on the technologies of self (to be discussed later in this chapter) which constitute the sociogenesis and psychogenesis of relations between the established citizens and non-citizen outsiders in post-apartheid South Africa.

The underlying thread running through the established-outsider relations theory as Elias defined it, DuBois' theory on relations between whites and blacks in America,[35] and Fanon's theory on relations between the colonizer and the colonized,[36] is a psychological one: internalization of negative self-images, negative we-images, by the weaker groups, the oppressed, the outsiders, the blacks, the colonized by virtue of their diminished command of power relative to the dominant groups. This is consistent with Elias' observation that "where power differential is very great, groups in an outsider position measure themselves with the yardstick of their oppressors."[37] The tragedy about internalization of negativity into one's own identity is that

try as one might one cannot get away either from a bad 'them' or the bad self, must in the end have a dire and debilitating effect on the psyche. This leads eventually to depression or expressions of anger and self-hate, which by the processes of symmetric logic can as easily be directed at others in the vicinity who are like me and therefore are the same as me. Elias is describing exactly the same mechanisms as Fanon and Freire – mechanisms that drive horizontal violence.[38]

What were the mechanisms of group stigmatization and internalization of negativity in these colonial relations as Fanon and Du Bois saw them? While Fanon shows how colonial constraints produced self-hating and -despising outsider black subjects, Du Bois describes vividly the psychological condition of black personality which forms and crystallizes under such constraints, a "double-personality" with which the black outsiders judge themselves by the standards of the established white colonial masters. The black outsiders enter the colonial figuration through birth. As they enter it, they find it colonial and, and in death they leaving it behind in the same condition. They live a colonizing life and die through a colonizing dying process. It is within such a social figuration that the process of subjectification and formation of colonial self take place.[39] I will return to this discussion later in the study.

BODIES IN ESTABLISHED-OUTSIDER RELATIONS

Although Elias is silent about the idealization and denigration of bodies through charisma and stigma in established-outsiders relations, it is clear that the bodies, both of the established and the outsiders, are deeply implicated. This is evident in his observation that the established hold the belief that the outsiders are dirty. "[O]utsider groups are often held as filthy and hardly human."[40] Moreover:

> Almost everywhere members of established groups and even more, those of groups aspiring to form the establishment, take pride in being clean, literally and figuratively, than the outsiders and, given the poorer conditions of many outsider groups, they are probably quite often right. The widespread feeling among established that contact with members of an outsider group contaminates refers to contamination with anomy and with dirt rolled into one.[41]

Fanon paid some attention to colonial construction of black bodies by the established whites. According to Fanon, the white construction of the black body centres on over-

36

sexualisation of black bodies.[42] In fact, Fanon has shown that the constitution of black group disgrace positions black bodies in highly sexually reductive ways, i.e. the black body is reduced to its genitalia: the Blackman is a walking penis. Susan Bordo, however, puts forward a theorisation of the body in relations akin to established-outsiders relations. Although she focuses on western female bodies in North American consumer culture, she describes an established-outsider figuration, including the respective identity politics that oils its wheels.[43]

In the established-outsiders figuration under consideration in this study, we are presented with a variation of this process. Here the established citizens invent stigmatizing images of non-citizen bodies. These images are circulated through gossip channels, which in this case consist of word of mouth and the media. Do the non-citizen outsiders, in turn, internalize these negativities and the emotional weight that goes with them into their "we-images"? Is there evidence of the impact of group disgrace on non-citizen bodies? This remains to be seen in the course of the study. The colonial and postcolonial contexts in this case produce a psychological twist to this problem. Postcolonial scholars, particularly Du Bois and Fanon, have demonstrated that people who have been subject to group disgrace for generations tend to harbour deep self-hatred and to engage in self-destructive practices, not necessarily through physical self-injury, although this is also often the case, but through projection of their group and personal disgrace to other similar groups and individuals. Violence is often meted against those who appear to look like "me", like "us". In the case of established-outsider figuration under consideration in this study, self-colonization is symptomatic of internalized group disgrace by the outsiders, who for generations were themselves non-citizens, but who have recently climbed up to the establishment of citizens. The construction of images of non-citizen bodies, and the accompanying feelings of aversion, fear, revulsion and suspicion, is one aspect of its manifestation. The disgracing of immigrant's bodily performances and movements in space enshrined in categories such as *makwerekwere,* or *magrigamba,* or *mapoti,*[44] is no less stigmatizing than the categories *nigger* and *kaffir* which the white establishment used against blacks during apartheid. Both the colonial and postcolonial sets of categories are cathected with negative emotional and moral

connotations. When these terms are used, they evoke fear, hatred, revulsion and suspicion. These issues will be taken up substantively later in the study.

TECHNOLOGIES OF SELF IN ESTABLISHED-OUTSIDER FIGURATIONS

How did it come to pass that the former outsiders, now the newly established blacks, consider themselves not simply as exclusively deserving of post-apartheid benefits but as superior human beings than the non-citizens who live among them? How did it come to pass that, in relating to non-citizens, they deploy the same logic of established-outsider relations which characterized their relations with whites during apartheid?

The relations between the established and the outsiders are mediated and accomplished through what Michel Foucault called "technologies of self."[45] Technologies of self are habits, discourses, disciplinary practices that mould subjects into culturally appropriate and acceptable subjects. They "permit individuals to affect by their own means, or with the help of others, a certain number of operations on their own bodies and souls, thoughts, conduct, and way of being, so as to transform themselves in order to attain a certain state of happiness, purity, wisdom, perfection, or immortality."[46] Individuals undergo training and modification "not only in the obvious sense of acquiring certain skills but also in the sense of acquiring certain attitudes."[47] Technologies of self are relational, always exercised by individuals vis-à-vis other individuals and by groups vis-à-vis other groups. Figurationally speaking, technologies of self operate only in pluralities of people, in figurations. As Foucault indicates, technologies of self mediate "the interaction between oneself and others… the technologies of individual domain… the mode of action that an individual exercises upon himself."[48] For example, the table manners which regulated behaviour during meals and the codes of conduct which regulated contact between social groups are examples of technologies of self and self-presentation that, in Elias' term, "civilized" European subjects in a certain direction in the course of modernization, thus producing a specific habitus. The civilizing process, in Elias' sense, appears in Foucault's work as the disciplining of subjects whose aim is production of docile bodies. The unwritten invisible code that constitutes the social and psychological distance between the established and the outsiders functions as

technologies of self. Colonial technologies of self will be discussed in the context of relations between the established and the outsiders.

Within the colonial figuration prevailed specific technologies of self that produced certain personality structures and structured everyday life. With the power balance tilted to the disadvantage of the outsiders, in established-outsiders figurations the established often set and put in motion the dominant technologies of self. Although official apartheid has collapsed, the old technologies of self still persist informally in post-apartheid South Africa.

DYSCIVILIZATION AND LIMINALITY IN ESTABLISHED-OUTSIDER RELATIONS

Elias's theory of civilizing processes holds that a fundamental currents of these processes has been the formation of the state, specifically the monopolization of the means of violence and taxation, which precipitated increased mutual identification and pacification of human relations between social groups. However, Elias also says that if the levels of fear rise, civilizing processes could be reversed unleashing torrents of violence and processes of dyscivilization: "The armour of civilized conduct would crumble very rapidly if, through a change in society, the degree of insecurity that existed earlier were to break in upon us again, and if danger became as incalculable as it once was. Corresponding fears would burst the limits set to them today."[49]

In turn, De Swaan expounded on the concept of dyscivilization, pointing out that the currents of civilization may bypass certain groups such as, for example, those categorized as criminals or outsiders. "The regime may mobilize the entire machinery of the state to persecute and annihilate this target group, and this more thoroughly than could have been achieved in societies where the state apparatus has not succeeded in monopolizing the means of violence so effectively."[50] According to De Swaan, the destruction of such groups involves "the social work of disidentififification" with these groups, that is, isolate the groups, turning them into "objects of a persistent campaign of vilification and dehumanization; hatred and loathing must be evoked against them among the population."[51] At the same time, there is an implicit social work "to strengthen positive identifications among the rest of the population."[52] In South Africa it is telling

that the South African Human Rights Commission's (SAHRC) report on open hearings on xenophobia states that:

> South Africa's background of separate development fostered an environment of distrust between the various so called ethnic, tribal and racial groups within South Africa. Reconciliation between South Africans long divided has posed tremendous challenges. *There are speculations that in unifying a nation of tremendous diversity, a shared, foreign threat can serve a unifying role*.[53]

According to De Swaan, following this social work, the physical destruction is brought upon the target groups. Special units prepared specifically for this task are deployed to round up the targets and isolate them, which requires the preparation of appropriate locations "off from the uninitiated so that the torturing and killing may proceed unnoticed (but not unbeknownst to them) in reservations of destruction."[54] De Swaan calls this compartmentalization of cruelty:

> [T]he categorization of a target population, the physical isolation of the sites of destruction, the institutional identification of the authorised agents, the censoring of all information and opinion on the subject, the social demarcation of brutalization from other forms of interaction, and the perpetrators the psychological separation of their psychic experiences from all other mental processes or social encounters.[55]

Thus emerges an "archipelago of enclaves where cruelty reigns while being reigned in all the while."[56] Compartmentalization of cruelty resembles the manifestation of schizophrenic or split personality: pro-citizen and anti-African orientations.

De Swaan lays a distinction between decivilization and dyscivilization. The first refers to complete collapse of civilizing forces: "Civilization has broken down, the social order has fallen to pieces, barbarism has spread all over."[57] Dyscivilization on the other hand means that civilization has broken down "only in well-defined episodes and spaces."[58] Compartmentalization in dyscivilizing societies allows the coexistence of contrasts such as civil/uncivil, good/bad, gentle/brutal, moral/immoral in rigidly defined spaces and relations:

> Dyscivilizing societies will develop quite strong, but also quite rigid types of social control and self-control. Very elaborate codes of conduct and expression will be maintained to the smallest detail, until the moment that one steps over the threshold and into the compartment of barbarity, where all cruelty and wildness

are permitted, until one leaves this reservation again and resumes one's controlled demeanour, *as if nothing had ever happened*: that is dyscivilized behaviour.[59]

It is worthwhile to add to De Swaan's compelling argument that compartmentalization in dyscivilizing societies does not have to be concentrated in archipelagos of cruelty. As I will demonstrate in chapter 7, in relations between citizens and non-citizens in South Africa, compartmentalization transcends space. It has been liberated from place, permeating non-spatial life processes, sociality itself wherever it occurs. In South Africa the distribution of compartmentalization is spread more or less evenly across social tiers so that no specific sites are overly more notorious enclaves of cruelty than others. It manifests itself in the everyday world practices and interactions, in the microcosm of social life. It is spread across the national territory. It occurs regularly even as the groups in question are locked in an established-outsider figuration. It occurs with or without state permission or promotion. Conditions of possibility emerge once the state looks the other way while the citizenry taunts outsider groups. Dyscivilization requires the state's indifference to human cruelty, or the retreat of the state as a civilizing force from certain spaces and human relations.

The enclaves of cruelty produced through the process of compartmentalization have structural characteristics of liminal spaces and personae. The idea of liminality gained currency in the literature through the writings of Victor Turner who used the terms "limen", "liminal", "liminoid" and "liminality" to describe isolation and marginality as the hallmark of rites of passage.[60] According to Turner, rites of passage have three phases – the separation, margin (or *limen*), and aggregation phases. In the phase of separation individuals engage in symbolic behaviour that signifies detachment from the group. In the phase of marginality, or "the liminal period", the initiate ("individual or corporate") takes on an ambiguous status: "[T]he state of the ritual subject (the "passenger") is ambiguous, he passes through a realm that has a few or none of the attributes of the past or coming state."[61] In the phase of aggregation "the subject is consummated", enters "a stable state once more and, by virtue of this, has rights and obligations of a clearly defined and 'structural' type, and is expected to behave in accordance with certain customary norms and ethical standards."[62]

Leo Chavez's work on Mexican nationals in the United States is an exemplary usage of Turner's idea of liminality as a metaphorical representation of the detrimental conditions to which foreign nationals are subject.[63] Drawing from Turner's insights, Chavez argues that the movement of Mexican nationals to the United States represents a "territorial passage that marks the transition from one way of life to another way of life."[64] In their commentary on Chavez's work, Donnan and Wilson elaborate:

> [T]he period of separation draws attention to their reasons for migrating, the liminal stage to their experience of border crossing, and the final phase to their ultimate absorption into American society, a culmination of effort which, as Chavez notes, may be marked by its own rite of incorporation when the migrant is called to the Immigration and Naturalization Service for confirmation of legal residency. However, for some migrants the passage is never complete. Crossing the border without documents, these migrants remain trapped in the liminal phase, as unincorporated outsiders in American society for whom even return to Mexico is problematic.[65]

The movement of Africans from the north of Limpopo (including the sociopolitical conditions in these regions) to South Africa represents the period of separation. The integration of these migrants into South African society through the granting of permanent residency and eventually citizenship by the Department of Home Affairs – a rare occurrence indeed – represents the phase of integration. However, I will leave these first and last phases to the passage to researchers interested in pull and push factors. What is of interest in this study is the liminal phase in which "the state of the ritual subject (the "passenger") is ambiguous"; the subject "passes through a realm that has a few or none of the attributes of the past or coming state."[66]

According to Turner, the liminal phase not only goes against the grain of the normal order of things and the structure of social life. "We are not dealing with structural contradictions when we discuss liminality," he writes, "but with the essentially unstructured (which is at once de-structured and pre-structured)."[67] The liminal zone is not only unstructured but also shadows the initiate subjects with an aura of structural, if not physical, invisibility. The subject is a "transition-being" with a "liminal *persona*", "at once no longer classified and not yet classified."[68] Later on he describes the ambiguity of the liminal in this way: "This coincidence of opposite processes and notions in a single

representation characterizes the peculiar unity of the liminal: that which is being neither this nor that, and yet is both."[69] Since they are unstructured, these zones are strange and confusing: "The symbolism attached to and surrounding the liminal *persona* is complex and bizarre."[70] Again, "neophytes are neither living nor dead from one aspect, and both living and dead from another. Their condition is one of ambiguity and paradox, a confusion of all the customary categories."[71] According to Turner, liminality is both negative and positive, "the Nay to all positive structural assertions, but as in some sense the source of them all, and, more than that, as a realm of pure possibility whence novel configurations of ideas and relations may arise."[72] Turner goes on to note that the neophyte is structurally "dead" and as such "he or she may be treated, for a long or short period, as a corpse is customarily treated in his or her society."[73] Thus the neophytes may ritually enact death:

> The neophyte may be buried, forced to lie motionless in the posture and direction of customary burial, may be stained black, or maybe forced to live for a while in the company of masked and monstrous mummers representing, *inter alia,* the dead, or worse still, the un-dead. The metaphor of dissociation is often applied to neophytes; they are allowed to go filthy and identified with earth – the generalized matter into which every specific individual is rendered down. Particular form here becomes general matter; often their very nature names are taken from them and each is called solely by the generic term for "neophyte" or "initiand."[74]

Turner also observes that the liminal personae are viewed as polluting: "liminal *personae* nearly always and everywhere are regarded as polluting to those who have never been, so to speak, 'inoculated' against them, through having been themselves initiated into the same state."[75] Turner elaborates more on this point:

> [T]he concept of pollution 'is a reaction to protect cherished principles and categories from contradictions'… in effect, what is unclear and contradictory (from the perspective of social definitions) tends to be regarded as (ritually) unclean. The unclear is the unclean: e.g., she examines the prohibitions on eating certain animals and crustaceans in Leviticus in the light of this hypothesis (these being creatures that cannot be unambiguously classified in terms of traditional criteria). From this standpoint, one would expect to find that transitional beings are particularly polluting, since they are neither here nor there; or may even be nowhere (in terms of any recognized cultural topography), and are at the very

least 'betwixt and between' all the recognized fixed points in space-time of structural classifications.[76]

To sum up, informing this study is Elias' established-outsider theory (and those who have drawn upon it), according to which the established, due to certain structural arrangements, command greater power advantage in monopolizing the means of prestige and survival. This power differential also enables the established do idealize themselves through in-group charisma whilst at the same time debasing the outsiders through out-group disgrace. From this point of view I argue that relations between the colonizers and the colonized, as described in Du Bois' and Fanon's works, also display similar dynamics. This point is crucial for an appreciation of relations between citizens, who until recently were subject to colonial inhumanities, and non-citizens. Drawing from Foucault, I also argue that the discursive devices of self-idealization (group charisma) and other-debasement (group disgrace) constitute technologies of self through which both the established and the outsiders produce themselves as culturally acceptable subjects. Finally, I introduced the idea of dyscivilization and liminality as developed by De Swaan and Turner respectively as analytical representations of non-citizens' spatio-emotional atmosphere. While dyscivilization depicts compartmentalization of human cruelty in non-citizens' life-worlds, liminality seeks to capture their structural ambiguity and invisibility that render such human cruelty socially excusable.

Before I proceed, however, I must make a few remarks about the appropriateness of Elias and his work in a study of an African subject matter. Shouldn't Elias' whiteness render him irrelevant for African studies? Why should he be privileged in this study over African theorists? At present we are socially located in an era of scholarship in which the "African"/"Western" or "Black"/"White" dichotomies not only lack the significance they enjoyed in the colonial days but also must be rethought. "African" and "Western" have become dulled categories and as such they must be denied the free pass they enjoyed in the past, at least in the marketplace of ideas. I find Elias to be sufficiently African to make him relevant to the subject matter under consideration in this study. His Western heritage is of little consequence to my African sensibilities. Scholars of various heritages have been borrowing and exchanging ideas for generations, at times acknowledging each other and at other times failing to do so. I am neither the first nor the last African to

44

borrow ideas from those who are not "of my kind". Hopefully this cross-fertilization continues and intensifies. To argue for African theory for African problems, to turn one's back on Western or Eastern scholarship because it is not African, encourages cultural self-insularity, scholarly narcissism, and reproduces old colonial divisions. In refusing to respect these old divisions, my work has a political edge.

Finally, it is also worth mentioning that Elias was a German-Jewish-British citizen, which is a testimony to his social location. As a Jew, he was an outsider in his own country Germany; his mother was gased in Auschwitz, a loss he was never able to emotionally overcome in his life. Elias fled to France where he lived as an outsider selling dolls for survival. When the Nazis invaded France, he fled to England where he, along with other Germans, was detained in the internment camp for Germans. After the war, he lived among the British as an outsider. Despite his brilliance and originality, he was not part of the British academic establishment. He remained in the shadows until his retirement. His outsider position throughout his life informed his writings. Much of *The Established and the Outsiders*, particularly the introductory chapter, reflects his social location and experience as a member of an oppressed group. As a Jew, Elias shares with Africans as well as with other colonized people a common history of dehumanization and genocide in the hands of Europeans.[77]

NOTES

[1] Http://www.norberteliasfoundation.nl/index_FS.htm.
[2] Ibid.
[3] N. Elias 2000, *The Civilizing Process*, p. 482.
[4] Ibid.
[5] S. Mennell and J. Goudsblom 1998, "Introduction" in N. Elias, *On Civilization, Power, and Knowledge*, p. 39.
[6] N. Elias 1978, *What Is Sociology*, p. 113.
[7] N. Elias 1998, *On Civilization, Power, and Knowledge,* p. 256-7.
[8] Ibid. p. 286.
[9] N. Elias 2000, *The Civilizing Process*, p. 481-2.
[10] The established-outsider relations theory has been applied to good effect in a variety of contexts. For example, see D. M. May 2004, "The Interplay of Three Established-Outsider Fifurations in a Deprived Inner-city Neighbourhood."

[11] N. Elias 1994, "Introduction: A Theoretical Essay on Established and Outsider Relations", in N. Elias and J. Scotson *The Established and the Outsiders*, p. xvii. Hereafter, "An Essay."

[12] D. M. May 2004, "The Interplay of Three Established-Outsider Figurations in a Deprived Inner-city Neighbourhood," p. 2161-1.

[13] F. Dalal 2002, *Race, Colour and the Processes of Racialization: New Perspectives from Group Analysis, Psychoanalysis and Sociology*, p. 190. Hereafter, *Race, Colour.*

[14] N. Elias 1994, "An Essay," p. xxvi.

[15] Ibid. p. xvi.

[16] Ibid. p. xxix.

[17] Ibid. p. xlvxx.

[18] Ibid. p. xxx.

[19] Ibid.

[20] Human Rights Watch (HRW); South African Human Rights Commission (SAHRC).

[21] N. Elias 1994, "An Essay", p. xxvi.

[22] Freud, S. 1949[1922] *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego*, London: The Hogarth Press, p. 54.

[23] Ibid. p. 55.

[24] A. Blok 1998, "Narcissism of Minor Differences", *European Journal of Theory* 1(1): 33-56.

[25] A. Blok 1998, "Narcissism of Minor Differences"; A. De Swaan 1997, "Widening Circles of Disidentification: On Psycho- and Sociogenesis of Hatred of Distant Strangers – Reflections on Rwanda", *Theory Culture and Society* 14(2): 105-122.

[26] H. Adam et al. 1998 *Comrades in Business: Post-Liberation Politics in South Africa*. Cape Town: Tafelberg Publishers Ltd, p. 47.

[27] F. Kupferberg 2003, "The Established and the New Comers: What Makes Immigrant and Women Entrepreneurs so Special", *International Review of Sociology* 13(1): 89-104.

[28] S. Ernst 2003, "From Blame Gossip to Praise Gossip? Gender, Leadership and Organizational Change", *The European Journal Of Women's Studies* 10(3): 277-99.

[29] D. May 2004, "The Interplay of Three Established-Outsider Figurations in a Deprived Inner-city Neighbourhood", *Urban Studies* 40(11): 2159-2179.

[30] P. Sutton and S. Vertigans 2002, "The Established and Challenging Outsiders: Resurgent Islam in Secular Turkey", *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions* 3(1): 58-78.

[31] Ibid. p. 67, 70.

[32] B. van Stolk and C. Wouters 1987, "Power Changes and Self-Respect: A Comparison of Two Cases of Established-Outsider Relations", *Theory, Culture and Society* 4: 477-88.

[33] C. Wouters 2004, *Sex and Manners: Female Emancipation in the West, 1890-2000.*

[34] E. Dunning and I. Waddington 2003, "Sport as a Drug and Drugs in Sport", *International Review of the Sociology of Sport* 8(3): 351-368.

[35] W. E. B. Du Bois 1990[1903], *Souls of Black Folk*; 1910, "Souls of White Folk".

[36] F. Fanon 1967, *Black Skins, White Masks.*

[37] N. Elias 1994, "An Essay," p. xxvi.

[38] F. Dalal 2002, *Race, Colour,* p. 193.

[39] As an internal process, the self does not need to be the opposite of external (or social) material conditions. In the approach taken here, the individual is not the opposite of collectivities; the internal is not the opposite of the external; nor is the self the opposite of society. (This issue is covered in the section on "methodological considerations" below). For analytical purposes we often abstract social processes. The binary oppositions "individual/social", "internal/external" are examples of this practice. Contrary to doing this, I work within the framework of figurational sociology in which these abstractions do not reflect the reality of life. In reality the individual and the collective, the internal and the external, the self and social, are aspects of the same life process. They do not exist independently in separate spheres. Changes in people's habits reflect the changing structures of the figurations they form with each other, and simultaneously make for changes in the psyche. Psychic structures always reflect social structures. Social structure and psychological structure remain interwoven.

[40] N. Elias 1994, "An Essay," p. xxvii.

[41] Ibid.

[42] F. Fanon 1967, *Black Skins, White Masks.*

[43] S. Bordo 1993, *Unbearable Weight: Feminism, Western Culture, and the Body.*

[44] Makwerekwere refers to an outsider, a person whose language is unintelligible – *kwere-kwere* is supposed to be the sound of unintelligible languages. But it also means that when the outsider speaks the language of the in-group the sound is still unintelligibly *kwere-kwere.* However, in the context of South African xenophobia the term *makwerekwere* has negative valences akin to those of *nigger* or *kaffir* during apartheid. The same goes with *magrigamba* and *mapoti.* This is important because many African immigrants who are thus categorized come from countries whose languages are the same as those that are spoken in South Africa, e.g. Tswana in Botswana, Tsonga in Mozambique, Ndebela in Zimbabwe, Sotho in Lesotho, and Swazi in Swaziland.

[45] M. Foucault 2003, "Technologies of Self".

[46] Ibid. p. 146.

[47] Ibid. P. 147.

[48] Ibid.

[49] N. Elias 2000, *The Civilizing Process,* p. 532.

[50] A. de Swaan 2001, "Dyscivilization, Mass Extermination and the State," p. 268. Hereafter, "Dyscivilization."

[51] Ibid.

[52] Ibid.

[53] SAHRC 2005, p. 25; emphasis added.

[54] A. de Swaan, "Dyscivilization", p. 268.

[55] Ibid. p. 268-9.

[56] Ibid. p. 269.

[57] Ibid.

[58] Ibid. p. 269. Compartmentalization is not necessarily harmful, as De Swaan himself points out: "The *modus operandi* of compartmentalization need not be so extreme, it may occur under comparatively innocuous conditions. Thus, in contemporary consumer societies, butchery is equally relegated to special compartments: not only abattoirs, but even pig and chicken farms are hidden from the public's view, and once out of sight they

47

are effectively out of mind. Somehow, when enjoying their meat, consumers manage to forget that they are actually eating an animal and to ignore the way it was raised and killed, even though they know these facts very well" (p. 270).

[59] A. de Swaan 2001, "Dyscivilization", p. 270.

[60] V. Turner 1987, "Betwixt and Between: The Liminal Period in the Rites of Passage." Hereafter, "Betwixt and Between."

[61] V. Turner 1987, "Betwixt and Between", p. 5.

[62] Ibid.

[63] L. Chavez 1991, "Outside the Imagined Community: Undocumented Settlers and Experiences of Incorporation." See also Leo Chavez 1992, *Shadowed Lives: Undocumented Immigrants in American Society*.

[64] L. Chavez 1991, "Outside the Imagined Community," p. 257.

[65] H. Donnan and T. M. Wilson 1999, *Borders: Frontiers of Identity, Nation and State,* p. 110.

[66] V. Turner 1987, "Betwixt and Between," p. 5.

[67] Ibid. p. 8.

[68] Ibid. p. 9.

[69] Ibid.

[70] Ibid. p. 6.

[71] Ibid. p. 7.

[72] Ibid.

[73] Ibid. p. 6.

[74] Ibid. p. 6-7.

[75] Ibid. p. 7.

[76] Ibid.

[77] Elias was the head of the department of sociology at the University of Ghana, Accra, in the 1960s where he discovered African works of art. Elias collected large quantities of West African artistic objects. Hence the Norbert Elias Foundation established the Norbert Elias Award for African Art. Few scholars, dead or alive, have made achievements of this magnitude. Elias was more aware of African cultures and histories than one might realize at first glance.

III. METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The methodological procedure in this study weaves together three complementary philosophical sets of views about the nature of the social world. They are the ontological points of departure that have informed the study from its conception to design to research and writing. They include social construction, historical materialism and figurational social thought. The first holds that human beings construct the social world in which they live. The second maintains that human beings construct their social world not within the circumstances of their choosing but within specific constraining and enabling material conditions. The third posits that human beings always live in groups, only in pluralities, some of which are larger and others smaller. These human pluralities are known through various designations such as societies, communities, nations, families, organizations, etc. The three are woven together in *the extended case method.*

ONTOLOGICAL AND EPISTEMOLOGICAL ISSUES

Research is always conducted and accomplished from specific explicit or implicit philosophical perspectives. Philosophical beliefs and assumptions about the nature of human beings, the nature of the social world (ontology) which human beings construct for themselves, and what constitutes valid knowledge of that world (epistemology), including the relationship between the knower and the known, are crucial to the outcome of research. It is therefore worth discussing them at this point.

Traditionally the work of sociologists has been driven by the ontological assumption that the social world, whether absolutely or probabilistically apprehendable, exists in its own right, that is, independent of human experience. Whether in its "naïve realism" or "critical realism"[1] version, this assumption underlies the hegemonic positivistic paradigm within which the discipline of sociology developed. This ontology exists hand in glove with the dualist/objectivist epistemological stance governing both natural and social sciences. As Crotty explains, this epistemology holds that

things exist as *meaningful* entities independently of consciousness and experience, that they have the truth and meaning residing in them as objects ('objective' truth and meaning, therefore), and that careful (scientific?) research can attain that objective truth and meaning.[2]

Researchers working within this epistemological framework assume they can collect preexisting data from respondents. In cases where interview research is involved the researcher is active only in so far as he/she plucks data from research subjects by means of questions. Beyond this, the researcher remains passive and detached in order to eliminate confounding factors, which in turn may have undesirable effects on the findings. Detachment is necessary to preempt spurious results. Data and texts produced by the researcher are presumed to speak for themselves while the researcher herself/himself remains silent and invisible.[3]

The study described here does not follow the postulates of this epistemological stance. Rather, the epistemological stance I take threads figurational sociology and social constructionism, rejects claims to objective truth existing in its own right and holds that socially located people construct their everyday lives and make their own meanings. As Crotty rightly argues:

> There is no objective truth waiting for us to discover it. Truth, or meaning, comes into existence in and out of our engagement with the realities of our world. There is no meaning without mind. Meaning is not discovered, but constructed… different people may construct meaning in different ways, even in relation to the same phenomenon.[4]

In undertaking this study I took the approach that "the key to the [research] process lies in sensitively representing in written texts what the local people consider meaningful and then in making their concerns accessible to readers who are unfamiliar with their social world."[5] Moreover, in this epistemological framework the relationship between the researcher and the respondents is subjectivist; that is, both the researcher and the respondent are self-conscious and conscious of each other's presence in the research encounter. As Reinharz observes, as researchers not only do we "*bring* the self… [but we also] *create* the self in the field."[6] I am aware therefore that I brought and created myself in the interview sites. For example, in order to obtain cooperation from the respondents I presented myself as *makwerekwere* sojourning South Africa. I also presented myself as a

Mozambican who was sympathetic to *makwerekwere* concerns. According to this perspective I co-generated the data with my respondents.[7] We all participated actively in producing the interviews.

Another epistemological stance informing this research is that of critical theory which understands reality to be historically shaped by "social, political, cultural, economic, ethnic, and gender values crystallized over time."[8] The context in which such values are embedded includes the historical processes of apartheid and its legacy; the dehumanizing demarcation and policing of social spaces; the decolonization of South Africa and the accompanying shifting of asymmetric power balances between social groups; the increasing representation of the formerly outsider groups in positions of power and prestige; the postcolonial problem of poverty, unemployment and violence along with the popular dissatisfaction with, and disapproval of, the government's performance. This epistemological stance resonates with the theoretical framework underpinning this study, which holds that human beings construct and negotiate their everyday world not under the circumstances of their choosing but under constraining and enabling conditions of possibility, the historical material conditions of their social environment.

THE EXTENDED CASE METHOD

Because it resonates with the philosophical assumptions that underpin the study, I use Burawoy's *extended case method* as my methodological procedure.[9] According to Burawoy, local life processes are connected to global, extra-local, forces in a variety of ways. The global shapes the local. But the local, in turn, also shapes the global. The global is constituted in the local. But the local is also constituted in the global. Both are mutually constituted and constituting. The extended case method begins with the study of local social processes, followed by the exploration of possible connections between local social processes and extra-local social forces of economic or political orders. Extended case method researchers are not interested in studying local communities as self-contained enclosures – not as "windowless monads" as Elias puts it – but as social spaces open to the outside world, as constellations of human relations in which the local and the global interweave.

51

Central to extended case method is the *extension* process, which involves four dimensions. First, the researcher extends himself/herself to the research site, in the centre of local social processes of everyday life. "Rather than bringing the 'subject' into the laboratory or into the world of the interviewer, the observer leaves the security of the university for the uncertain life of the participant."[10] Second, the researcher extends his/her "*observations over time and space.*"[11] The observers "spend extended periods of time following their subjects around, living their lives, learning their ways and wants. Believing that situations are important in determining both actions and beliefs, the ethnographer's problem becomes one of understanding the succession of situations as social processes."[12] Third, the researcher extends his/her visual range from micro processes to macro forces, "from the space-time rhythms of the site to the geographical and the geographical context of the field."[13] This dimension of extension is therefore concerned with the exploration of possible micro-macro connections. These connections are conceptualized differently:

> [T]he micro [is] an expression of the macro, discovering reification [for example] within the factory, commodification within the family, bureaucratization within the family. Some putative principle that governs society is found in its every part. [But] For us the micro-macro link refers not to such an "expressive" totality, but to a "structural" one in which the part is shaped by its relation to the whole, the whole being represented by "external forces.[14]

The final dimension is "an essential moment of the extended case method" and it pertains to theoretical extension, since extended case method is not based on attitudes, assumptions and principles of grounded theory. In extended case method, the researcher does not embark on observation without theory, hoping to develop theory from observations. Rather, he/she begins and ends with theory, confirmed, modified or rejected. As Burawoy points out, "[w]e cannot see the field… without a lens, and we can only improve the lens by experimenting with it in the world."[15] The discovery of extralocal determinations "is impossible… without prior theory that would identify those external factors likely to be important."[16] Theory enables the observer to see, though it does so at the cost of precluding the seeing of life processes outside the range of the theoretical lenses. Seeing and not seeing befall all researchers, including grounded theorists who claim not to have theory prior to observation.

This dimension of extension is central to this project, because it deals with the extent to which the established-outsider theory as described by Elias is extendable to relations between citizens and non-citizens in South Africa, where it remains to be seen whether the theory is confirmed or challenged or both. After all, the theory arises out of a divided British working class community of the 1950s. But it will be put to work in a twenty-first century divided African community, whose members live in the shadow of their colonial history. But Burawoy also rightly warns against the dangers of this dimension of extension:

> We are in danger of straitjacketing the world we study, disciplining it so that it conforms to the framework through which we observe it. We must expose our theories to continual critique from those they presume to understand, we must search for anomalies that challenge our theories, if we are to avoid the sorts of power effects that Edward Said, for example, discerns in "Orientalism."[17]

CRITIQUE OF THE EXTENDED CASE METHOD

The predominance of binary oppositions in the extended case method as described by Burawoy is dissatisfying. The *social process/social forces* and *local/extralocal* dualities are offshoots of the master binary opposition *individual/society* that has largely functioned as the basic principle of western habits of thought with which social scientists do their work. This faith in the existence of individual and society as separate and opposed entities leads Burawoy to distil from it the *local/global* binary opposition. This is a theoretical limitation of extended case method. Indeed, Burawoy himself acknowledges that the limitation of a theory is its critique. But instead of throwing the baby with the bath water, I will turn to figurational sociology not only to critique but also to enrich extended case method.

Burawoy's methodological conceptualization of social research resonates with Elias' idea of human figurations or human interdependences – but not quite. For the sake of comparison, I refer to Burawoy's conceptualization of micro-macro connections once again. He writes:

> One way to think of the micro-macro, but not the way we think of it, is to view the micro as an expression of the macro, discovering reification [for example] within the factory, commodification within the family, bureaucratization within

the family. Some putative principle that governs society is found in its every part. For us the micro-macro link refers not to such an "expressive" totality, but to a "structural" one in which the part is shaped by its relation to the whole, the whole being represented by "external forces."[18]

While it contains virtues and merits, the extended case method represents what Elias called "process reduction". This is evident in Burawoy's language. However, Burawoy himself is not to blame for this, because the language of the scientific community of which he is part is itself process-reductive. It would be unfair to cast all the sins of his community solely on him. In any case, according to Elias, the reduction of processes, fluxes, motions, flows and dynamics into states of rest endemic within the academia precludes the development of social sciences. Burawoy remains locked in process reduction. By using terms such as "forces," he runs onto the very same problem of mystification and objectification that he wishes to avoid:

> [C]onstituting the extralocal as forces gives them a false sense of durability. After all, forces are only the historically contingent outcome of processes that are hidden from the ethnographer. Objectification can be a powerful source of mystification, since we often believe we are in the grip of forces beyond our control which turn out to be quite fluid and susceptible to influence.[19]

He is aware he is mystifying and objectifying life processes. Yet he cannot conceptualize life process without doing so. In his essay, "The Extended Case Method", he explains the analytical strategy of the extended case in the same process-reductive ways. One starts with the "situational knowledge" and then aggregates "situation knowledge into social process" and finally,

> [One looks] upon the external field as the conditions of existence of the locale within which research occurs… [one] therefore move[s] beyond *social processes to delineate the social forces* that impress themselves on the ethnographic scale. These social forces are the effects of other social processes that for the most part lie outside the realm of investigation… the everyday world… [is] simultaneously shaped by and [shapes] an external field of forces.[20]

IS THERE FIGURATIONAL METHODOLOGY?

In addition to displaying a theoretical framework, figurational studies also exude an attitude and procedure to sociological research, to data generation and exegesis, to

acquisition, construction and validation of knowledge. This is exemplified in the works of Elias. His writings suggest that figurational sociology is both theory and method at once. The two are organically integrated so that one is inherently part of the other. The binary opposition between the two dissolves. The segregation between disciplines is not respected and ought not to be. Instead, interdisciplinary/multidisciplinary cross-fertilization is embraced and celebrated, because figurational researchers believe that no single discipline can capture all aspects of human life. Each discipline is a one-sided, fragmented, representation of humanity. Hence the disciplines are complementary, not opposites. Figurational studies are diachronic, taking a long-range (or developmental) view to various aspects of humanity. As Elias writes: "One cannot ignore the fact that every present society has grown out of earlier societies and points beyond itself to a diversity of possible futures."[21] Within this framework, human figurations and/or individuals who form them are cumulative processes of successive historical events. Some of these events are concurrent while others are not, but they all interrelate and interweave in complex figurational flows.

Elias' rejection of the view of societies as forces external to human beings, of the binary opposition between "society" and "individual", opens up different theoretical and methodological imaginations. His conceptualization of life processes provides for a rethinking of social groups and individuals, charting methodological procedures that resist reification of human action and social life. Methodology has to come to terms with the fact that, large or small, societies are ways of living together, that human beings are processes bound together in longer or shorter, denser or thinner, wider or narrower, webs of interdependences; the ties that bind people into networks/webs called figurations. This is even more so as "more and more people have tended to become more and more interdependent with each other in longer chains and denser webs" to the point of "outstripping people's understanding of it."[22] As Elias writes:

> The network of human activities tends to become increasingly complex, far-flung and closely knit. More and more groups, and with them more and more individuals, tend to become dependent on each other for their security and the satisfaction of their needs in ways which, for the greater part, surpass the comprehension of those involved. It is as if first thousands, the millions, then more and more millions walked through this world with their hands and feet

chained together by invisible ties. No-one is in charge. No-one stands outside. Some want to go this way, others that way. They fall upon each other and, vanquishing or defeated, still remain chained to each other. No-one can regulate the movements of the whole unless a great part of them are able to understand, to see as it were from outside, the whole patterns they form together.[23]

From this perspective, one can begin to understand why, in the extended case method, Burawoy speaks of forces exerting pressure on processes, of the extralocal (global) shaping or forcing the local, in other words, of society coercing individuals as if individuals were not processes of society.

OBSERVATION AND INTERVIEWS

The influence of Chicago School on qualitative social research in North America contributed for the genesis in the sociological imagination of the binary opposition and hierarchy of participant observation research vis-à-vis interview research wherein the former was/is perceived as superior to the latter seeing that it gives the researcher the necessary direct access to the events of the social world as they occur. The researcher witnesses the social world first hand as it unfolds and he/she captures it. Interview research, on the other hand, is not only staged but the researcher relies on the respondents' recollection of the events after the fact. This reliance on memory is problematic, since memory is fallible and cannot recollect or reconstruct the past with absolute fidelity.

As Anderson and Coffey propose, however, "[m]emory *and* personal experience are narrated" and so can be used differently. "Narrative is a collective, shared cultural resource… even the most intimate and personal of experiences are constructed through shared narrative formats. The 'private' does not escape the 'public' categories of narrativity." Drawing from C. Wright Mills, they add:

> [M]otive should be seen as a cultural and linguistic in character, and not a feature of internal mental states or predispositions, we must recognize that memories and experiences are constructed through the resources of narrative and discourse. Narratives and the resources of physical traces, places, and things – these are the constituents of biography, memory, and experience.[24]

Anderson and Coffey also demonstrate that the categorization of action/event (in participant observation) and accounts/talk (in interview research) is inappropriate. They

argue that accounts and narratives produced through interview research are "forms of social action in their own right". Events and accounts may be different kinds of enactments and performativities. However, "the specific dualism that implicitly asserts the authenticity for what people (observable) do and the fallibility of accounts of action is both unhelpful and 'untrue'". The realization that "memories, experiences, motives… are themselves forms of action… [and that] mundane routine activities are enacted" leads to an understanding of research methods in a symmetrical and nonreductionist ways wherein one form of action does not enjoy undue primacy over another form of action.[25]

I have used focus group interviews to produce supplementary data to what was already available in other sources on the subject. However, the history of focus group interview research saddles this method with a set of problems, most of which are due to social scientists' prejudice against the origins of focus groups. Therefore it is of utmost importance to make a few remarks on the matter.

Morgan provides an excellent exposition of the history of adoption of focus group research in social sciences.[26] The heritage of focus groups is marketing research wherein marketers used the method to understand consumption habits and tastes of populations with the aim to market and sell products. This "low-status origin may help to explain why few of the early social science articles on focus groups made more than passing mention of their debt to marketing."[27] Focus groups made their way into the social scientific establishments carrying the disgrace and stigma of marketing companies and corporations. The focus groups were the untamed and untouchable method, wanting in rigour and vigour of disciplined research. Serious scholars were above such mean occupation as focus groups. Those who used focus groups did so in a colonizing way, always relegating them to a secondary or supplementary status: e.g. preparatory method for more rigorous and serious methods such as surveys and individualized in-depth interviewing.

As Morgan points out, in addition to the low-status often assigned to interview research, as a method focus group research still endures low status in some positivist quarters of social sciences. If, in the conventional wisdom, interview research is regarded as an inferior method, say, to direct observation, focus groups are regarded even more so.

They are classified beneath observation and individualized interviewing as more staged and therefore less genuine, less natural, and less valid. A pioneer of focus groups within social sciences, Morgan had numerous encounters with this strain of naïve realism. His account of encounters with objections to focus groups is instructive and hence worth citing at length:

> I had a particularly memorable encounter with the idea that focus groups are less natural than individual interviews when I taught a workshop for several professors from the former Soviet Union, to help them study the transition to democracy in their home countries. My week of teaching about focus groups was preceded by a similar unit on autobiographical interviews taught by an anthropologist. I was confronted with the opinion that focus groups are a contrived way of taking to people, at least in comparison to the techniques that been presented a week before. In response, I asked the students how "natural" it is to have a complete stranger spend several hours talking about just the portions of his or her life that involved politics. In contrast, I asked whether it would be possible to bring together a group of neighbours to discuss how the politics in their country had changed since independence. They responded enthusiastically with remarks like, "You'd never be able to get them to go home!"[28]

According to Morgan, the charges that focus groups are less authentic than individualized interviews emanate from three factors. The first is the obvious preparatory labour the researcher expends in organizing and accomplishing the interview – e.g. organizing the venue, recruiting participants and bringing them together. This is staging, so goes the conventional wisdom. This (dis)regard to focus groups is accomplished through wilful oblivion to the fact that in individualized interviews the researcher is just as involved in the preparatory labour and organization. The second factor pertains to the equally obvious facilitation role of the researcher. In the conventional wisdom this is manipulation, which requires a denial of the fact that, even if less obvious, in individualized interviews the researcher also dictates the terms – the topics, the questions, and often the setting. The third factor pertains to the seniority of focus groups vis-à-vis other research methods. Focus groups are newcomers in the social science fold. Like immigrants in many human societies, focus groups are newcomers in social science fold – they remain in the margins of "serious" research communities – denigrated, disgraced and denied the rights and privileges of full membership enjoyed by other methods.

The privileging of individualized interviews over focus groups, of participant observation over individualized interviews and focus groups, goes hand in glove with the reluctance to recognize informal settings as authentic sites of knowledge production. Are informal human interactions – e.g. conversations in buses, taxis, trains, in public or private toilets, bedrooms, living rooms, locker rooms, in markets, on streets or sidewalks, etc. – legitimate ways of knowledge production? Are informal human interactions in less controlled settings inferior or superior or equal to formal human interactions in more controlled spaces such as offices, classrooms, churches, jails, hospitals and so on? Are informal interactions worth serious sociological attention? Can sociologists learn anything useful from them?

Figurationally, the privileging of the formal over the informal, the official over the unofficial production of knowledge, signals a sociological mistake, not least because it dovetails well with the Eurocentric and phalocentric validation of knowledge in western and westernized academic establishments. Within the figurational analytical framework animating this study, the formal, written and official lack, and deserve no precedence over the informal, unwritten and unofficial. Figurational sociology does not recognize the formal and the informal as mutually exclusive and exhaustive categories. Figurationally, mundane subjectification is no less consequential than formal subjectification. Figurational studies explore social processes wherever and however they occur. Society becomes actual in a variety of settings, incarnate both in the formal and informal life. History is made in the banalities of everyday life.

FIELDWORK AND ITS METHODS

The site of fieldwork was the inner city of Johannesburg, particularly the neighbourhoods of Hillbrow and Yeoville. Johannesburg is an ideal location for a project of this kind for several reasons. First, its mining industry has for generations attracted large numbers of migrant workers from neighbouring countries, particularly Mozambique, Malawi and Lesotho. On the one hand, these migrants crystallized in different national grouping forming a specific power figuration with each other. On the other hand, these various groupings are interlocked in an established-outsider figuration with the citizenry. Second, virtually all members of the established and outsider groups had no visible skin colour or

socioeconomic status differences. In many cases, they spoke exactly the same languages and shared ancestries. This meant that members of one group, notably members of the establishment of the citizenry, engaged in the narcissism of minor differences to blame and stigmatize members of other groups, particularly members of the weaker groups. Third, since the early 1990s Johannesburg has seen explosions of aggression and violence by members of the citizenry against members of the outsider groups. The latest incidents of violence occurred in May 2008 as I finished writing up this study, killing over 60 (reported) foreign nationals, injuring over 600 and displacing over 30,000.[29] It is noteworthy that although this latest spurt of violence was nationwide, Johannesburg was the centre-stage. As the media reported, it began from Johannesburg and spread like wild fire across the country.[30] Again, in this case elements of the narcissism of minor differences animated the violence.

Lasting for nine months, from November 2006 to July 2007, the fieldwork involved the following methods of research: participant observation; focus group interviews; individualized interviews; informal conversations; and other data sources (see below).

Participant observation

My outsider position in South Africa meant that I was a participating observer involved in the social processes I had set out to study. In the course of my fieldwork I had uninvited encounters with the South African police, which provided me with opportunities to observe the unfolding drama of politics of autochthony when the police and alleged foreigners cross paths. Furthermore, my fieldwork was an accretion to a personal foretaste of South African politics of autochthony. From 1994 to 2000, I lived in South Africa as a Mozambican foreign national. Stimulated by my allochthon positioning, and the experience that goes along with it, my interest in South African nativist discourse began back then. In the 1990s I had numerous encounters with the South African police in which my dignity was violated with crude and rude strip-searches; I was asked for cool drink payments when I needed to renew my study permit at the department of home affairs, or when I needed authentication of documents at the police station. During my fieldwork in 2007 I was stopped three times, spread-eagled,

strip-searched and questioned. In all cases the police did not express appreciation for my cooperation or apologies for the inconvenience and humiliation. My outsider position experience was both an analytical resource and a narrative amenable to analysis.

Participant observation entailed personal navigation of South African social spaces, interacting with citizens and non-citizens, and being engaged as an outsider by police agents. This provided me with an entry into South Africa's methods of reasoning in policing and controlling national social spaces against suspected strangers. It provided me with an understanding of the ways in which African foreign nationals within the community react to the physical, social and psychological controls to which they are subject. The questions that occupied my participant observation were, how do South Africans construct and deploy common sense ideology to keep perceived outsiders at bay – the categorization of the outsiders' bodies and moral character – to protect their social spaces? What might be the mundane methods of reasoning with which the citizenry closes its ranks against foreign nationals? How do they identify/know "the foreigner"?

Focus group and individualized interviews

In this study I used focus groups not to construct photographic representations of individual members of the immigrant community, but to produce narratives of generic trends, patterns, characteristics features of relations between the immigrant and the host groups broadly defined. While the groups are not monolithic, one defines itself positively by what the other allegedly is not. Thus, as Landau writes, in South Africa, when citizens and non-citizens converge in the formerly forbidden sites the two groups construct their collective identities through antagonistic discourses. The citizens deploy "the nativist discourse… and various extraordinary (and often extralegal) efforts, which are legitimized by such discourse, to 'uproot' aliens."[31] This autochthony discourse downplays ethnic cleavages and degrees of autochthony within the citizenry thus setting the citizenry apart from perceived allochthones. Meanwhile the allochthones are not ashamed of their allochthonous status. Indeed,

> while rarely identifying themselves as a unified population, [they] have devised a counteridiom of superior transience in which they draw on a shared discourse of self-alienation and permanent mobility. In so doing, they create distance between

61

themselves and the nationalist project, the national territory they inhibit, and South Africa's autochthons.[32]

I conducted six focus group interviews, three of which had 10 participants each, while each of the rest had 11 participants. In total there were 63 participants, of whom 15 were women. Of the 63 participants, two were Burundians, two Zambians and three Zimbabweans. The rest of the interviewees were Congolese nationals from the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC). Among them were asylum seekers, refugees, permanent residents and students. All of them lived in Johannesburg, particularly Hillbrow and Yeoville. A vast majority of them spoke in French. An interpreter-informant located participants and interpreted the exchanges in the sessions. Given the atmosphere of fear, distrust and suspicion within which the participants lived, the use of an informant was indispensable to secure trust and sense of safety. The interviews were conducted in Yeoville in a shelter of the Catholic Church that housed some of the participants.

Of the 63 participants, 12 offered individual in-depth interviews in which I invited them to offer their personal life stories, relating their experiences of the journey to, and life in, South Africa. Of these 12 individualized interview participants, four were women and the rest were men.

In addition to the six focus group interviews, I also secured one focus group interview with seven police officers whose primary task on their beat was to "crack down on illegals." A South African student arranged the session and conducted the interview. I instructed him to invite the officers to discuss the ways in which they did their work, namely how they identified suspect "illegals." All the participants, including the police officers, were informed that their identities were not prerequisites for participating in the study. They were assured that their identities would be kept confidential and that the interviews would be discarded at the end of the study.

The interviews were intended to elicit from African foreign nationals narratives about their reactions to the stigma and the blame-gossip with which they were constructed. Did they resist or conform to the stigma and the blame imputed onto them? Therefore I invited them to reflect on their lives as African foreign nationals and their everyday interactions with the citizens. I also intended to unearth the processes through

which the outsiders constructed retaliatory counter-stigma and counter-blame gossip against the citizenry. According to Alan Morris, Congolese and Nigerian immigrants were able to transmit news, stereotyping of South Africans, and other gossip items through their networks.[33] But whether these were effective means of resistance, Morris does not tell us. In this project I intended to explore their nature as well as their effectiveness.

I recorded and transcribed both the focus group interviews and individualized interviews. The focus group interview with the police officers was recorded as well. My analytical procedure consisted of listening and taking notes during the sessions. At the end of each focus group interview session I recorded my impressions of what had taken place.

Other sources

In order check the validity of my participants' intimations, I turned to other sources looking for representations of African immigrants. South Africa is literally littered with literature on attitudes to foreign nationals in the country. I used five sources: (1) Reports on human rights of foreign nationals produced by the Human Rights Watch (HRW) and the South African Human Rights Commission (SAHRC); (2) official statements by politicians; (3) surveys on attitudes to immigrants and immigration conducted under Southern African Migration Project (SAMP) auspices; (4) the electronic media and press articles; (5) and dissertations and other academic writings.

All these sources were agreed on both the existence of xenophobia and its nature. The stories told in all these sources revealed the same patterns of citizens closing ranks against African foreign nationals, namely the denial of services in both state and private institutions, notably hospitals, home affairs, police stations, banks and employers; police abuses in collusion with criminals; public slurs, insults and humiliation by civil servants and the public at large; arrests, detentions and deportations based on language, accents and shades of skin colour; aggression and violence both by state agents, notably the police and home affairs officials, and the public; denial of banking services; denial of school registration for children and youth; denial of employment opportunities; negative

representations of nationals in the medias and so on. These and similar complaints make up the stories told repeatedly by African foreign nationals in all these sources.

The aim of the literature on South African xenophobia has been to prove the existence of anti-immigrant bigotry. It has focused on documenting immigrants' experiences of xenophobia. This the authors have done to great effect and their evidence is compelling. In subsequent reports or studies the new stories do not supersede but reinforce the old ones. In other words, the point of diminishing returns has been reached as far as the nature and patterns of exclusion are concerned. The interviews that I conducted during my fieldwork were no exception, for they simply confirmed what these sources provided. First, from the outset it became clear that the problem was shifting from production of data to the enframing of data. If the point of this study had been to produce new stories with new content, then it would have been a dismal failure since the interviews that I conducted added practically nothing to the existing information. Second, the point is not to prove the existence of anti-immigrant attitudes again and again but to look beneath and beyond the stories of exclusion, to look into the structure of the ruins of the history on which these stories are produced. The contribution of this study is the figurational intervention on what these attitudes, habits and practices of exclusion constitute in the production of South African nationhood, citizenship and subjectivity. In other words, this study grapples with the question of what revulsion toward outsiders, wishes for their destruction, including aggression against them, represent in South African society. As I will demonstrate in this study, contrary to what has been argued so far, the anti-immigrant bigotry among South Africans is not the result of their patriotism. Rather, it forms a substantive part of their patriotism. It is exactly that which through which their patriotic self-images are produced. In the end, aversion, blaming, and stigmatizing of African foreign nationals – the expenditure of emotional and cognitive energies that all this requires – operate as technologies of self through which South Africans transform themselves into what they are without realizing it.

Sampling procedure

The traditional sampling procedure in sociology is representative sampling, whose goal is to obtain a sample with social characteristics that are congruent with those of the

population from which it is drawn. Data generated from the sample are generally regarded as data generated from the population itself and the interpretations derived from such data are extrapolated back to the population. This sampling strategy is inconsistent with the philosophical assumptions and the theoretical framework that have guided this study. Therefore I did not use representative sampling. Instead, I used what could be described as theoretically informed sampling.

I instructed my informant to recruit participants who, by the time of the interview, had been residing in South Africa for at least a year. I also instructed him to recruit as many women as possible. However, this proved challenging due to the fact that there were more men available than women in the immigrant community. Due to reasons that remain unclear – perhaps fear of violence – Congolese immigrant women are less visible than their male counterparts.[34] The literature indicates that, due to the belief among immigrants about South Africa as an immoral and violent society, immigrant men often felt it inappropriate to bring their wives (or female family members) and children to South Africa.[35]

My decision to focus more on the Congolese was motivated by the fact that, to my knowledge, although a significant amount of research had been done on xenophobia in South Africa, so little of it has investigated the relations between the host community and the Congolese community.

POLITICS OF LOCATION

As a researcher I am socially located in relation to my respondents. Like them, I was an African foreign national sojourner in South Africa. I had lived in South Africa as a Mozambican foreign national for six years in the 1990s. However, I was also aware of my privileged outsider position: I am Mozambican but by naturalization I am also Canadian. I came from the centre of prestige and privilege, from an academic institution located in Alberta, one of the richest provinces of Canada. I had to reckon with the fact that I was far more privileged than they were, not because I was more deserving than they were but by chance. To be candid, my personal academic ambitions also played a role in this undertaking.

65

I hired a Congolese informant from the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) who was familiar with the Congolese immigrant community in Johannesburg. He had come to Johannesburg as a refugee. When I recruited him he was an undergraduate sociology student at the University of Johannesburg. However he was dropping out because he lacked funds to pay for his fees. He had a bachelor's degree of French literature from Congo and was unemployed. He was married, but by the time I met him he had been living in Johannesburg for eight years without his wife. He lived with twelve other Congolese refugees, the majority of whom were men, in a Catholic refugee shelter where he coordinated education programs for Francophone immigrants. For eight years he had been trying unsuccessfully to bring his wife to South Africa. Six months before we met he was granted official refugee status after bribing concerned officials in the department of home affairs. This means that for seven years he was an asylum-seeker having to renew his asylum-seeker permit every three months. He introduced me to the social spaces of his community, including refugee living quarters, churches, restaurants and bars. Like me, he was socially located and interested. Our social locations differed, but they also overlapped, which to a greater or lesser extent facilitated rapport and trust. He was more emotionally involved with, than he was detached from, the immigrant community, most notably the Congolese. He wanted to make known to the world the plight of immigrants in South Africa, particularly refugees. His opinions on the subject were understandably visibly passionate.

Although the interviews involved co-participation between my respondents and me this co-participation was not on equal terms. Without consulting them, I, the researcher, designed the study and set the agenda of our encounter. And this is a thorn in the flesh of all researchers who do interview research, no matter how uncolonial they try to be:

> [T]he interviewer defines what the parties are going to talk about and what will count as relevant... This is true even of so-called unstructured interviews. The sequence may be flexible; the question wording may be flexible; it may be dressed up like a conversation between friends. But an interview is not a conversation. It is a deliberately created opportunity to talk about something that the interviewer is interested in and may or may not be of interest to the respondent. If the interviewer refuses to propose topics, the respondent is obliged to guess what might be relevant until the interviewer gives some indication that he or she is happy with the line being taken.[36]

I am also aware of my power over my respondents in that I have taken what they said and reassembled it "to appear in quite a different setting in a different language and with interests and purposes that are not theirs."[37] Similarly, Stacey points out: "In the last instance an ethnography is a written document structured primarily by the researcher's purposes, offering a researcher's interpretations, registered in a researcher's voice."[38]

ANALYLICAL PROCEDURE

Out of this exercise arise conventional analysis questions common to all research. With the assistance of my informant, the interviews were translated and transcribed. I read the transcripts, taking note of emerging themes and patterns in the narratives. I compared my fieldwork notes with notes taken as I read the transcripts.

Second, I explored the links between my respondents' stories and the particular engendering life conditions in which they were produced and located. In so doing I aimed to weave biographies with history and keep agency in the foreground of analysis. I identified the specific ways members of the immigrant community reacted to structural pressures to which they were subject. This way their human actions became meaningful. This analytical procedure is consistent with figurational sociology in which personal life processes are regarded as dynamic nodal points in the network of social relations that interweave with ongoing societal changes.

In the language of the extended case method, I explored the ways in which the local setting – the social spaces in which immigrant life-worlds are constructed and negotiated – was connected to the extra-local social conditions of possibility. As Burawoy explains, in this analytical strategy one starts with the "situational knowledge"[39] and then aggregates "situation knowledge into social process"[40] and finally,

> [One looks] upon the external field as the conditions of existence of the locale within which research occurs… [one] therefore move[s] beyond *social processes to delineate the social forces* that impress themselves on the ethnographic scale. These social forces are the effects of other social processes that for the most part lie outside the realm of investigation… the everyday world… [is] simultaneously shaped by and [shapes] an external field of forces.[41]

Drawing from Burawoy's extended case method, I used horizontal comparison to compare foreign nationals' self-understanding vis-à-vis their host community emerging from their life stories. I also compared patterns of my respondents' reported practices with those of respondents' in other studies on the subject. Meanwhile I paid attention to the shifting asymmetric power balances between different groups of the citizenry, to the structural power asymmetry between members of the citizenry and members of the immigrant community. Both these constrained and enabled the lifestyles that shaped self-images of both sides of the divide. This method helps to correct the snapshot approach endemic to cross-sectional research, which reduces processes, or human figurations for that matter, into states of rest.

So far my discussion has focused on the methodology I used to generate, analyze and interpret data. Now I move on to discuss the criteria used to assess and enhance the quality of sociological research generally, and the approach to quality used in this thesis.

QUALITY OF RESEARCH

In sociology the quality of research has traditionally been judged by positivistic criteria of validity and reliability, with the former measuring the extent to which the researcher has indeed measured/studied what he/she set out to measure/study, while the latter measuring the extent to which the same results are obtained whenever, wherever and by whomever the study is replicated. At times, triangulation or the mixed method approach is used in order to pre-empt biases and enhance the validity of the study.[42]

In the case of interview research, elaborate care is taken to ensure that confounding factors – inadequate wording, poorly defined terms, double-barrelled questions, leading questions, loaded questions, and so on – are eliminated from the interview.[43] All possible sources of bias – social desirability, acquiescence, yea- and nay-saying, prestige, threat, and so on – must be dismantled to elicit valid responses.[44] Neutrality, detachment and disinterestedness are sacrosanct virtues taken to the interview site to avoid biasing the respondent's responses. Holstein and Gubrium have labelled it the "vessel-of-answers" approach, which makes particular assumptions about subjects:

> They are repositories of facts and the related details of experience. The vessel-of-answers view cautions interviewers to be careful about how they ask questions,

68

lest their manner of inquiry bias what lies within the subject… it is assumed that the interviewer who poses questions that acknowledge alternative sides of an issue is being more "neutral" than the interviewer who does not. The successful implementation of neutral practices elicits truths held in the vessel of answers behind the respondent. Validity results from the successful application of the procedures.[45]

The naïve realism of positivism as described by Denzin and Lincoln has often raised the questions about how the researcher could possibly know whether the respondents are telling the truth about themselves.[46] How do we know respondents are not lying? As Anderson and Coffey point out, the comparison between participant observation and interviewing is based on this "hoary question" of "the ironic contrast between what people do and what people say (they do)."[47]

The problem with this approach is not only the cynicism it represents but also the paralysis and nihilism it leads to. That is, all research, not just interview research, is not helpful. For if it is appropriate to assume that respondents could be untruthful, if not indeed, why limit the assumption to respondents? Would it not be appropriate, in fact fair, to extend the assumption to researchers? In fact, of course, as the history of research teaches us, researchers have not only used deception to obtain information from respondents but also used research for exploitative and genocidal purposes.[48] That is the modern/colonial experience. From this nihilistic perspective, all accounts – people' tales, official documents, research monographs, etc. – are discursive stories subject to suspicion of deception. The researchers' ironic self-arrogation of authority to authenticate what counts as truthful accounts of people's everyday worlds appears to be sediment of colonial arrogance and hypocrisy. Dorothy Smith's observations constitute an apt attitude to respondents in interview research, namely that people "are indeed the expert practitioners of their everyday worlds" and, as such, researchers stand to learn a great deal from them.[49] Contrary to academic establishment beliefs, research is animated by faith, and accomplished through faith.

However, these positivist criteria are increasingly recognized as inappropriate when applied to research informed by other paradigms. Traditional validation methodologies are being rejected and new ones are being suggested.[50] Even triangulation,

which has traditionally been used to enhance understanding of the phenomenon in question, is now taking a new meaning:

> Triangulation is not a tool or strategy of validation, but an alternative to validation… The combination of multiple methodological practices, empirical materials, perspectives, and observers in a single study is best understood, then, as a strategy that adds rigor, breath, complexity, richness, and depth to any inquiry.[51]

In fact, the critique of traditional social sciences research is coming from almost all directions – feminist and standpoint theories, critical race theory, post-colonial theory, cultural studies, action research, social constructionism and so on. This is the era of "blurred genres"[52] of the postmodern condition in which the traditional conventions for the assessment of research quality are being deconstructed.[53] All these critics are developing their own methodologies and criteria for judging the quality of their work.

APPROACH TO QUALITY IN THIS STUDY

The critiques of conventional approaches to "quality" are relevant for this research also. Validity and reliability as they are traditionally understood are not methodologically appropriate criteria for assessing the quality of this research. Instead, the criteria for judging the quality of this study should resonate with the worldviews of social constructionism and historical realism.

Holstein and Gubrium view interview research as an enterprise in which the researcher and the respondent are both active creators of knowledge. They maintain that the assessment of the quality of this kind of research should not focus on the replicability and validity (in the sense of capturing the truth "out there") but on the process by dint of which the knowledge is produced:

> The focus is as much on the assembly process as on what is assembled… conversational records of interpretive practice are examined to reveal reality-constructing practices as well as the subjective meanings that are circumstantially conveyed… The goal is to show how interview responses are produced in the interaction between interviewer and respondent, without losing sight of the meanings produced or the circumstances that condition the meaning-making process.[54]

In monitoring this meaning-making process I followed Mason's recommendation: "You should be able to… trace the route by which you came to your interpretation."[55] Therefore I recorded the steps I have taken in producing the final corpus of meaning. I wrote memos describing the thinking and theoretical routes which lead me to the final interpretations.

Holstein and Gubrium also note that "[t]he analytic objective is not merely to describe the situated production of talk, but to show how what is being said relates to the experiences and lives being studied."[56] In keeping with this observation I ensured that my final interpretations have a bearing on the life stories generated in the interviews. I ascertained that my interpretations resonate with the historical context from which the life stories originate.

Another strategy I used to safeguard the quality of my study was to compare my interpretations with the interpretations of other researchers who have studied the problem of xenophobia in South Africa. This conforms to Silverman's suggestion that researchers ought to compare their work with that of their peers working in similar research areas.[57] In so doing I checked for possible similarities and differences between my interpretations and theirs and, whenever appropriate, I borrowed their views and expanded them.

In the course of analysis I often discussed the crystallizing ideas with my supervisor in the context of the existing knowledge of established-outsider relations of various types. In this way the study benefited from her scholarly expertise and experience in sociological theory and African studies. In addition to this, I read works of authors who, in different settings, have applied theoretical and methodological approaches similar to those I used.

Another approach to quality assessment is "member-validation" in which the researcher takes the work back to the people under study to decide whether it is an authentic representation of their social world. However, the problem with this approach is that the people under study are not always able to understand the esoteric language used in the academia, or they may disagree as to whether they have been authentically and faithfully represented.[58] In my case, this approach was unrealistic not only because many of my respondents can't read or write English, the write-up language. In order to proceed

with "member-validation", it would be necessary to translate the thesis into French, which would require enormous resources that I lack.

Finally, the decisions to ensure the quality of this study were taken within, rather than prior to, the course of the research process itself. As Denzin and Lincoln write: "The choices as to which interpretive practices to employ are not necessarily set in advance."[59] Hence they describe social research as an artistic enterprise that requires skill and flair on the part of the social researcher:

> The researcher… may be seen as a *bricoleur,* as a maker of quilts, or, as in filmmaking, a person who assembles images into montages…. There are many kinds of *bricoleurs* – interpretive, narrative, theoretical, political… The interpretive bricoleur produces a *bricolage* – that is, a pieced-together set of representations that are fitted to the specifics of a complex situation. If new tools or techniques have to be invented, or pieced together, then the researcher will do this.[60]

Denzin's and Lincoln's position is somewhat overstated, for no researcher descends upon the research site with an empty head. Certainly I was not an empty vessel when I went to Johannesburg hoping to be filled up by immersing myself in the field. As described in this chapter, I had a foretaste of South African nativist politics and sensitizing philosophical assumptions that enabled to me to undertake the project. Yet, is there not a grain of truth to what Denzin and Lincoln say here? For it seems obvious that producing quality research does indeed come with practice. Learning occurs on the job and this was certainly my experience.

NOTES

[1] Y. Lincoln and E. Guba 2003, "Paradigmatic Controversies, Contradictions, and Emerging Confluences", in Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln (eds.), *The Landscape of Qualitative Research: Theories and Issues.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publication.
[2] M. Crotty1998, *The Foundations of Social Research: Meaning and Perspective in Research Process.* London: Sage Publications, p. 6; italics in the original.
[3] J. Potter 1997, *Representing Reality.* London: Sage Publications.
[4] M. Crotty1998, *The Foundations of Social Research*, p. 8-9.
[5] R. Emerson et al. 1995, *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, p. 108.
[6] Quoted in Y. Lincoln and E. Guba 2003, "Paradigmatic Controversies", p. 283.

[7] J. Mason 1996, *Qualitative Research.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

[8] Y. Lincoln and E. Guba 2003, "Paradigmatic Controversies", p. 256.

[9] M. Burawoy 2000, *Global Ethnography: Forces, Connections, and Imaginations in a Postmodern World*; 1998, "The Extended Case Method."

[10] Ibid. p. 26.

[11] Ibid. p. 27.

[12] Ibid.

[13] Ibid.

[14] M. Burawoy 2000, *Global Ethnography,* p. 26.

[15] Ibid. p. 28.

[16] Ibid.

[17] Ibid.

[18] Ibid. p. 27.

[19] Ibid.

[20] M. Burawoy 1998, "The Extended Case Method", p. 14.

[21] N. Elias 1987, "The Retreat of Sociologists into the Present", p. 226.

[22] S. Mennell 1992, *Norbert Elias: An introduction*, p. 169-70.

[23] N. Elias 1998, *On Civilization, Power, and Knowledge,* p. 223.

[24] P. Atkinson and A. Coffey 2002, "Revisiting the Relationship Between Participant Observation and Interviewing", p. 424.

[25] Ibid. p. 425.

[26] D. Morgan 2002, "Focus Group Interviewing" in J. Gubrium and J. Holstein (eds) *Handbook of Interview Research: Context and Method*. London: Sage.

[27] D. Morgan 2002, "Focus Group Interviewing", p. 144.

[28] Ibid. p. 150.

[29] *Mail & Guardian* 31 May 2008, "Toll From Xenophobic Attacks Rises".

[30] T. Tshetlo 18 May 2008, "Xenophobia Epidemic Spreads", *The Citizen.*

[31] L. Landau 2006, "Transplants and Transients: Idioms of Belonging and Dislocation in Inner-City Johannesburg", *African Studies Review* 49(2), p. 128.

[32] Ibid.

[33] A. Morris 1998, "'Our Fellow Africans".

[34] J. Hornberger 2008, "Nocturnal Johannesburg", in S. Nuttall and A. Mbembe (eds) *Johannesburg: The Illusive Metropolis.* Durham: Duke University Press, 285-296.

[35] A. Morris 1999, *Bleakness and Light: Inner-City Transition in Hillbrow, Johannesburg*. Johannesburg: University of Witwatersrand Press; A. Morris 1998, "'Our Fellow Africans Make Our Lives Hell': The Lives of Congolese and Nigerians Living in Johannesburg," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 21(6): 1116-1136; C. Petkou 2005, "The Development of Ethnic Minorities: A Case Study of West Africans in South Africa", PhD Dissertation, University of the Witwatersrand; H. Shindondola 2001, "Xenophobia in South Africa: The Views, Opinions and Experiences of International Students at the Rand Afrikaans University", MA Thesis, Rand Afrikaans University, Johannesburg.

[36] R. Dingwell 1997, "Accounts, Interviews and Observations", in G. Miller and R. Dingwall (eds.), *Context and Method in Qualitative Research.* London: Sage, p. 58-9.

[37] D. Smith 2002, "Institutional Ethnography," in T. May (ed.), *Qualitative Research in Action.* London: Sage, p. 20.

[38] J. Stacey 1988, "Can There Be a Feminist Ethnography?", *Women's Studies Int. Forum,* 11(1), p. 23.

[39] M. Burawoy 1998, "The Extended Case Method", p. 14

[40] Ibid. p. 15.

[41] Ibid. italics in the original.

[42] A. Bryman1988, *Quantity and Quality in Social Research*. London & New York: Routledge; W. Newman 2000, *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon; C. Seal 1999, *The Quality of Qualitative Research.* London: Sage Publications.

[43] Fowler, F. 1993, *Survey Research Methods.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications; P. Spector 1992, *Summated Rating Scale Construction: An introduction*. Newbury, Ca: Sage Publications.

[44] P. Alreck and R. Settle 1995, *The Survey Research Handbook: Guidelines and Strategies for Conducting a Survey*. Chicago, IL: Irwin.

[45] J. Holstein and J. Gubrium 2002, "Active Interviewing," in D. Weinberg (ed.) *Qualitative Research Methods.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, p. 115.

[46] N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln 2003, "The Discipline and Practice of Qualitative Research", N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln (eds) *The Landscape of Qualitative Research;* P. Atkinson and A. Coffey 2002, "Revisiting the Relationship Between Participant Observation and Interviewing", in J. Gubrium and J. Holstein (eds) *Handbook of Interview Research: Context and Method*. London: Sage.

[47] P. Atkinson and A. Coffey 2002, "Revisiting the Relationship Between Participant Observation and Interviewing", in J. Gubrium and J. Holstein (eds) *Handbook of Interview Research: Context and Method*. London: Sage, p. 423.

[48] L. Smith 1999, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples.* London and New York: Zed Books.

[49] D. Smith 1998, *The Everyday World as Problematic: A Feminist Sociology.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, p. 161.

[50] Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. (eds.), *The Landscape of Qualitative Research.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

[51] N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln 2003, "The Discipline and Practice of Qualitative Research", N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln (eds) *The Landscape of Qualitative Research.* Thousand Oaks: Sage, p. 8. See also M. Fine et al. 2003, "For Whom? Qualitative research, representations, and social responsibilities", in N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln (eds) *The Landscape of Qualitative Research*.

[52] N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln 2003, "Introduction: The Discipline and Practice of Qualitative Research", p. 24.

[53] Y. Lincoln and E. Guba 2003, "Paradigmatic Controversies, Contradictions, and Emerging Confluences". In the same volume see also J. Kincheloe's and P. McLaren's "Rethinking Critical Theory and Qualitative Research", and V. Olesen's "Feminisms and Qualitative Research at and Into the Millennium".

[54] J. Holstein and J. Gubrium 2002, "Active Interviewing", p. 124-5.

[55] J. Mason 1996, *Qualitative Research.* Thousand Oaks: Sage, p. 150.

[56] J. Holstein and J. Gubrium 2002, "Active Interviewing", p. 125.

[57] D. Silverman 1993, *Interpreting Qualitative Data.*

[58] J. Mason 1996, *Qualitative Research*; J. Stacey 1988, "Can There Be a Feminist Ethnography?"
[59] N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln 2003, "Introduction: The Discipline and Practice of Qualitative Research", p. 6.
[60] Ibid. p. 5.

IV. THE MAKING OF AN ESTABLISHMENT

> [T]he celebration of Africanism and 'African Renaissance' has alternated with xenophobic statements and practices towards other Africans.[1]

South Africa is a figuration of diverse social groups, a fact acknowledged and embraced in the Constitution: "[We] are united in our diversity". These various groups – Blacks, Chinese, Coloureds, Indians, Whites, etc – are themselves internally diverse in a variety of ways.[2] However, I am not going to focus on fissures and fractures within these groups but on the ways in which the binaries "citizen"/"foreigner", "South African"/*"Makwerekwere"* have been deployed in the social imagination, even despite the breaches within the citizenry, as well as on the increasing representation of blacks in the South African establishment through the process of functional democratization.

In a figuration that maintained white privilege, the multitude of outsider groups – Blacks, Chinese, Coloureds, Indians, Jews, etc. – the masses of the historically oppressed – were eager to be counted as part of the nation.[3] What does this process of becoming the established entail? What are the specific historical, political and psychosocial characteristic features of this transformation from an outsider position to that of an established? How do those who undergo this metamorphosis imagine themselves as a community of the established? What is the resulting configuration of established-outsider relations between the neophyte citizens – that is, the novice establishment – and the non-citizen outsiders? In addressing these interrelated questions, the chapter attempts to chart the formation of a neophyte establishment on the national scale alongside the development of post-apartheid group charisma (South Africa's self-idealization) and group disgrace (the ideology of *makwerekwere*).

The demise of apartheid, the election of a black majority government, stands out in the transformation of outsiders into the established. Accompanied by the shifting of asymmetric power balances between the old establishment and the rising outsiders, these developments ushered changes in the demographic composition of the South African figuration. As the establishment became increasingly porous, more and more outsiders penetrated it. Blacks became citizens formally, and with the progressive collapse of group

areas laws, they had begun to settle in the previously prohibited spaces – inner-city spaces and suburbs – in increasing numbers.[4]

The process of integration of outsider groups (or their representatives) into the establishment manifests itself saliently through the transformation of the nationalist project. Historically, particularly following the unification of South Africa in 1910, whiteness was the dominant nationalist project. The community was imagined as white. The national body had to be whitened. Blacks and their squalid dwellings became the "black spots", blots, blemishes, disgrace, dirt, disease, stains, stigma that soiled the national body. With the collapse of apartheid, this Europeanization tendency that animated South African nationalism for generations diminished considerably.[5] This being the case, what are the features of South African nationalism which inform the relations between the newly established citizens and African non-citizens? If the national body no longer imagines itself as white, then what does it imagine itself as? And does this imagination have anything to do with how African outsiders, the non-citizens, are viewed and treated? Has Europeanization diminished or has it metamorphosed?

Continentally, the process of post-apartheid establishment implies the reintegration of South Africa into the figuration of African nations. The collapse of apartheid represents the crumbling of walls of separation that kept South Africa alienated from the greater continent. With the effects of prolonged alienation, the return of South Africa returns is economically, socially and politically demanding. What does it mean to return after generations of forced alienation and abuse? Related to this question is another question. How do Africans from the rest of the continent receive their returning siblings? For one, the return occurs in tandem with contradictory feelings of attraction and revulsion that are manifest in the returning returnees' contradictory behaviour toward their counterparts from the greater continent. On the one hand, there is homecoming romanticism, thus suggesting attraction to Africa – e.g. the romantic discourse of Ubuntu, Africanism and African Renaissance. On the other hand, this return is rejected through selective and violent xenophobia against Africans – e.g. "these Africans are invading us, to take our jobs and our women"; "they bring crime;" "they bring diseases, especially AIDS"; "they are dishonest"; "they are leeches that must be cleaned out of our streets"; "they are dirty, they don't use deodorant."

77

IDENTIFICATION WITH AFRICA

Explosion of identity politics among all social groups – blacks, whites, Indians and coloureds – is a characteristic feature of post-apartheid South Africa. Often these politics revolve around assertions of South Africa's Africanness and celebrations of African Renaissance. Through these assertions and celebrations, South Africans embrace (or appear to embrace) the continent, positioning themselves as part and parcel of it. Thus South Africans, particularly the black elite, strive to develop mutual identification with Africans from the rest of the continent. President Mbeki has been on the forefront in spearheading the movement of Africanness and African Renaissance. His speeches on these subjects have sparked sustained debate in the press. By highlighting Africa's great achievements and proclaiming a claim to them, Mbeki's speeches constitute an emotional embrace of Africa as South African and South Africa as African.

With selective readings of African history, Mbeki invents common African mythologies and traditions, stitching together historical fragments to produce a quilt of Pan-African charisma, which ought to function as emotional means of mutual identification between and among Africans. This charisma operates as a binding tie that in principle enables South Africans to experience themselves as one with Africans from the greater continent. Thus on 13 August 1998, Mbeki declared on national television: "We recall with pride the African scholar and author of the Middle Ages, Sadi of Timbuktu, who had mastered such subjects as law, logic, dialectics, grammar and rhetoric, and other African intellectuals who taught at the University of Timbuktu." On the occasion of the adoption by the Constitutional Assembly of the Republic of South Africa Constitution Bill on 8 May 1996, Mbeki declared in his now famous "I Am an African" speech:

> On an occasion such as this, we should, perhaps, start from the beginning.
> So, let me begin.
> I am an African.
> I owe my being to the hills and the valleys, the mountains and the glades, the rivers, the deserts, the trees, the flowers, the seas and the ever-changing seasons that define the face of our native land.[6]

Later on in the speech he proclaimed his affinity with the people of the greater continent. "My mind and my knowledge of myself," he said, "is formed by the victories that are the

jewels in our African crown, the victories we earned from Isandhlwana to Khartoum, as Ethiopians and as the Ashanti of Ghana, as the Berbers of the desert."[7] Or consider yet again but in other words:

> I am an African.
> I am born of the peoples of the continent of Africa.
> The pain of the violent conflict that the peoples of Liberia, Somalia, the Sudan, Burundi and Algeria is a pain I also bear.
> The dismal shame of poverty, suffering and human degradation of my continent is a blight that we share.
> The blight on our happiness that derives from this and from our drift to the periphery of the ordering of human affairs leaves us in a persistent shadow of despair.[8]

The president has been in the forefront of constructing a foundational mythology of a Pan-African imagined community on which South Africans, and indeed all Africans, ought to draw in the construction of their identities. Thus in a speech to the United Nations University in Japan on 9 April 1998, Mbeki positioned himself as an African speaking for Africans, quoting Leo Africanus, a Spaniard who visited West Africa at the beginning of the 16th Century and then wrote:

> The rich king of Timbuktu ... keeps a magnificent and well-furnished court ... Here are great store of doctors, judges, priests, and other learned men, that are bountifully maintained at the king's cost and charges. And hither are brought diverse manuscripts or written books out of Barbarie, which are sold for more money than any other merchandise.[9]

In the same speech Mbeki burst out in a litany of African achievements and contributions to humanity. "[A]s we speak of an African Renaissance," he said, "we project into both the past and the future…. a glorious past of the emergence of homo sapiens on the African continent." He referred to "African works of art in South Africa that are a thousand years old"; to "the continuum in the fine arts that encompasses the varied artistic creations of the Nubians and the Egyptians, the Benin bronzes of Nigeria and the intricate sculptures of the Makonde of Tanzania and Mozambique"; to "the centuries-old contributions to the evolution of religious thought made by the Christians of Ethiopia and the Muslims of Nigeria"; to "architectural monuments represented by the giant sculptured stones of Aksum in Ethiopia, the Egyptian sphinxes and pyramids"; to "the Tunisian city of Carthage"; to "the Zimbabwe ruins"; to "the legacy of the ancient universities of

Alexandria of Egypt, Fez of Morocco and, once more, Timbuktu of Mali." This is historical group charisma on which Africans should draw for "our rediscovery," "our rebirth," and "our confidence" as "midwives of our own continent's rebirth."[10]

However, this identification with Africa is not without its limits, as we shall see shortly. Located in the press, the debate on South Africa's Africanness is, however, a luxury which the elite alone can afford. The language of the debate is an esoteric one, as Maphalala rightly charged intellectuals of failing to communicate with the masses: "The re-awakening of the African mind can only happen when African intellectuals talk to the masses in their home languages."[11] Indeed President Mbeki himself has been accused of elitism and intellectualism in his deliberations on African Renaissance. "Perhaps the greatest weakness of President Thabu Mbeki," writes Mamaila, "is – paradoxically – his profound depth, to which is allied a failure to package his sophisticated understanding of politics in terms that are intelligible to an ordinary person."[12] As we shall see later, this ensures the exclusion of the masses, most of whom are either illiterate or under-literate, from the debate. According to the University of KwaZulu Natal literacy statistics, 46 percent of South Africans have less than Grade 9 education; 28 percent have less than Grade 7; 11 percent have no schooling; some 32 percent are functionally illiterate.[13] In this state of affairs, the academic language of the debate prevents the trickle down and diffusion of the ideas. Consequently, the Africanness of South Africa in the lower tiers of the figuration is strongly parochial, chauvinistic and exclusive, rather than Pan-African and inclusive.

THE NATION AND MUTUAL IDENTIFICATION

According to Elias, as discussed in the theory chapter, the exclusion of outsiders by the established issues from the latter's shared history, myths, traditions and hierarchy passed on from generation to generation. This engenders mutual identification and cohesion among the established, enabling them to monopolize the means of power and status. This assumption is, however, inapplicable in established-outsider relations under consideration in this study.

South Africans have made their history together, but that history is not the history of increasing mutual identification between groups, not the history of social groups

80

warming up to each other, but the history of antagonism, mutual hatred and polarization between social groups. The idea of shared mythologies, traditions and unifying codes of conduct is inapplicable in this case. In Anderson's terms, South Africans do not have old foundational myths of imagined communities.[14] However, as citizens they are still able to close ranks against the outsiders on the basis of some other ideology.

The citizens share no history of common belonging and community. First, whites had a community of their own, with their own traditions, languages, and cultural practices, for the English and the Afrikaners had closed ranks against other groups. But even the warming up of the English and Afrikaners toward each other had its limits. Their closing of ranks against the rest was instrumental at best, for antagonism and alienation characterized their relations. These relations had many structural characteristics of established-outsider relations as defined by Elias. On the one hand, the English despised the Afrikaners seeing them as rural, decivilized, ignorant and stupid.[15] They monopolized the means of power and prestige – e.g. means of production and capital. They controlled education and the flows of information (the media), monopolizing the networks and gossip channels that connected South Africa to the rest of the world, thereby enabling them to project the Afrikaners internationally with negativity. This left the Afrikaners stigmatized and disgraced globally without redress. The Afrikaners, on the other hand, resented the English, seeing them as colonizers, greedy capitalists, imperialists and oppressors. Over the years, the resentment of the English never abated but deepened and became part of Afrikaner emotional culture and nationalism.[16] It is noteworthy that not even their monopolization of the state since 1948 was able to attenuate their group disgrace and resentment of the English.

Secondly, the Coloureds formed their own community with their language, habits, traditions, practices, etc. So did the Indians, who in their "cultural narcissism"[17] hardly mixed with other social groups. Even the blacks who have many commonalities did not necessarily maintain friendly relations with each other. Not only were they organized in distinctive ethnic groups each of which with its own practices, tradition, way of life, code of conduct, and language, but they also had, to some degree, antagonistic relations with each other. The outbreak of violence and desolation in southern Africa in the 1820s wherein black ethnic groups fought against each other, breeding widespread fear

81

throughout the region, bears historical testimony to this. However, the antagonism that characterized the relations between Africans and oppressive forces of white privilege throughout the region contributed for increasing solidarity and mutual identification among Africans. But one cannot go too far in making these claims, because the Bantustan leadership was keener to defend than to destroy the status quo.[18] This often led them to side with the powers that be and oppose the liberation movement.

The spatial, social and psychological distance between the social groups remained great until recently. The construction of South African social spaces suggests that the groups that occupied and used these spaces were anything but warm toward each other. Each group remained in its spatial, socioeconomic and psychosocial enclave. South African history is a history of social groups at odds, not at home, with each other.[19] These are the characteristic features of the history of group relations in South Africa. This then begs the question, what, then, if anything, are the ties that bind the citizens as one with each other at the exclusion of non-citizens? What produces the current nationalistic sentiment of camaraderie and oneness? What enables the citizens to close ranks against foreign nationals? What are the engendering figurational features of this exclusion? Thus is implicated the policing of social spaces vis-à-vis the outsiders: how do the citizens police their social spaces to keep non-citizens at bay?

The commonality of traditions, of myths, of the past, of ancestry, of a code of conduct, of a way of life, of an ingrained social habitus, which in Winston Parva accounted for the mutual identification among the established, on the one hand, and mutual dysidentification between the established and the outsiders, on the other hand, are replaced in South Africa by psychosocial processes of imagined communities[20] constituted through mythologization and invention of tradition.[21] At the same time, this mutual identification between these historically antagonistic groups is accomplished through the invention and mobilization of the figure of *makwerekwere,* including the desire for the destruction of those who are construed as incarnations of this figure. These are the political and psychosocial processes that animate the greater process of post-apartheid South African establishment. Through these processes the citizens accrue national charisma whilst projecting foreign disgrace to the figure of *makwerekwere.*

Nation building

Since the formation of the first post-apartheid government, nation building has been the driving force of South African nationalism. Spearheading this project are the black elite, many of whom control the state, for whom, along with the old establishment, disunity represents a threat to their interests. Out of historically polarized groups, these elite seek to construct national unity. In this undertaking the state suppresses ethnic differences and promotes a unified national South African identity, on the one hand, and suppresses group rights and promotes individual rights, on the other hand.[22] Following the first national democratic election in 1994, President Mandela proceeded to form The Government of National Unity in an effort to reconcile and unite polarities. Thus in his first month in office, he activated the autochthony discourse declaring: "[E]ach of us is as intimately attached to the soil of this beautiful country as are the famous jacaranda trees of Pretoria and the mimosa trees of the bushveld."[23] In 2001, President Mbeki proclaimed:

> [A new patriotism in the new South Africa] is a material factor in both our individual and collective efforts to achieve success in our lives …. Thus shall we achieve national unity, national reconciliation and the mobilisation of the millions of our people to hold hands as a single mighty movement mobilised to transform ourselves into the winning nation that we can, must and will be.[24]

On 29 May 1998, Mbeki, then the Deputy President, opened "The Debate on Nation Building" in the National Assembly in Cape Town declaring, "[w]e are interested that our country responds to the call to rally to a new patriotism." He told the assembly that the patriotism to which he called them was:

> An all-embracing effort to build a sense of common nationhood and a shared destiny, as a result of which we can entrench into the minds of all our people the understanding that however varied their skin complexions, cultures and life conditions, the success of each nevertheless depends on the effort the other will make to turn into reality the precept that each is his or her brother's or sister's keeper.[25]

Asking rhetorically what nation building was, he replied: "Nation building is the construction of the reality and the sense of common nationhood which would result from

the abolition of disparities in the quality of life among South Africans based on the racial, gender and geographic inequalities we all inherited from the past."[26]

An important discursive current emerging in this process is the idea of "The Rainbow Nation." The idea has been widely publicized, exhaustively repeated, that it has become a cliché, a taken for granted reality out there. The trend has been rightly termed as "rainbowism".[27] The Archbishop Desmond Tutu is credited for inserting the idea in the nationalistic discourse.[28] According to Baines, the clergyman coined the phrase "the rainbow nation":

> As chairperson of the Truth and Reconciliation Committee, Tutu is associated in the public mind with the process of reconciliation and nation building. He appeared in a series of television slots in which he spoke of the 'Rainbow People of God'. As a cleric, his image presumably draws on the Old Testament story of the flood where the rainbow symbolises God's promise not to pass further judgment on humankind.[29]

But all stakeholders, from the state to civil society to businesses, have jumped on the bandwagon of inventing the rainbow nation. When President Mandela declared that "each of us is as intimately attached to the soil of this beautiful country as are the famous jacaranda trees of Pretoria and the mimosa trees of the bushveld", he also added "[we are] a rainbow nation at peace with itself and the world."[30] The idea of the rainbow nation, Valji rightly argues, has become the accepted foundational myth of the new imagined community.[31]

Proudly South African

South African institutions – the media and businesses, for example – did not fail to respond to the call to patriotism. Thus, in its bid to cultivate the patriotic sentiment, the South African Broadcasting Corporation (SABC) has been using the slogan *Simunye, We Are One,* on its television network. More than a decade later it is still being used, having gone through various revisions. To keep the message fresh and captivating, it is edited at least once every year, played at least every ten minutes, opening and closing every commercial break.[32] This slogan calls historically antagonistic groups to imagine and experience themselves as one with each other. Businesses have also discovered the value of stimulating patriotic emotions. Thus, with its advertising slogan *One Beer, One*

Nation, the South African Breweries, the sponsor of the national football team, *The Bafana-Bafana*, also seeks to invent unity through its liquor products.

On 3 October 2001, the state, trade unions and organized business launched a yearly nation building campaign sloganized as *Proudly South African*. Initially, a *Proudly South African Day* was set aside for yearly celebrations of pride in buying and consuming proudly produced South African commodities. Two years later, the day increased to *Proudly South African Week*. The campaign encourages citizens to show their patriotism by purchasing and consuming South African goods and services. Companies are encouraged to become members of Proudly South African organization, and to label their products with Proudly South African logo. Hence not only citizens but also everything else is *Proudly South African*: hotels, tourism, leisure, restaurants, retailers, energy companies, foods, body care products, clothes, bottled water, liquor, to name a few. Besides the official logo, *Proudly South African* is promoted through a variety of objects: button badges, bumper stickers, pins, t-shirts, ties, mugs, desk top flags, caps, lanyards, wall banners, ribbons, tags, wobblers, laundry-line banners. For instance, the bumper stickers say one or the other: "I am proudly South African" or "I buy only proudly South African." The laundry-line banners carry lines such as "More jobs in every bag", "I choose proudly South African", "Shop until unemployment drops."

The community at large – media, schools, universities, churches, commercial centres, etc – is involved in being and promoting Proudly South African. The media in particular have been on the avant-garde in the campaign. In an article titled "Shopping therapy for a nation," the *Cape Argus* writes: "Turning shoppers into nation builders is the simple but powerful idea behind Proudly South African, the campaign to boost the country's economy by promoting local products and services."[33] By September 2003, Proudly South African had 1,000 member companies.[34] By September 2004, membership had grown to more than 2,300 companies.[35] In the same issue, *The Star* carried another article titled "The Wealth of a Nation" saying "[e]ach year, as part of National Heritage week, South Africans have an opportunity to stand together and proclaim how proud we are to be South African and to celebrate our many achievements. This is what Proudly South Africa Day is all about."[36] The *Sunday Tribune* told its readers to "Be proud you're South African and get busy shopping."[37] On winning the Oscar Award, the Tsotsi

character in the film by the same name, exploded emotionally on national television: "I am *proudly, proudly, proudly, proudly, South African!*" The cultivation of South Africa as an imagined community of individuals who are one with each other is also accomplished through sport.[38]

Truth and Reconciliation

The Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) functioned as means of inventing the new unified community through invocation of emotional pains of the past. As Valji points out, the TRC suppressed the antagonism, hatred and cruelty that characterized group relations during apartheid.[39] This was achieved through the process of storytelling in which the TRC decided which stories were suitable to elicit emotions that would bind perpetrators and victims into nation. Only those stories that, in the eyes of the TRC, were appropriate for nation building could be told, heard, catalogued and archived as the sacred, mythical memory of the nation. Potentially divisive stories were suppressed. By blaming only a few individuals for the violations of human rights, the TRC also suppressed difference, collapsing perpetrators and victims into one category, i.e. South Africans victimized by their own past. The white majority who made up the old establishment, who repeatedly gave the apartheid regime the sinister mandate, were proclaimed victims of the past and therefore absolved.[40] At the inauguration of the TRC, President Mandela was of the opinion that, "looking at the guilt and suffering of the past, one cannot but conclude: In a certain sense all of us are victims of apartheid, all of us are victims of our past."[41] In April 1996, Archbishop Desmond Tutu, the Chair of the TRC, stated: "We are charged to unearth the truth about our dark past, to lay the ghosts of that past so that they may not return to haunt us. That it may thereby contribute to the healing of a traumatised and wounded nation, *for all of us in South Africa are wounded people.*"[42] At the closing of the TRC, the Archbishop again declared:

> We have been wounded but we are being healed. It is possible even with our past of suffering, anguish, alienation, and violence to become one people, reconciled, healed, caring, compassionate, and ready to share as we put our past begin us to stride into the glorious future God holds before us as the Rainbow People of God.[43]

In the end, the TRC was a site for victim status competition in which the old establishment, the perpetrators and legitimators of apartheid, sighed with relief when told they had also attained the victim status. The TRC's failure to publicize the brutalization of millions of people in frontline states created the impression that only South Africans were victims of the past, whereas citizens from neighbouring states are opportunistic parasites seeking to abuse South Africa's scarce resources.[44]

Promotion of national unity; Proudly South African production, spending and consumption; invention of national foundational myths, i.e. rainbowism; attribution of victim status to perpetrators and victims of apartheid – all these nation building practices work in the best interests of the establishment, both black and white, who otherwise stand to lose a lot. Nation building, then, is a psychosocial process that helps generate an image of a "good society".[45]

THE ELITICIZATION OF THE STRUGGLE

From the point of view of the theory of the established and the outsiders, what Neocosmos called the eliticization and urbanization of the struggle represents certain aspects of the process of establishment – they are facets of the transformation of outsiders into the established. The eliticization of the struggle against apartheid resulted in freedom fighters becoming part of the establishment, which in turn led to the eliticization of the negotiation process, which ultimately led to the eliticization of the postcolonial state and nation building. When the African National Congress (ANC) was banned, its leadership was either imprisoned or went to exile. This created a leadership vacuum within the anti-apartheid movement. In this context, a popular coalition of hundreds of civic, church, student and worker organizations (locally, nationally and regionally) emerged in the early 1980s and crystallized into the United Democratic Front (UDF). The UDF was characterized by active popular participation. As Murphy Morobe, the UDF's Acting Publicity Secretary, declared in 1987:

> [T]he people in our country can not only vote for a representative of their choice, but also feel that they have some direct control over where and how they live, eat, sleep, work, how they get to work, how they and their children are educated, what the content of that education is; and that these things are not *done for them by the*

government of the day, but [by] the people themselves… The rudimentary organs of people's power that have begun to emerge in South Africa (street committees, defence committees, shop-steward structures, student representative councils, parent/teacher/student associations) represent in many ways the beginnings of the kind of democracy that we are striving for.[46]

Concerning the leadership of the UDF, Murphy Morobe had this to say:

1) Elected Leadership. Leadership of our organisations must be elected (at all levels), and elections must be held at periodic intervals… Elected leadership must also be recallable before the end of their term of office it there is indiscipline or misconduct.
2) Collective Leadership. We try by and practice collective leadership at all levels. There must be continuous, ongoing, consultation…
3) Mandates and Accountability. Our leaders and delegates are not free-floating individuals. They always have to operate within the delegated mandates of their positions and delegated duties.
4) Reporting. Reporting back to organizations, areas, units, etc. is an important dimension of democracy… We feel very strongly that information is a form of power, and that if it is not shared, it undermines the democratic process. We therefore take care to ensure that language translations occur in necessary…
5) Criticism and Self-Criticism. We do not believe that any of our members are beyond criticism; neither are organizations and strategies beyond reproach…[47]

Meanwhile the exiled elite, detached from the internal reality of popular resistance in South Africa, were championing an elitist leadership and struggle for democracy.[48] As Neocosmos points out, "the dominant political discourse became more and more defined by a leadership not always closely linked to the rank and file and informed by popular experience."[49] Their idea of leadership and democratization contradicted the populist opinion that prevailed within the UDF. The "hegemony of state-structured xenophobia," he writes, issues from "the changing configuration of politics from a period of popular national struggle ('national democratic revolution') lasting from 1984 to 1990, to state-led process of 'nation building' from 1990 to the present."[50] The lifting of the ban against the liberation movement in 1990 not only legitimated the "nationalist political parties in the eyes of the state" but also allowed them "to operate within a state domain of politics."[51] Seeing these exiled elites as representatives of the people, the old establishment invited them to the negotiation table. As part of the formation of post-apartheid establishment, the negotiation process represents betrayal of the masses. Adam et al.'s insightful observation on this point is worth citing at length:

[A]n elite conspiracy emerged between both sides, quite willingly, to keep their respective constituencies in the dark about how they were bargaining away fundamental policy positions that they had promised were completely non-negotiable. This was as true for the ANC ad for the NP… As Cyril Ramaphosa put it, "sufficient consensus means, if we and the NP agree, everyone else can be stuffed"… (including the bulk of their supporters). The negotiators on both sides had indoctrinated, manipulated and coerced their followers to accept "the line", i.e. the resolvability of the conflict *on their own terms.* When the elite or leadership on both sides agreed that this could not be done because of a commonly accepted stalemate, they were progressively forced to deceive the expectations of their constituents through negotiations.[52]

Unbanned and legitimated by the old establishment, the returning exiled elite dispensed with the people's mandate to lead or to negotiate on their behalf. They simply went on to cut deals with the old establishment in contradiction with the populist aspirations. Next, they proceeded to explain (to sell) these deals to the masses. In 1991, *Mayibuye,* the journal of the ANC maintained that "[a]ccountability means that leadership must discuss decisions with membership. Decisions must be explained so that members understand why they are made."[53] This process, writes Neocosmos, "engendered the collapse of popular prescriptive politics as popular organizations were gradually but clearly and irreversibly de-politicized through linkage to a state subjectivity."[54]

The privileging of elite discourses had the effect of defining new notions of citizenship and nation without broad, grassroots consultation. While the inclusive construction of the nation and citizenship characterized the populist movement from 1984 to 1990, autochthony or indigeneity dominated the elitist construction of nation and citizenship: "Different conceptions of the nation dominated nationalist politics during these two different periods along with differing notions of those outside it and different relations between state interpellation and popular prescriptions."[55] As a result, for Neocosmos, the collapse of the populist stream generated condition of possibility that favoured the rise of xenophobia: "The absence of popular prescriptions on politics today (their collapse since the end of the apartheid sate in 1990) is what largely enables the existence of various forms of xenophobia as directed against both foreigners and ethnic minorities."[56] This situation, as Neocosmos assesses it, follows the trend throughout Africa toward manipulation of citizenship by the elite to exclude certain groups from the political process after independence.[57]

URBANIZATION OF THE STRUGGLE

The eliticization of the struggle was entangled, interrelated and interwoven with its urbanization. In other words, the struggle became simultaneously both elitist and urban-cantered. The construction of nation and citizenship was elitist also in the sense that it was urban-focused. Neocosmos aptly argues that anti-immigrant sentiments and violence against African outsiders issue from the pro-urban/anti-rural character of South African nationalism:

> It is a notion of the nation which is fundamentally urban one, centred on the cities. As a result it tends to exclude the rural in the 1980s, and eventually transfers this exclusion to the non-South African rural hinterland whence migrants had emanated and where current immigration originates; 'illegal immigrants' in South Africa were implicitly or explicitly seen as coming from the 'backward rural' areas of the continent, or from 'failed states', they are ultimately the same thing: the impoverished Other.[58]

Evidence from South African literature suggests that the urbanism of anti-apartheid movement was symptomatic of an increasingly urbanizing South African habitus. In a critique of South African literature, Ndebele observes that "the city appears to have taken tyrannical hold on the imagination of the average African writer, life outside the major urban centres was all but obliterated. Only the miners would oftentimes be an irritating reminder [of rural consciousness]."[59] Ndebele also detected this urban takeover within the liberation movement where it was believed that the decisive battle and victory lay with labour in major metropolitan centres: "[T]he perception appears to have consolidated within the ranks of the liberation struggle that the decisive element in determining the course of the coming South African future is the workers in the cities."[60] The problem was not that South African literature was urban-focused, but that it failed to tell rural stories, which reflected an increasing dysidentification with rural life.

> I did not remember ever coming across as compelling a body fiction about peasant life in South Africa…. there existed a disturbing silence in South African literature as far as peasants, as subjects of artistic attention, were concerned…. Seldom do we see peasants, *in their own right*, struggling to survive against the harsh conditions of nature or manmade injustice. What seems to be lacking, then, is an attempt at a sincere imaginative perception that sees South African peasant life as having a certain human validity, albeit a problematic one.[61]

90

Ndebele situates this pro-urban/anti-peasant literary imagination within the colonial oppression which took the shape of "peasantisation of urban Africans by the government through the Bantustans."[62] Consequently, resistance against colonial oppression took the shape of (or mirrored) what it resisted. This amounted to rejection of peasant life as oppressed being in the world and the simultaneous embrace of urban life as free being in the word. Hence liberation entailed movement from the rural to the urban, both physically and imaginatively. Physically, this entailed the permanent exodus from peasant life to city life in pursuit of varieties of opportunities, most notably jobs and education. Once these goals were attained, the former peasants, now urbanites, had developed amnesia of their recent past peasant being in the world. Imaginatively, the rejection of the rural was a psychic process wherein the peasant consciousness gradually receded from the souls of these former peasants and was replaced by urban life orientation. "[T]hose Africans who managed to acquire an education," writes Ndebele, "did not have any material or compelling ideological incentives to return to their peasant origins, neither physically nor imaginatively." Ndebele does not refer simply to "individuals here and there," as he puts it, but rather to "socially significant movements." As a result, he notes, "peasant consciousness never seriously benefited from the now relatively sophisticated intellectual perspectives of its own original sons and daughters."[63] The rejection of the rural, on the one hand, and on the other hand the embrace of the urban consciousness were symptomatic of the repression of the peasant in process of the establishment which was to be projected onto the figure of *makwerekwere*.

In this context, the liberation movement, particularly the leading exiled elite – who themselves had become urbanized – cultivated negative attitudes toward migrant work. These attitudes coexisted hand in glove with the vulgar economic thinking wherein migrant labour was viewed not simply as dehumanizing but as the very foundational basis of apartheid. For the exiled ANC elite, "apartheid was not so much a form of state but a form of labour control based on rural migrant labour, moreover a labour which was kept in dormitory areas (Bantustans) against its will by the pass system, and hence 'tribalised' in the process."[64] Consequently, the leadership sought to do away with "migrant labour from Southern African sub-region… justified as part of the dismantling of apartheid itself, and as such as a democratic process. As a state discourse, this

conception fed into creating the conditions for popular xenophobia."[65] In 1984, Ndebele discerned this attitude within the struggle movement and called for caution:

> [I]t is natural for us to want to condemn the obvious exploitative conditions of work in the mines. But we should be careful that condemnation does not extend to condemning the necessity for work and the satisfaction that can result from it…. the values of work and experience should be rescued and separated from the conditions of exploitation in which that work is done. The necessary political vilification of exploitation should be separated from the human triumph associated with work, a triumph which constitutes a positive value for the future.[66]

This call to caution was not heeded, for these sentiments translated in visions of liberation and democratization as the elimination of migrant work, which in turn tended to devalue migrant work not only in South Africa but throughout the southern African region.[67]

DISIDENTIFICATION WITH AFRICA

One of the characteristic features of the establishment process in post-apartheid South Africa is the assimilation of South African exceptionalism by the rising outsider groups, firstly by the black elite or the new middle class, and secondly by the masses through a trickle down of cognitive and emotional signals. First highlighted by Mamdani and recently by Neocosmos,[68] South African exceptionalism refers to:

> Dominant arrogant political discourse held by many South Africans of all racial groups regarding the apparent exceptionalism of the country on the African continent, a discourse which forms part of South African nationalism. According to this discourse, South Africa is somehow more akin to a Southern European or Latin American country given its relative levels of industrialization, and now increasingly of liberal democracy.[69]

It is important to note here that such exeptionalism is a form of group charisma through which South Africans as a group idealize themselves. Weren't the leaders of most post-independent African states Africans? And didn't they fail? Were they not corrupt? South Africa's postcolonial leaders would like to see themselves as Africans. But not quite Africans like those in the failed states up north. They are exceptional Africans, the incarnations of *Ubuntu*. Unlike Africans from the north, they are "people of the south" – advanced, modernized, and better off.

One must note here that this attitude, invented by the old colonial establishment, predates post-apartheid society. Neil Lazarus' intimations on this question are particularly instructive. Recalling the mentality of the white establishment of which he was part in colonial South Africa, Lazarus writes: "For most whites in South Africa, of course, South Africa was not really in Africa at all. It was a 'Western' society that just happened, accidentally and inconsequentially, if irritatingly, to be situated at the foot of the dark continent."[70] Lazarus remarks how this attitude ironically characterized the anti-apartheid struggle. "[E]ven within the anti-apartheid movement," he writes,

> a dangerous and inexcusable ignorance about Africa was quite widespread. This ignorance was premised not, obviously, on difference but on categorical *differentiation...* South African commentators… tended always "to regard the country as sui generic and somehow able to evade the pressures experienced by the rest of Africa."[71]

Lazarus goes on to note that not even scholars, including those on the left, were an exception to the rule:

> [T]he insularity, the provincialism, the inward directedness, the self-obsession of so much South African scholarship, including left-wing scholarship, and including that by South African scholars living abroad, in exile or by choice. The conventional wisdom has been that South Africa would be able to solve the problems of development (and maldevelopment or underdevelopment) experienced by other African states, rather than to fall victim to them; to control its own fate; to write its own scripts rather than find itself written into ones not of its own devising.[72]

This exceptionalism was not simply an ideology with which its proponents constructed their social reality vis-à-vis Africa back then. It was also futuristic in that, even at the time of the struggle, its proponents projected it into the future, enabling them to hope for and dream of an exceptionally liberated South Africa. Lazarus' remarks are once again instructive:

> The assumption has been that, with *our* particular and particularly irreducible history – which is to say, our history of struggle – *our* decolonization, when it came, would not prove to be the neocolonization that it had been elsewhere; *our* nationalism really *would* correspond to the "all-embracing crystallization of the innermost hopes of the whole people": it would not decompose, as it had elsewhere on the continent, into ethnic chauvinism or class rule; *our* national liberation front would not serve, once it became the party in power after decolonization, to cover over its traces and disavow both its heritage and its

historic responsibility; *our* leaders, our "men of the people" (and "women of the people") would not become, as elsewhere on the continent, the puppets of international capital.[73]

Although Lazarus hits at the heart of the matter, he however does not go far enough. The fact that now South Africans of all social stripes partake in this attitude has to do with the fact that, in the process of the establishment, the aspiring outsider groups assimilate to a greater or lesser extent the attitudes, codes of conduct and habits of the more established, more powerful groups. Lazarus' observations of South African self-imagination as "a 'Western' society that just happened, *accidentally and inconsequentially, if irritatingly*, to be situated at the foot of the dark continent" allude to, but do not capture adequately, the South African psychic condition vis-à-vis its situation on the continent. South Africa's geographical and demographic situation on the continent remained a nightmare, weighing down heavily in the brain of the white establishment. The development of South African exceptionalism is situated within the mood of fear of contamination which constantly taunted the imagination of the white establishment. The imagined numerous uncivilized Africans seemed to impose themselves on the white establishment, threatening to swamp it irreversibly. This idea of exceptionalism somehow found its way into the worldview of the new black establishment.

The question of narcissism of minor differences is essential on this point. The failed African states were all formations of good societies of the black elite that had been reduced to equality in inferiority vis-à-vis their colonial masters throughout the continent. That is, the onslaught of colonization made no distinction in its machinations against Africans. Where and when distinctions were made, the aim was to facilitate colonial exploitation. By ruling Africans with the same native or customary laws, under the same notorious native affairs departments, colonization reduced differentiation of African social groups, making them all equal in their assigned inferiority and oppression. As Block observes, where differences have been diminished, that is, where groups have become less unequal, narcissism of minor differences abounds.[74] At the extreme, such narcissism manifests itself in the annihilation of rival groups, as was the case in Bosnia and Rwanda. (In the next chapter, more will be said on the operation of narcissism of minor differences).

WHITE SUPREMACY

The relations between citizens and foreign nationals and the ideology of South African supremacy that mediates these relations ought to be understood within the historical development of modern white supremacy, notably the ideas of blackness and whiteness, which shaped the formation of South Africa both as a nation and as a state. Since whiteness in *white supremacy* transcends the literal meaning of whiteness (more on this below), blacks become implicated in this process. The negative representations of African foreign nationals by South African citizens are consistent with the ideology of white supremacy even if the actors are black. The question "Who are the victims of South African hatred, aggression and violence?" is just as important as the question "Who are the offenders?"

The imagination of South Africa as a community of the light skinned since at least the beginning of the 20th century (see next chapter), notably around 1910, was a manifestation of modern white supremacy. Residues of this imagination shape the self-images of South Africans of all groups, shape the images of South African territoriality, and shape the idea of the continent. The representations of Africa as disease ridden, poverty stricken, plunged in darkness and suffering is part of a long standing discourse within which South Africans have considered themselves too good to be Africans. Initially held by the old white establishment (the Afrikaners and the British), which always identified itself culturally, emotionally and politically with Europe, this tradition – including the attitudes, habits and practices alongside it – lives on today in all social groups: black, white, coloured and Indian, rich, poor. In shaping the construction of national social spaces, white supremacy also shaped the organization of groups and their social life, producing distorted patterns of identification and dysidentification, the "we-images" and "they-images" that are consistent with anti-African sentiments, attitudes, habits and practices among citizens of all groups.

Bell hooks aptly argues that to speak in terms of *white supremacy* instead of *racism* "allows for a discourse of colonization and decolonization, the recognition of the internalized racism within people of colour."[75] Unlike *racism,* the term *white supremacy* "doesn't just evoke white people" but "a political world that we can all frame ourselves in relationship to."[76] According to hooks, the term allows us

to acknowledge our collusion with the forces of racism and imperialism… far from simplifying the issues, it complicates the questions of freedom and justice globally because it means, then, that we have to look at what black people are doing to each other… that we have to problematize nationalism beyond racism in all kinds of ways.[77]

Recognizing that her own biography and family history are threads of the greater history of white supremacy, she says:

I grew up in racial apartheid where there was a color caste system so that obviously I knew, through my own experiential reality, that it was not just what white people do to black people that is wounding and damaging to our lives. I knew that when we went over to my grandmother's house, who looked white, who lived in a white neighbourhood, called my sister blacky because she was dark and her hair looked nappy… my sister would sit on a corner and cry or not want to go over there. I knew that there is some system here that is hurting this little girl that is not directly the direct hit from a white person.[78]

Farhad Dalal has eloquently demonstrated the evolution of the significations of colour. According to Dalal, in its trajectory, colour transcended the linguistic (literal) meaning in which it signified objects of a particular colour into a mythical meaning in which it came to signify aesthetics, morality and value. An observable pattern of glorification of whiteness and demonization of blackness, of whitening and blackening things, people and emotions emerged in the 18th Century. This trend went beyond signifying objects to signifying phenotypic human traits, then to signifying more and more human traits such as character, desire, emotions, legality, morality, value and worth. White became beautiful, good, legal, moral, pure and right. So did Europe. Black became the opposite of all these significations: bad, evil, illegal, immoral, impure and ugly. So did Africa. Fanon makes this point quite forcefully:

[O]ne is Negro to the degree to which one is wicked, sloppy, malicious, instinctual. Everything that is opposite of these Negro modes of behaviour is white…. In the collective unconscious, black = ugliness, sin, darkness, immorality. In other words, he is Negro he who is immoral. If I order my life like that of a moral man, I simply am not a Negro…. Colour is nothing, I do not even notice it, I know only one thing, which is the purity of my conscience and the whiteness of my soul.[79]

Cultures and languages have now become littered with negatively cathected ideas of blackness: "black listed," "black death," "black market," "black magic," "black mass,"

"blackmail," etc – not to mention the idiomatic phrases. Dalal indicates that this blackening process is retrospective in character. For example, until the 1860s the so-called "black death" had simply been referred to as "the great plague". The negativity of blackness has become canonized and lexicalized officially in authoritative corpuses. In the Oxford Dictionary black is:

> Of the very darkest colour; the opposite of white; without light, completely dark; (of tea or coffee) without milk; of a race that has dark skin; of black people; very dirty; covered with dirt; without hope; very sad or depressing; very great despair; full of anger or hatred; evil or wicked; (of humour) intended to be funny but about TRAGIC or terrible things; (of goods, etc) not to be handled by trade union members while others are on strike.[80]

The historical blackening of evil, vice and negative emotions, on the one hand, and the historical whitening of good, virtue and positive emotions, on the other hand, developed in tandem with each other as two sides of a coin, so to speak. The canonization and lexicalization of the negativity of blackness in opposition to the positivity of whiteness in people's common sense knowledge – into the natural and the obvious – into what everybody knows – into culture and language – into the tradition of users and makers of culture and language to accomplish various ends, including the structuring of everyday life – into "people's behaviour and feelings and social character – what sociologists now fashionably call 'habitus'"[81] – all this is the function of asymmetric power relations between the established and the outsiders. Dalal succinctly writes:

> First, the associations of positivity and negativity with whiteness and blackness are not natural in any sense, but developed within the context of a field of power relations. Second, the evidence [demonstrates] that the terms black and white have become increasingly ubiquitous over the last thousand years, penetrating, organizing and *structuring* all aspects of existence, both internal and external. The terms, *for they are no longer just colours*, tag all sorts of things, by colour coding them, and so locate them on a dual grid of morality and desire. Third, this has resulted in the English language itself becoming colour coded. Fourth, the fact that emotions that are disapproved of start becoming coloured black at about the same time that the European imperialist adventure is taking place, is powerfully suggestive that in this process we are witnessing the mutation of aspects of the psyche in response to changing structures and the preoccupations of society. [82]

In keeping with Elias' thesis, this means that as society becomes colour coded the psyche also becomes colour coded, for what is society if not a way of living together? This is

clear unless one believes that society is an external and virtual entity that exists in and of itself apart from the human beings who form it – that is, unless one does not believe that society is nothing but an abstraction of historically specific and situated living/behavioural patterns of human beings in time and space.

NATIONAL CHARISMA, FOREIGN DISGRACE

To sum up, I have discussed the processes through which natives constitute themselves as an establishment of citizens, which in turn enables them to construct and mobilize the figure of *makwerekwere* against those perceived as outsiders. I have argued that the national building projects seek to overcome South Africa's divisive history and mythologize antagonistic groups into a unified imagined community, a community of the nationally established. The process of establishment relies on the cultivation of these historically divided groups' ability to imagine themselves as one with each other, as a nation of South Africans. This way, difference is repressed whilst sameness is exaggerated.

Drawing on Elias' theory of the established and the outsiders, I propose to call group charisma of citizens on the national scale "national charisma", and group disgrace of non-citizens on the same scale "foreign disgrace." The social processes described above do not simply provide for the imagination of community among the citizens. They also represent the formation of national charisma among the citizens and the projection of negativity (disgrace) on to *makwerekwere*, the non-citizen outsiders. As a group, the citizens reserve to themselves self-idealizations while subjecting non-citizen outsiders to vilification. Thus with the ideology of exceptionalism the citizens imagine themselves, and indeed project themselves to world, as an island of beauty, civilization, grace, good governance, morality, order, prosperity and success in a vast sea of barbarism, chaos, corruption, decay, degeneration, disgrace, disorder, failure, immorality, rot, shame and ugliness. The ideology of exceptionalism enables South Africa to adorn itself with positive attributes while projecting negativity to Africa. Cathacted with negativity, Africa is experienced as a threat. Fear of contamination informs the neophyte citizens' aversion to non-citizen outsiders from the greater continent. Therefore, while novice establishment

98

asserts its Africanness and celebrates African Renaissance thus embracing Africa, the embrace is far weaker than rejection of which exceptionalism is symptomatic.

Nation building and rainboism create mutual identification among citizens wherein they experience themselves as one with each other. However, the logic of nation building and rainbowism alienates citizens from non-citizens thus creating mutual des-identification between the groups. In its bid for nation building, the TRC suppressed the stories of destruction, death and misery caused by apartheid in the southern African states. Further, the stories of struggle against apartheid throughout the continent hardly enter the gossip channels through which the discourse of South African nationalism flows. These stories are suppressed, creating not only the perception that South Africans alone were victims of apartheid but also the conception of African non-citizens as wanting to enjoy undeserved post-liberation spoils. This does not simply render non-citizens as outsiders but positions them as opportunists, and as a threat to the emerging national body. As I hope to discuss elsewhere, in climate like this, campaigns such Proudly South African create the impression that, like non-citizens from elsewhere in the continent, foreign commodities take away jobs from citizens.

As Neocosmos indicates, the monopolization of the definition of the aims and the course of the anti-apartheid struggle, the monopolization of the negotiation process, and ultimately the monopolization of the state, by the exiled elite ensured that their autochthonous construction of citizenship prevailed over the masses' inclusive construction of citizenship. This also ensured that nation building is controlled and led by the elite-controlled state. As Elias has observed, within a figuration the aristocracy (or good society) not only forms sees itself as the state but also sees itself as both the nation and its guardian.[83] Good societies have historically set the standards and ideals that then spread, as in water tower, across the lower sections.[84] In South Africa, the black good society's construction of citizenship – the exclusive, autochthonous citizenship – has spread across the lower tiers of society.

What Neocosmos describes as the urbanization of the struggle functioned to the same effect. In their bid to reject peasantization imposed on them by the apartheid state, the aspiring black elite increasingly associated peasant life with negativity, i.e. backwardness, illiteracy, oppression, etc. In this context, the peasant migrant workers

represented the backwardness of rural life worlds and acquired an increasingly negative badge as sustainers of apartheid. Thus, the end of apartheid increasingly came to mean the end of migrant work. Since the mining industry recruited a lot of its labour from the surrounding states, the foreign worker became the increasingly vilified peasant who willingly supported apartheid with his labour. As the anti-apartheid struggled dragged on, the negativity of peasant life – backwardness, dirt, illiteracy, ignorance, stupidity, superstition, traditionalism, etc. – was simply projected from South Africa to southern Africa where many migrant workers came from. South Africa now appeared as urban, while the north appeared as rural and backward. Logically, the end of apartheid and democratization increasingly meant the exclusion of these workers from South Africa. The stigmatization of migrant labour formed the basis of group disgrace of migrant workers, the majority of whom were from rural southern Africa. Therefore democratization of South Africa amounted to elimination (e.g. deportation) of migrants, meaning sealing off the nation from the greater region.[85]

NOTES

[1] M. Neocosmos 2006, *From 'Foreign Natives' to 'Native Foreigners': Explaining Xenophobia in Post-Apartheid South Africa*, p. 12. Hereafter *From 'Foreign Natives'*.
[2] Statistics South Africa 2006, *Mind-year Population Estimates*. Http://statssa.gov.za/publications/P0302/P03022006.pdf.
[3] A. Emery 2004, "Sources of Social Power and Democratization in South Africa", Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, San Francisco, CA, Aug. 14. Http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p110809_index.html.
[4] The disintegration of "whites only" spaces has been long in the making. It would be reasonable to say, however, that it accelerated in the 1980s when the irrationalities of apartheid proved more and more unsustainable.
[5] See A. Adedeji 1996 "Within or Apart?" in Adebayo Adedeji, ed. *South Africa and Africa: Within or Apart?* London: Zed Books; Cole, E. 1967 *The House of Bandage*. New York: Randon House; Peberdy, S. 1999 "Selecting Immigrants: Nationalism and National Identity in South Africa's Immigration Policies, 1910 to 1998. PhD Dissertation, Queen's University, Kingston.
[6] T. Mbeki 1996, "I Am an African".
[7] Ibid.
[8] Ibid.
[9] T. Mbeki 1998, "The African Renaissance".
[10] Ibid.

[11] Maphalala, J. 28 February 1999 "African intellectuals Must Talk to the Masses in Their Home Languages," *City Press*.

[12] Mamaila, K. 19 June 2001, "The Message Is Passing the Ordinary Voter by," *The Star*.

[13] J. Aitchison and A. Harley 2004, *South African Illiteracy Statistics and the Case of the Magically Growing Number of Literacy and ABET Learners.* Centre for Adult Education, University of KwaZulu Natal. Http://www.ukzn.ac.za/cae/caepubs/JJWAAH04.pdf.

[14] B. Anderson 1991, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism.*

[15] H. Gilliome's book *The Afrikaners: Biography of a People* is an outstanding chronicle of turbulent relations between the Afrikaners and the English in South Africa.

[16] H. Giliomee 2003, *The Afrikaners: Biography of a People.*

[17] H. Adam et al. 1998, *Comrades in Business: Post-Liberation Politics in South Africa.*

[18] M. Mamdani 1996, *Citizens and Subjects: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism.*

[19] The polarization of social groups in South Africa does not mean that the groups did not form webs of interdependencies with each other. For generations the groups were locked in multilayered and multifaceted racially based established-outsiders figurations. These interdependencies, however, were predominantly instrumental, formed out of necessity. Malicious emotions such as anger, envy, fear, hatred and resentment oiled the wheels of South African figuration. For more see H. Adam and H. Gilliome 1979, *Ethnic Power Mobilized: Can South African Change?* New York: Yale University Press; H. Adam 1971, *Modernization Racial Domination: The Dynamics of South African Politics,* Berkeley: University of California Press.

[20] B. Anderson 1991, *Imagined Communities.*

[21] E. Hobsbawn and T. Ranger 1983, *The Invention of Tradition.*

[22] See A. Habib 1996, "Myth of the Rainbow Nation: Prospects for the Consolidation of Democracy in South Africa;" G. Baines, 1998 "The Rainbow Nation? Identity and Nation Building in Post-Apartheid South Africa;" N. Valji, 2003 "Creating the Nation: The Rise of Violent Xenophobia in the New South Africa" – Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation.

[23] Quoted in N. Valji 2003, "Creating the Nation: Creating the Nation: The Rise of Violent Xenophobia in South Africa".

[24] Quoted in N. Valji 2003, "Creating the Nation".

[25] T. Mbeki 1998, "The African Renaissance".

[26] Ibid.

[27] G. Baines 1998, "The Rainbow Nation?"; I. Filatova 1997, "The Rainbow Against the African Sky or African Hegemony in a Multi-Cultural Context?"

[28] G. Baines 1998, "The Rainbow Nation?"; N. Valji 2003, "Creating the Nation".

[29] G. Baines 1998, "The Rainbow Nation?"

[30] Quoted in N. Valji 2003, "Creating the Nation".

[31] N. Valji 2003, "Creating the Nation".

[32] When I lived in South Africa (from 1994 to 2000) the *Simunye, We Are One* slogan was revised every December. The revision is an ongoing yearly practice. One needs only to watch SABC1, for example, for a few minutes at any time of the day of night to hear or see the slogan played.

[33] *Cape Argus,* 14 December 2001.

[34] *The Star,* 22 September 2003.

[35] *Sowetan*, 23 September 2004.

[36] *The Star,* 22 September 2003.

[37] *Sunday Tribune,* 21 September 2003.

[38] D. Black and J. Nauright 1998, *Rugby and the South African Nation: Sport, Culture, Politics and Power in the Old and New South Africa,* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

[39] N. Valji 2003, "Creating the Nation".

[40] B. Hamber, D. Nageng and G. O'Malley 2000, "'Telling it like it is…' Survivors' Perceptions of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission", *Psychology in Society* 26: 18-42; B. Hamber 2002. "'Ere their story die': Truth, Justice and Reconciliation in South Africa", *Race and Class* 44(1):61-79.

[41] Quoted in N. Valji 2003, "Creating the Nation".

[42] Ibid.

[43] Ibid.

[44] M. Neocosmos 2006, *From 'Foreign Natives'*; N. Valji 2003, "Creating the Nation."

[45] The term "good society" refers to social formations that make up social establishments and is not a moral comment. The term was used in the manners books of the 18th century. Elias introduced the term in sociology. In his book *The Germans*, he defined 'the good society' in this way:

> 'Good societies' are a specific type of social formation. They form everywhere as correlates of establishments which are capable of maintaining their monopoly position longer than a single generation, as circles of social acquaintance among people of families who belong to these establishments. … In Britain there is a 'high society' with a long tradition, where, until recently, the court was the pinnacle of the hierarchy and at the same time the centrepiece which integrated it … When the integration of a country is incomplete or belated, as was the case in Germany, many local 'good societies' develop; none, however, gains undisputed precedence over all the others and becomes the authoritative source for the behavioural code or the criteria of membership for all the others (1996: 49).

In *The Established and Outsiders*, Elias and Scotson used the term "the minority of the best" to refer to these social formations. In South Africa, the social formation dubbed "Black Diamonds" is an example of a good society. The pinnacle of this social formation features tycoons such as Cyril Ramophosa and ***Tokyo*** Sexwale and others who left active politics for business. In their book *Comrades in Business*, Adam and his associates have demonstrated how far the ANC and their allies have gravitated farther and farther from the ideas of the liberation struggle. Wouters (1998) has done a comparative study of German, British and American good societies.

[46] Quoted in M. Neocosmos 2006, *From 'Foreign Natives',* p. 58.

[47] Ibid. p. 59.

[48] To my knowledge, the majority of ANC leaders at the time were either in jail or in exile. The ANC exiled elite include, to mention a few, prominent personalities such as Alfred Nzo, Cyril Ramaphosa, Mac Maharaj, Thabo Mbeki, Tokyo Sexwale, Trevor Manuel.

[49] M. Neocosmos 2006, *From 'Foreign Natives',* p. 66.

[50] Ibid.

[51] Ibid.

[52] H. Adam et al. 1998, *Comrades in Business,* p. 61.

[53] Quoted in M. Neocosmos 2006, *From 'Foreign Natives,'* p. 68.

[54] M. Neocosmos 2006, *From 'Foreign Natives,'* p. 66.

[55] Ibid.

[56] Ibid. p. 20-1.

[57] F. Fanon 1990, *The Wretched of the Earth.* London: Penguin Books.

[58] M. Neocosmos 2006, *From 'Foreign Natives',* p. 19.

[59] N. S. Ndebele 1994 [1984], *South African Literature and Culture*, p. 26.

[60] Ibid.

[61] Ibid. p. 24-5.

[62] Ibid. p. 26.

[63] Ibid.

[64] M. Neocosmos 2006, *From 'Foreign Natives'*, p. 23.

[65] Ibid.

[66] N. S. Ndebele 1994[1984], *South African Literature and Culture*, p. 55-6.

[67] M. Neocosos 2006, *From 'Foreign Natives'.*

[68] M. Mamdani 1996, *Citizens and Subjects;* M. Neocosmos, *From 'Foreign Natives'.*

[69] M. Neocosos 2006, *From 'Foreign Natives,'* p. 5.

[70] N. Lazarus 2004, "The South African Ideology", p. 610.

[71] Ibid.

[72] Ibid.

[73] Ibid. p. 611.

[74] A. Blok 1998, "The Narcissism of Minor Differences."

[75] b. hooks, http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OQ-XVTzBMvQ&feature=related.

[76] Ibid.

[77] Ibid.

[78] Ibid.

[79] F. Fanon 1967, *Black Skins, White Masks,* p. 192.

[80] *Oxford Advanced Lerner's Dictionary of Current English,* Fifth Edition, 1997.

[81] S. Mennell 2007, *The American Civilizing Process,* p. ix.

[82] F. Dalal 2002, *Race, Colour*, p. 168-9; italics in the original.

[83] N. Elias 2000, *The Civilizing Process.*

[84] N. Elias 2000, *The Civilizing Process;* C. Wouters 1998, "Etiquette Books and Emotion Management in the Twentieth Century".

[85] M. Neocosos 2006, *From 'Foreign Natives'*; N. S. Ndebele 1994[1984], *South African Literature and Culture.*

V. CITIZENS ON THE OFFENSIVE

What are the practices through which the citizens, enabled by their established position, construct the figure of *makwerekwere?* What are the exclusionary practices through which they police their social spaces to keep the imagined *makwerekwere* at a social distance? This chapter seeks to expose the ways in which the figure of the *makwerekwere* is generated through citizens' attitudes and practices of exclusion. Focus will be on some of the exclusionary practices – by the state and the civil society – vis-à-vis those who are imagined as *makwerekwere*. The state institutions discussed include the department of home affairs, the national defence force, and the police service, while the civil society institutions include churches, banking services, workplaces and community organizations. Although the police service is part of the state, I assigned it a section of its own and I open the discussion with it due to its ubiquity in the lives of foreign nationals and its reported collusion with the criminal section of civil society.

Since many of the antiforeigner practices described in this chapter often violate laws stipulated in the legal documents of the land, it is imperative to enumerate at the outset the specific clauses in question. Concerning detention and deportation of undocumented immigrants, Article 34(1) of the Immigration Act 2002 states that "an *illegal foreigner*" maybe be deported provided the following conditions are met:

> The *foreigner* concerned –
>
> (a) shall be notified in writing of the decision *to deport* him or her and of his or her right to appeal such decision in terms of *this Act;*
>
> (b) may at any time request any officer attending to him or her that his or her detention for the purpose of *deportation* be confirmed by warrant of a *Court,* which, if not issued within 48 hours of such request shall cause the immediate release of such *foreigner;*
>
> (c) shall be informed upon arrest or immediately thereafter of the rights set out in the preceding two paragraphs, when possible, practicable and available in a language that he or she understands;
>
> (d) may not be held in detention for longer than 30 calendar days without a warrant of a Court which on good and reasonable grounds may extend such detention for an adequate period not exceeding 90 calendar days, and
>
> (e) shall be held in detention in compliance with minimum *prescribed* standards

protecting his or her dignity and relevant human rights.[1]

Article 27 of the Refugees Act 1998 states that a refugee "enjoys full legal protection, which includes the rights set out in Chapter 2 of the Constitution and the right to remain in the Republic in accordance with the provisions of this Act"; "is entitled to an identity document"; "is entitled to a South African travel document"; "is entitled to seek employment"; "and is entitled to the same basic health services and basic primary education which the inhabitants of the Republic receive from time to time."[2]

Article 19 (1) and (2) of the Refugees Acts places restrictions on detention of refugees:

> No person may be detained in terms of this Act for a longer period than is reasonable and justifiable and any detention exceeding 30 days must be reviewed immediately by a judge of the High Court of the provincial division in whose area of jurisdiction the person is detained, designated by the Judge President of that division for that purpose and such detention must be reviewed in this manner immediately after the expiry of every subsequent period of 30 days.

> The detention of a child must be used only as a measure of last resort and for the shortest appropriate period of time.[3]

The Constitution of South Africa states:

> We, the people of South Africa,
> Recognise the injustices of our past;
> Honour those who suffered for justice and freedom in our land;
> Respect those who have worked to build and develop our country; and
> *Believe that South Africa belongs to all who live in it, united in our diversity*.[4]

THE POLICE SERVICE

The police service is a ubiquitous state institution that engages citizens and non-citizens on everyday basis. It permeates numerous aspects of the lives of its charges. Therefore it is worth discussing its operations in the lives of non-citizens at length. Evidence suggests that its personnel tend to discriminate populations on the basis of citizenship: citizens and non-citizens are engaged in different ways. As I will discuss, in many cases police services are simply denied to non-citizens, or are offered in exchange for bribes. Crime against non-citizens is often treated with inaction or indifference. Non-citizens who have reported criminal acts committed against them were greeted by a denial of justice or due

process. On occasion the police unleash outright violence against foreign nationals – e.g. in 2000, a group of policemen set dogs on detained Mozambican youths, punching and kicking them, while filming the event.[5] Aversive statements – "Makwerekwere go home"; "Go back where you came from"; "What are you doing here in South Africa?"; "We don't want you here"; "We're tired of you"; "You're taking our jobs" – constitute the customary police response when immigrants report crimes committed against them. Foreign nationals who participated in this study were unanimous in seeing the police as anti-immigrant. For example, a Congolese national had this to say: "The police here in South Africa protect only South Africans, only citizens. If you are a citizen you're protected even if you're wrong." She went on to tell this story:

> Another day at my work there was a manager, very small guy. He got the job simply because he's citizen. There was another guy who invested the money in the business. But they beat badly that guy [the investor] until he began to have caesuras; white stuff coming out of his mouth and his nose. But they continued to beat him. The man started to urinate in his pants. So they called the police… their friends. When the police arrived they asked why they did not put him in the fridge. Can you imagine! A man is dying and all the police can say is why they did not put him in the fridge. When I asked why they did not get an ambulance, the police simply said he should be left like that. "He's a foreigner. And he's just here to make money." Citizens beat and kill foreigners but the police offer no protection. Instead they side with criminals because they're citizens.[6]

As I will show in this later on, evidence suggests that the police hold negative views about immigrants, legal or illegal, that police practices not only create but are also informed by the imaginary figure of *makwerekwere*. My research assistant, who was a citizen, secured an interview with a group of seven police. When he asked them to comment on immigration, the officers reduced the subject down to decrying "foreigners who come to our country illegally," with stress on "zero tolerance" toward "illegals". When asked whether they thought immigration had any positive aspects, they strongly felt South Africa would be well off with a complete ban on immigration.[7] Their ideal Rainbow Nation was South Africa free of immigrants. In 2004 the Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation (CSVR) released a survey on diversity and transformation among South African Police Service (SAPS) in Johannesburg and area. The police officers that participated in the CSVR survey held strikingly similar views to those held by the seven police officers in this study. Among the questions asked in the CSVR survey

was: "Are most undocumented immigrants in Johannesburg involved in crime?" While 87.1 percent strongly agreed, only 11.4 percent strongly disagreed. Of all black police officers involved in the survey, 91.6 percent strongly agreed. Of all white officers who participated in the survey, 69.5 percent strongly agreed. One police officer is quoted in the survey declaring:

> We do not want illegal foreigners in this country because they cause a lot of serious crimes, don't pay tax and it is often difficult to solve a crime caused by illegal immigrants because of lack of their fingerprints. We can never solve especially serious crimes because of these faceless people who do not even have a physical address where we can find them…whenever we suspect that they are illegal we arrest them and in many instances they try to be clever by producing fake papers…we tear those up in front of them to frustrate their efforts and send them to Lindela.[8]

Consequently, from the immigrants' perspective, policing is not a set of technologies of order and protection. Policing is rather viewed as an apparatus of violence – the cause of fear, hate, panic and suspicion in immigrant quarters. Another study found that non-South Africans living or working in Johannesburg report having been stopped by the police far more frequently than South Africans; that 71 percent of refugees interviewed had been stopped by the police, as opposed to 47 percent of South Africans.[9] Antipathy toward the figure of *makwerekwere* appears to have taken on the character of a just national cause, very much conflated with nation building in the official and unofficial public discourse.

Arrests

It appears that many South Africans do not measure up to the profile of the imagined citizen. They are black and do not have identity documents. There are indications that the police frequently arrest, detain and deport citizens who appear to fit the profile of the imagined non-citizen. According to the South African Human Rights Commission, one in five "illegal immigrants" detained at Lindela repatriation centre in 2000 was in fact a citizen who could not produce his or her identity document.[10] Another study estimated that about 30 percent "of people arrested by police on suspicion of being illegal immigrants are in fact South Africans" who are "picked up because they are too dark and they happen to be in the wrong place at the wrong time."[11] The police themselves have

been victims of this witch-hunting. "Bizarrely," writes Masuku, "even off-duty police officials who are unable to produce their identification run the risk of being apprehended and detained."[12] Indeed, a black police captain recounted the experience of tasting his own medicine:

> I was drinking at a tavern when police raided the place. I told them I was a police official…but these guys arrested me for failing to follow instructions from a police official and for being illegal in the country. I was locked up for the whole night until someone I knew at the police station alerted them that they had arrested a police official.[13]

Stories of unwarranted arrests and detention were common among my interviewees. One of them related how he was once arrested:

> I lost my papers. I went to the police for an affidavit so that I could go back to home affairs to ask for the replacement of my lost papers. But I fell sick and did not have enough time to go home affairs to ask for the replacement of the papers that I lost. When I went to home affairs they told me to go back to the police to ask for another police affidavit because the one I had had expired. When I went back to the police to ask for a new affidavit, the police arrested me.[14]

Such stories are consistent with those reported in other studies. For example, in Petkou's study a Sierra-Leonean national related a similar story about how he was arrested:

> My permit was to expire the following day so I decided to go for renewal. On my way approaching the Civic Theatre a police car approached me and stopped next to me. The driver asked me where I was going and I told him, I am going to renew my permit. He asked to see the permit and when I showed him, he said it is expired. He came out of the car and handcuffed me, put me in the car and drove to the Yeovilled police station where I was locked up. I was released after two days when my friends intervened and bribed the police officials.[15]

The press is also littered with arrest stories. The weekly *Mail & Guardian* reported that "[r]efugees trying to renew their permits risk not only being picked up by the police, but also the possibility of detention by the Department of Home Affairs."[16] The weekly also reported in May 2000 that "Nearly all the refugees and asylum seekers outside the office have similar complaints: of police tearing up permits and arresting them, or of officials refusing to renew permit and constantly telling them to come back tomorrow."[17] Non-

citizens are arrested frequently "from the queue outside the [Home Affairs] office" for expired permits.[18]

Police cruelty

The state's practices of space policing have allowed regular arrests, detentions, and repatriations of suspected non-citizens. The police and the army in partnership with the department of home affairs are charged with carrying out these activities. The detainees are often denied their constitutional right to challenge their arrest, detention and deportation in the court of law. Before being deported, detainees are kept in a privately run detention camp in Lindela west of Johannesburg and in police cells throughout the country. There are no facilities for children or for women with children. The removal of "illegals" from South African social spaces ensures their exclusion from accessing government services.[19] At the beginning of 2000, the state announced its "US-style bid to rid SA of illegal aliens."[20] Following this announcement, the police launched what so far could be the nastiest campaign against "illegals" in post-apartheid South Africa: "Operation Crackdown" and "Operation Monazite." The description of the campaign is strikingly reminiscent of ethnic-cleansing campaigns in recent history.

> In March, 144 suspected 'illegal immigrants were arrested in Johannesburg, fourteen in Soweto, 212 persons on the West Rand including 92 suspected 'illegal immigrants', 235 alleged 'illegal immigrants' were arrested in Mpumalanga region, and 87 in Pretoria…. In the last instance 14,000 people were searched and over 1000 arrested including many South Africans suspected of being 'illegal immigrants'…. In a two month period of 'Operation Crackdown', 10,000 suspected 'illegal aliens' were arrested, 7,000 of whom were taken to Lindela [detention camp].[21]

From the hunt to arrest to detention to deportation, physical and emotional abuses accompany the victims. This treatment of detainees is predicated on a number of assumptions. First, the detainees are guilty and can never prove themselves innocent – for example, "there have been ongoing reports of non-nationals having their identity papers confiscated or destroyed to justify an arrest."[22] Second, the detainees, the "illegals", have no rights whatsoever in South Africa. Third, the state shuns "illegals" and has no responsibility over their lives or deaths. These assumptions enable the police to disrespect

and humiliate their victims with impunity. Police searches and arrests are rough and aggressive or outsight violent. In detentions, the victims are ordered in physically torturous postures.

On 6 March 2007, I travelled by bus from Johannesburg to Maputo. Due to visa complications in Ressano Garcia, the Mozambique's border post, the bus crew abandoned me and drove off to Maputo without me. When the visa problem was finally resolved, I took a minibus taxi to complete my trip. But as it turned out, the ordeal became a blessing in disguise. My fellow passengers in the minibus taxi were all Mozambican youths who had just been dumped at border post by the South African police. I asked whether their trip from Johannesburg to Ressano Garcia had until then been pleasant. They cringed. They told me it had been cruel. The police, they said, had made them sit for 12 hours with their upper bodies bent forward and heads turned down toward the floor between the knees. There was no space between the bodies. They were not allowed to look up or straighten their backs. Anyone who wanted to look up or straighten his back had to be prepared to pay either in cash or in beatings. They also said the police offered to release those who were willing to pay. Those who paid for release were thrown out the train in motion. Since its inception in 1994, the ANC government has been doing this consistently. Victims in other studies have reported the same practice:

> We are made to squat with our head between our legs [sitting chafkop]. The police sjambok us on the train to make sure we keep our heads down. They ask if we have money and they beat us all the way to Ressano Garcia [the Mozambican border post]. It takes a long time, but about ten hours. We have to sit like that the whole time. It gets very painful and people get swollen. Many people bleeding, many people become unconscious. The police just laugh. If you straighten your head, you have to pay fifty rands, or you get beaten.[23]

Concerning the demand for bribes for release during deportation, Harris reports:

> Kenneth Simango, an illegal immigrant' bribed a guard to let him jump from the window of a moving train deporting him back to Mozambique. While he was waiting in a line for his turn to 'escape', Simango saw a small leap from the train. He heard a heavy thud and saw sparks. Simango is certain the man fell under the train and was crushed.[24]

Another immigrant explained:

110

When you don't pay, then they send you to Maputo; but if you pay you can stay. When they send people on the train to Maputo, there are police on the train. You can pay them there and they let you off the train. They push you off the moving train. People are scared of the moving train. People hurt themselves on their legs, their hands and their arms. I know someone who lost an arm because of this. His hand fell underneath the train when they pushed him off and so he had to have his arm amputated. This person is no longer in South Africa because he cannot find a job.[25]

According to Harris, "not only are people allowed to jump off the trains for money," but the police also forcibly confiscate money from detainees, then pushing or throwing them off the trains. A Mozambican immigrant explained: "I had R250 hidden in my collar. They [the officials] took it and pushed me off the train. I hit my head and face and I was coughing blood. We heard a woman screaming as she was thrown onto the trucks. The train cut off both her legs."[26] The SAHRC report on open hearings on xenophobia also indicated that "[f]or those facing deportation, there were reports of foreigners paying to jump off moving trains."[27]

At Lindela camp detainees are subjected to cruelty including physical and emotional abuses. Lindela supposedly has capacity for 4,000 detainees. However, according to the SAHRC, the camp is always overcrowded even when it is operating under capacity, because detainees are packed like sardines in one section while the rest of the camp is kept empty.[28] In 2000 the SAHRC reported that deaths of detainees were fairly frequent at Lindela.[29] According to SAHRC, in 2003 alone Lawyers for Human Rights (LHR) investigated 16 cases of death at Lindela, for which the commonest causes were meningitis and pneumonia.[30] But the security guards' brutality – e.g. physical violence such as beatings – has often been the cause of detainee deaths. On 10 March 2002, the weekly *Sunday Times* carried a headline saying, "five staff members jailed for bloody murder at Lindela."[31] They had fatally assaulted a 25-yeal-old Nigerian detainee: "He had severe head, back and chest injuries as well as lacerations from barbed wire," said the weekly. Detainees are woken up two to five times at night for "security reasons." Security guards enter the rooms beating up those who are "slow in waking up."[32] It is supposedly unlawful to detain anyone for more than 30 days. A high court is supposed to review detentions exceeding 30 days. However, Lindela repatriation camp is a

dyscivilized space that operates as if these laws did not exist. At the camp detainees live within a state of exception just as all non-citizens' life worlds in the country are within what some might see as a perpetual state of exception. As Agamben points out, state of exception is "a space devoid of law, a zone of anomie in which all legal determinations…are deactivated." [33] According to SAHRC, there are suspicions that the prolongation of detention beyond the 30 days maximum might be "a way of maximizing on the R50 per day they receive per inmate."[34] Jambu Trust, a business consortium belonging to leaders of the ANC Women's League – the ruling party – runs Lindela repatriation camp on behalf of the Department of Home Affairs.[35]

THE STATE

The good society that makes up the state has been complicit in nurturing anti-immigrant sentiments that cut across all social groups. State-led nation-building projects have facilitated the transformation of these sentiments into patriotism, permitting them to grow to violent proportions. Neocosmos rightly argues that South African xenophobia is state-structured and led.[36] As I noted in the preceding chapter, the notion of autochthony championed by the state underpins the construction of citizenship and nation building. Those imagined as allochthones to South Africa are excluded from citizenship – including all the rights and responsibilities tied to it. These exclusionary processes have been part and parcel of postcolonial nation-building since early 1990s. As Bemma Donkoh of the UNHCR stated: "[O]ur refugee protection monitoring activities suggest that xenophobia-related sentiments are increasingly taking on a more sinister and menacing, but subtle form, with public servants selectively victimising refugees, asylum seekers and even those South Africans whom they mistake for foreigners."[37]

The antipathies against non-citizens appear to be strong as they often come to the surface of public discourse. In this context, it appears as if self-restraint abounds among some members of good society, many of whom control the South African state. Thus, members of parliament of all political parties, cabinet ministers and other senior state officials have consistently made inflammatory anti-immigrant statements on the radio, television and the press, particularly during electoral campaigns, laying the blame of unemployment and crime on non-citizens. In what amounted to citizens closing ranks to

keep non-citizens at bay, after the first democratic elections in 1994 the state created an interdepartmental body to deal with the "problem" of "illegal aliens." The objective was to tighten border controls and prevent "illegal aliens" are restrict access to services to citizens. As Peberdy writes:

> In 1994 the government set up an "interdepartmental committee on illegal aliens" with representation from the Department of Home affairs, Justice, Correctional Services, and Foreign Affairs as well as the SAPS,[38] and the SANDF[39] and National Intelligence. Government service providers at provincial, municipal and national levels are introducing measures to control the access of non-citizens to services. The Minister of Home Affairs has called on all government departments to "request the identity documents or passports of all foreigners requesting services subsidized by the government" to "ensure that they do not gain access to services in short supply to our own people."[40]

The Municipal government of Johannesburg introduced a policy restricting access to informal market spaces to citizens.[41] Children of undocumented non-South Africans are denied access to schools. Peberdy indicates that in 1997 the Department of Education in Western Cape "wrote to schools, including private schools, asking them to ensure that all non-South African parents were legally resident before registering their children."[42] In Johannesburg I encountered cases of children who had been denied registration in schools on account of their parents' immigration status. For 10 consecutive years a Congolese refugee has been denied university admission on account of his immigration status. At the Johannesburg General Hospital all non-citizens are required to pay large deposits "before they can receive routine surgical procedures," even if they are permanent residents. The Constitutional Court has frustrated attempts by the Department of Education in the North-West Province to fire all non-South African teachers, many of whom were Africans and Indians.[43]

The home affairs

M. G. Buthelezi,[44] the Minister of Home Affairs throughout the 1990s, has arguably been the bitterest foe of non-citizens and the Department of Home Affairs embodies the state's anti-immigrant feelings. The minister often embarrassed his fellow state officials who might have preferred to keep their sentiments out of the public domain. He has stated that

"in spite of the more official aspects of the policy debate highlighting the benefits of immigration, there are deep, strong undercurrents both within government and political circles and communities alike which feel that, in general, foreigners in our territory are an evil, even though at times an admittedly necessary one."[45]

Buthelezi's introductory speech in parliament in August 1994, after only three months in office, dubbed non-citizens as "illegal aliens". With regard to the "main aims of the RDP [Reconstruction and Development Program] to create job and other opportunities for the citizens of this country", he feared that these opportunities might "end up being taken up by illegal aliens." Ironically he also disdained *aliens'* self-employment, deriding them for "starting their own businesses or … taking up employment with unscrupulous employers". For Buthelezi, "the aliens" also had to be excluded from the informal sector. This led him to consult with the association of informal business to assist the department in dealing with the "aliens" problem in the informal sector. "I am pleased," he told the assembly, "to mention that I have had very fruitful discussions with the South African Chamber of Hawkers and Independent Businesses with regard to aiding the Department in its task of identifying and tracing these people." He accused businesses for condemning "good and honest citizens" to poverty by employing "illegal aliens", threatening to deal with them "very unsympathetically". "[T]hese employers of illegal aliens," he said:

> Can and will be prosecuted by my Department as they are depriving good and honest citizens of the country of job opportunities. Honourable members can be assured that I shall deal very unsympathetically with employers employing illegal aliens. I am thinking of proposing to Cabinet consideration of legislation which will impose severe punishment for people who employ illegal aliens as it is in fact unpatriotic to employ illegal aliens at the expense of our own people."

Buthelezi called for "all members of the public to aid the Department and the South African Police Services in the detection, prosecution and removal of illegal aliens from the country." The minister made an appeal for the patriotic duty of being on the look-out for the "illegals": "The co-operation of the community is required in the proper execution of the Department's functions"; "[t]he Department is grateful of any assistance and I must emphasize that any information offered to it in this regard will be dealt with

confidentially." According to Buthelezi, identifying, detaining and deporting "illegal aliens" would not only aid "the Department's efforts towards more effective alien control, but it would also be in the interest of all South Africans." Buthelezi also decried the long and inadequately controlled border on land and sea, fearing "aliens" could easily walk, sail or swim their way into the Republic and blend in with the citizenry. Moreover, Buthelezi believed "illegal aliens" were "involved in a variety of criminal activities such as drug-trafficking, prostitution and money-laundering in what can only be described as typical Mafia-activity," which according to him made "alien control with respect to these individuals extremely dangerous." Hence his vow of mercilessness: "It is my aim, with the assistance of the South Africa Police Services and the community at large, to deal effectively and harshly with these people."[46] In 1995, he declared to the National Union of Mineworkers that 'illegal aliens' were responsible for the growing unemployment in the country:

> This situation has been aggravated by the influx of illegal aliens from the neighbouring countries in particular, where conditions of economic deprivation and depression occur and who are consequently prepared to work for meagre wages… with whatever empathy and understanding one may judge the underlying reasons and motivations why people are compelled to leave their fatherland and seek refuge here, the interests of RSA and her citizens and legal residents must our first and foremost consideration.[47]

Home Affairs officials, particularly Buthelezi throughout his incumbency, have remained consistent in their contempt for non-citizens, airing their sentiments on radio and television. Citing one of them, Neocomos writes:

> [A] Home Affairs official called Mr George Orr in a television talk show on 'illegal immigrants' (South African Broadcasting Corporation Television Channel 1, Two-Way, 13 October 1996) stated without apparently even blushing: 'we will grant a grace period to those who have been in the country for five years or more to apply for permanence residence; after which they ('illegal immigrants') will be hounded, using police to trace them, prosecute employers, deny them health, education services and make life unbearable for them.'[48]

Indeed to be labelled as "illegal immigrant" is to carry an unbearable weight. However, since xenophobia makes no distinction between the "legals" and "illegals", the weight is

thrown upon all black foreign nationals. This is salient when non-citizens seek services

from the home affairs offices. Studies have found that lines are deliberately kept long,

and time deliberately unproductively wasted.[49] The victims become physically exhausted

and psychologically demoralized. Humiliation of non-citizens has become normalized in

home affairs offices where the interactions between the staff and their victims are

mediated through grotesque incivility to ensure that black foreign nationals are not

welcome in South Africa. The SAHRC found this to be true:

> In the Braamfontein DHA [Department of Home Affairs] office one female SDO
> [Status Determination Officer], forced a woman from Cameroon, to get down on
> her knees and beg for forgiveness for some minor infraction. It was then that she
> was assisted. A young mother and child from Sierra-Leone were forced to return
> to the office everyday for two weeks and beg for forgiveness because the young
> woman was allegedly cheeky. A Somali asylum-seeker was forced to sing the
> Somali national anthem down the telephone to an official in Pretoria because an
> SDO at the Braamfontein office suspected he was not Somali because of his
> fluency in English.[50]

In his study, Petkou also found that non-citizens seeking assistance with the home affairs

were greeted by officials with aversion: "You must go back to your country"; "Nigerians

go home"; "Cameroonians go home"; "Kwerekwere stop making noise"; "Why did you

come here"; "When are you going back"; "We don't want you here."[51] In his 1997

budget speech, Buthelezi reiterated his position, this time with exaggerated estimates:

> With an illegal population estimated at between 2.5 million and 5 million, it is
> obvious that the socio-economic resources of the country, which are under severe
> strain as it is, are further being burdened by the presence of illegal aliens. The cost
> implication becomes even clearer when one makes a calculation suggesting that if
> every illegal costs our infrastructure, say 1000 rands [U.S. $ 200] per annum, then
> multiplied with whatever number you wish, it becomes obvious that the cost
> becomes billions of rands per year.[52]

In 1998 Buthelezi announced in parliament that "if we as South Africans are going to

compete for scarce resources with millions of foreigners who are pouring into South

Africa, then we can bid goodbye to our Reconstruction and Development Programme."

Therefore "it is not surprising that there is in the country a growing resentment of most

foreigners… just as South Africa was coming to grips on how to meet its people's needs

and to develop, it faced a deluge of migrants."[53] In a parliamentary media briefing in Cape Town, 22 August 2002, he spoke of "illegal foreigners" as "a serious problem" who could "carry on being a problem as long as South Africans continue to employ illegal foreigners as cheap labour, rather than employing South African citizens."[54] He declared that "our security efforts must also be placed in detecting and deporting illegal foreigners by enforcing our laws at community level, especially in workplaces."[55] Following its criticism of South Africa's "increasingly xenophobic public culture" and avid consumption of politicians' "unsubstantiated inflammatory statements" in 1998, the Human Rights Watch was accused left and right of wanting "five-star treatment of illegal aliens while more than 50 percent of South Africans were living below the poverty line."[56] And indeed Ike Maphoge, an ex-Mkonto we Sizwe official, now ANC Member of Parliament, asked in August 1999 in parliament why refugees from the neighbouring countries "were being treated so leniently."[57]

The opposition

Formed by members of the good society of South Africa, the opposition parties are also part of the state establishment. Their representatives sit in the parliament and influence the drafting and legislation of the laws of the land. South African opposition parties' position on immigration is similar to that of the Minister of Home Affairs. In its 1998 report, Human Rights Watch noted that National Party (NP) was anti-immigrant. The report cited Frik van Deventer, the NP's spokesperson on Home Affairs, linking immigration and crime, claiming that since 1994 "illegals" were entering the country "in droves" and that "eighty percent of all suspects appearing in court in Johannesburg in connection with drugs are Nigerians." The report cites him blaming the ANC for accommodating "old solidarity friends" thus causing the rise in the influx of "illegals." He called for tougher methods to the problem of "illegals": "Without stricter policies and a sincere political will of the ANC government to resolve these problems, South Africa will lose the drug war and become home to criminal elements and thousands of illegal immigrants."[58] According to the report, the NP blamed "illegals" for snatching jobs away from citizens, worsening poverty, and spreading diseases.

In January 1998 the Human Sciences Research Council released a questionable study claiming that "illegal aliens" cost South Africa R2.75 billion per year ($550 million US). The political parties took the study as gospel truth. Thus on the basis of this study, the Freedom Front (FF) and the NP demanded tougher measures against "illegal aliens." The NP spokesperson Daryl Swanepoel stated that "the cost [of undocumented migration] cannot be justified given the enormous pressure ... to supply our own citizens with basic services."[59] The FF said it would support "all measures" in the fight against the "illegals." M. G. Buthelezi's party, the Inkatha Freedom Party (IFP), urged the government "to take stronger steps against undocumented migrants since September 1994, threatening to organize marches and take 'physical action' if the government fails to respond to the perceived crisis."[60] During the 1999 electoral campaign, parties campaigned on 'illegal aliens." An unnamed NP official declared during the campaign: "[I]t was no good to take R10 million from the budget of the Department of Home Affairs for the Reconstruction and Development Programme when illegal aliens were removing far more than that from the economy by taking jobs away from South Africans."[61]

The army

Speaking of "illegal aliens" as a problem to national security, the minister of defence stepped up border patrols, threatening to raise the voltage on the fence to lethal levels. "[T]he threat we are facing now is not a military one," he said, and "if we are not coping with illegal immigration and our people are being threatened, there will come a time when we will switch on the fence to lethal mode."[62] In its 1998 report, "Prohibited Persons", Human Rights Watch cites an interview in which the Defence Minister Joe Modise closely linked "the problem of illegals" to the rise in crime:

> As for crime, the army is helping the police get rid of crime and violence in the country… We have one million illegal immigrants in our country who commit crimes and who are mistaken by some people for South African citizens. That is the real problem. We have adopted a strict policy and have banned illegal immigration in order to combat the criminals coming from neighbouring states so that we can round up the criminals residing in South Africa.

According to Peberdy, the SANDF allocated 5,000 of its 90,000 troops to border patrols. In 1995 this number was increased to 8,200. In 1996, the South African Airforce allocated an Alouette helicopter and a Cessna light plane in order "to stem the flow of illegal immigrants."[63] In 1997, the Cabinet established an Operational Working Team commissioning it to study the situation of borders and make recommendation for a tighter and more integrated border patrols. This "Team", writes Peberdy, made unsubstantiated claims to the effect that with "the advent of a new [sic] democracy, South Africa was seen as a 'land of milk and honey' by many global citizens" and that "the number of immigrants and the volume of goods, both legal and illegal, entering the country increased substantially." This, the "Team" concluded, had "an extremely negative impact on our country's economy and increasing crime rate."[64] Thus the "Team" recommended that designated points of entry be upgraded; that all applicable legislation be reviewed; that its suggested steps to control corruption" should be taken; that "the question of detention facilities for 'illegals' should be addressed"; and that "a coordinating committee should be set up to increase control at the borders."[65]

VILIFICATION, CRIME AND COMPLICITY

The attitudes and practices of state agents have had vilifying and criminal effects on those construed as *makwerekwere*. Foreign nationals are increasingly viewed negatively and made increasingly vulnerable to crime. State agents have blamed "illegal aliens" for the escalation of crime and violence. For example, in 2002 Billy Masethla, an ANC ex-Director General of Home Affairs made claims to the effect that:

> Approximately 90 percent of foreign persons, who are in the RSA with fraudulent documents, e.g. either citizenship or resident documents, are involved in crimes as well… it is quicker to charge these criminal for their false documentation and then to deport them than to pursue the long route in respect of the other crimes committed.[66]

The reality, however, points to the contrary. Citing Harris' study of SAPS crime statistics, Neocosmos notes: "[I]n 1998 according to police statistics, South African citizens comprised on average ninety-eight percent of all arrests made, foreigners arrested

rarely exceeded one percent in any crime category, actual conviction rates are, of course, much lower."[67] In fact, "[m]any of the non-nationals who are arrested are charged with immigration related offences which are administrative rather than criminal in nature."[68]

Contrary to official and popular opinion, xenophobia in South Africa structures the national social habitus and the everyday world.[69] Aversion to immigrants, particularly African immigrants, dominates the national mood that it is increasingly becoming part of what it means to be South African. This means that anti-immigrant sentiments steer not only the conduct of state officials but also that of the general citizenry, including criminals. Individual criminal acts committed by citizens are personal elaborations of the national sentiment. The SAHRC report indicates:

> Foreigners in South Africa feel particularly vulnerable and physically threatened. In Johannesburg, 81 per cent of non-nationals felt unsafe compared to 38 per cent of South Africans. Foreigners' marginalisation and vulnerability is exploited by criminals, SAPS and unscrupulous South Africans. In addition, there is evidence that the police do not provide non-nationals with adequate protection when their rights have been violated. This reinforces attitudes that foreigners do not belong and are not worthy of protection.[70]

Feelings of insecurity among non-citizens are not unfounded, because contrary to popular beliefs, non-citizens are the social group most vulnerable to crime and exploitation. Studies have shown that non-citizens are far more likely to be victims of crime than are citizens. The SAHRC report declared: "The hearings heard evidence that far from being perpetrators of crime, non-nationals were more likely to be victims of crime than South Africans. Seventy-two per cent of migrants reported that they or someone lived with had been a victim of crime in the country, compared with 56 per cent of South Africans."[71] But these crimes are often viewed with indifference. Regardless of their legal status, non-citizens who approach the police to report offences committed against them risk rejection, aggression, extortion and humiliation. The preferential targeting of non-citizens by criminals is an opportunism that feeds on a public culture that is strongly antiforeigner, particularly police inaction, indifference and hostility toward victims. The following stories – of Burundian and Congolese nationals respectively – illustrate instructively the interdependent relationship between violence against non-citizens and police inaction and indifference. They are worth citing at length:

I was chatting to a Cameroonian friend, and I told him how some names could sound funny: "Imagine somebody called Makwerekwere. One guy in Time Square mistook me for his friend called Makwerekwere." Instead of the laughter I was expecting from him I got a concerned look and this answer: 'Actually, Makwerekwere is you." Me?" I asked. 'You, me, all foreigners…no, well, all black foreigners," he replied, surprised at my naivety. "The next time you hear this word, you must run away from the place," my friend warned. The next time somebody called me by my new name, I felt like running, but I didn't stand a chance because the bulky guy facing me was pointing a gun at me, urging me to get closer to him: "Come on, makwerekwere, come over here." He then asked me if I had a cellphone and if it could be his. The cellphone and money from my shirt changed hands and the guy satisfied with my docility, told me: "Hamba". I did, toward the next police station in Hillbrow, to report the theft. The first policeman I talked to asked me if I was South African. I said: 'No, I am makwerekwere." He burst into a loud laughter and went to call some colleagues, whom he discretely asked to put the same question to me. They got the same answer and laughed uncontrollably. Thanks to the good mood, I got my affidavit quickly. When I was out I heard a mirthful "goodbye Makwerekwere" echoing from inside. So did a policeman who was standing outside the building and who was not part of the hilarious team inside. He came up to me and asked if he could have a look at my documents. They were up to date, he handed them back and said: "Do you have a cold drink for me?" The price of my "makwerekwereness" was not so high.[72]

We were coming from the store one morning. I was wearing jewellery. It was 10.30 in broad day light. We saw three men approaching us. They pointed a gun at us and said: "Give us your cell-phones." The lady that was with me had her cell-phone hidden in her underwear. The criminals knew that women hide their cell-phones in their underwear. They told her to take off her clothes in public in a very busy street. The people saw us and no one did anything. The police were there, too. They saw us. They saw we needed their help. But they, too, didn't do anything. They laughed at us. We don't understand. The police see people molested by criminals in public but they do nothing, they laugh at us instead. Is it just because we are immigrants? It is very sad. They don't just want to steal from you. When you're a woman, they want to steal from you and rape you. If you're a man, they take everything… clothes, shoes, money, documents, and they beat you. Many of us Congolese who came to South Africa died and were buried. Because you can't even open an account you keep all your money at home. The criminals come and take it all.[73]

Evidence suggests that certain sections of the civil society have often been less civil toward those construed as incarnations of the figure of *makwerekwere*, the African non-citizens. They are reports that some institutions and private citizens within the civil society display similar antiforeigner sentiments and behaviour. This section discusses the reported antiforeigner attitudes on the part of these sections of the civil society.

The media and blame-gossip

In its bid to invent and pin a badge of shame and stigma on non-citizens, the state has a reliable partner in the media. The media is xenophobic not least because its journalists and reporters harbour antiforeigner feelings that influence the ways they portray black non-citizens. The media are *national gossip channels*[74] through which antiforeigner narratives flow and reach even the most unlikely in South African hinterlands. The media have contributed significantly for the fast spread and entrenchment of antiforeigner atmosphere in South Africa in the 1990s. Representations of black African foreign nationals in the South African media have been negative. In November 1994, the *Natal Witness* warned: "Illegal immigrants from war-torn and poverty-stricken parts of Africa are flooding into most SA cities."[75] On 6 June 1993, the weekly *Sunday Times* stated: "In one of the biggest apartment blocks in Jo'burg, notices in English and Afrikaans have taken a second place to signs in French and Portuguese as thousands of new migrants from Africa pour into the city."[76] On 29 July of the same year, the *Sowetan* said, "Foreign influx: citizens fear for their job prospects after hordes descend on the country from the troubled north."[77] On 28 August 1994, the *Sunday Times* claimed: "Xenophobia rife as Africans flood SA…" while the *Cape Argus* claimed on 26 April, 1997, claimed that Cape Town was a "haven for victims of Africa's wars and woes."[78] On 29 September 1996, the *Sunday Independent* claimed that "citizens of neighbouring countries flood the home affairs department with applications for legal residence…"[79] On February 5 1997, the *Electronic Mail and Guardian* spoke of "flow of job-seekers from neighbouring countries," while an S. Modise claimed in the *Weekend Star* that "Illegals are helping to turn SA into a banana republic … I want to say that even under the most oppressive

122

conditions we endured under apartheid, our economic conditions were never as bad as in the rest of Africa."[80]

The media has been on the forefront of constructing the law-abiding citizen against the "illegal alien". In the media the state has a patriotic ally, a network of national gossip channels that distribute the anti-immigrant rhetoric. The moral character of non-citizens is attacked through negative headlines such as, but not limited to, "20 'aliens' held in Pta raid", "Illegals: Home affairs blamed", "419 nabbed in crime blitz", "Illegals could do better." One of these articles states:

> [I]llegal women from other countries are flocking to South Africa in huge numbers… this is unacceptable…. How can we reach our goals if we allow illegal immigrants to flock into South Africa and live in shacks, RDP houses, flats and other crowded places when they have their own countries with rich mineral resources? These illegal immigrants should go back to their countries as participate in improving the living conditions there. Once they are back in their countries their needs and wants can be identified, proper strategic planning can be carried out and world-class South African technical experts can help them build their required infrastructure.[81]

The disgracing of immigrants is also accomplished through anti-immigrant radio and television talk shows. Tim Modise is a member of the respectable class. The Institute of Justice and Reconciliation awarded him the prestigious *Reconciliation Award* in 2001. In 2003 he was awarded the *James Brunet Prize* for promoting human rights. He is the president of Proudly South African, a state-business coalition that promotes nation building and South African identity through consumption of made in South Africa commodities. He is listed in Speakers of Note Website where he is described as "Business and the community's first choice when they are looking for an MC, debate chairperson, speaker or issue moderator."[82] The GQ Magazine readers elected him *Best TV and Radio Presenter of the Year*. He also received the *Presidents' Award* from the Institute of People Management. Technikon Pretoria (now Tshwane University) crowned him *Communicator of the Year,* while The Rotary Club presented him with *Paul Harris Award*. Obviously, he is an influential man, and in a country obsessed with celebrities, he is seen as a role model to emulate. When I was in South Africa he was the host of a talk-show named after him at 702 Radio: *The Tim Modise Network*. His show on Nigerians in December 2006 betrayed his anti-immigrant sentiments. Calls poured in from citizens

condemning Nigerians for bringing drugs to South Africa. A man identifying himself as Nigerian called in to protest. "Are you in the country legally?" Tim Modise asked. When the caller said he was, Tim Modisse said: "Are you willing to give me your name, address and telephone number so that the police can check if you're really legal?" In a different talk-show, Tim Modise's replacement Redi Direko jokingly aired her xenophobic sentiments. The talk that day was about the denial of entry visas to South African citizens by western countries. Calls poured in from citizens expressing an outrage that law-abiding citizens should be subjected to such humiliation. A man called in with the view that every country reserved the right to grant or deny entry visa to anyone: "Even Nigeria once denied me an entry visa," he said. In reaction, Redi Direko said: "What! Maybe Nigerians do not want law abiding citizens in their country." One wonders whether sometimes jokes are not manifestations of symptoms of deep-seated emotions that surface from time to time. In South Africa where xenophobia has both breadth and depth, jokes such as this on national airwaves can never be innocent.

These radio shows function as gossip channels through which vilifying terms about immigrants are inserted, reproduced, recycled, aired and consumed throughout South Africa thus stimulating and nurturing anti-immigrant moods. It is striking that even the most enlightened, the least expected, among the South African middle class – the social group from which the talk show hosts come from – are unabashedly xenophobic. Popularly known as role models, the talk show hosts and television presenters are members of the respectable, part of the new black good society. Their opinion carries weight of authority and respect. Their intimations on any subject – whether they are based on fact or fancy or fantasy – land on eager ears of bitter, hopeless, poor and uneducated masses, many of whom go on angry rampages against immigrants, looting their belongings and killing them.

According to Petkou, South Africans' lack of appreciation of immigrants is due to the "immigrant's weak capacity to advocate their views and interests in the country."[83] The issue really is more of access and control of gossip channels. The media are means though which perceptions are shaped, opinion is formed, feelings manipulated and action influenced. The media are channels though which social capital is built and maintained. If powerful groups are to remain powerful they must ensure the monopolization of the

media. Non-citizens do not control the media. They have limited access to them. When the Nigerian national called to insert his views on the gossip channels, the talk show host seemed to accuse him of being an "illegal" and threatening to report him to the police. The talk-show host was in effect policing the access to national gossip channels. Indeed, one Cameroonian noted that "When I was locked in John Vorster police station, they [sic] police people didn't want to hear anything from me."[84] The assumption is one of African non-citizens as illegal, alien, immoral, abnormal, criminal, diseased and undesirable, and with nothing good to say, at least not worth broadcasting. What non-citizens say tend to come across to citizens as evidence of dishonesty, as lies, as distortion, as deception. The established common sense assumes that African immigrants will do anything to mislead the state and the public. The negative stereotyping of immigrants persists amid glaring evidence to the contrary.[85]

Banking services

In the 21st century banking has become a basic human service for anyone engaged in some form of income generating activity. Employers usually pay their employees electronically. In South Africa where safety is constantly assailed, it is risky to carry large amounts of cash. For non-citizens, who are easy targets both by thugs and police, it is even riskier. However, the South African "banking legislation prevents anyone except permanent resident and citizens from opening bank accounts,"[86] forcing many non-citizens to carry large amounts of cash daily. This hangs their lives on the line. The SAHRC elaborates:

> Migrants' inability to access secure banking has manifold consequences. A lack of access to financial services limits the ability of migrants to invest in the city. They are less likely to grow small businesses and create employment for South Africans. Without access to the formal economy, the government is denied revenue. Foreigners struggle to secure their money and are thus more often victims of crime as they are forced to carry their earnings on them personally or hide them in their homes. Many employers require a bank account into which they deposit wages. Those denied banking services are therefore also denied opportunities for employment.[87]

In a different study, non-citizens indicated that lack of access to banking affects many of their basic activities: "Most of the time, we bury our money in our shacks. Even buying a car is a nightmare. One has to use the name of a [South African] neighbour, as one may be arrested for being an immigrant."[88]

Undocumented non-citizens often live in precarious places that are frequently raided both by the police and the civilian citizenry, forcing them to walk around with large amounts of cash. Hence they are popularly known as "walking ATMs." The police and civilians have used their power to extort funds and sex from foreign nationals. The SAHRC report on xenophobia open hearings indicates: "The hearings heard that many police officials are aware that foreigners need to carry their cash on them and thus, 'some police officers have come to see foreigners as mobile ATMs'".[89] This makes them favourite targets "extortion to the extent that in some countries this has been referred to as a 'street tax'".[90] A Congolese national left no doubt that this was an abiding concern:

> The police also can take my money anytime they want. The gang-stars can attack us and take everything. They all know that as refugees we don't have bank accounts. They know we have all the money with us. The money you have in your pocket is all the money you have because even where you stay you're not sure you'll find everything when you come back. So you keep all your money with you.[91]

Religious institutions

Citizens and non-citizens are also divided along religious lines, with one forming its own exclusive religious organization. It its 2005 report on xenophobia hearings, the SAHRC presented evidence of "divided religious groupings." According to the report, in the hearings the church was cited as "sustaining racism and xenophobia and not optimally using religion as an avenue for cultural sharing and integration." The report noted that "[m]any foreigners are forming their own religious organisations to ensure familiar ways of worship in their own languages" and that "[t]hese exclusionary practices perpetuate social isolation."[92]

In fact, exclusive religious organizations represent perhaps the most visible manifestation of a divide that manifests itself in other less visible ways. Let us consider religious worship as a case. I interviewed participants about their participation in

126

religious organizations. I attended some church services myself. My goal was to understand the extent to which participation in religious organizations facilitated interactions between citizens and foreign nationals. Participation in religious organizations was organized in three ways, all of which have characteristic features of established-outsider relations. Nearly all participants in the interviews were churchgoers.

Some participants indicated that they attended religious worship consisting of two different gatherings on the same space but in different times: one fellowship for citizens (the established) first, and another for non-citizens (the outsiders) at a later time. During the fellowship of citizens, the service was conducted entirely in the languages of the establishment, which non-citizens could hardly understand. Where and when non-citizens manifest interested in learning the languages of the establishment, they soon hit the wall. Citizens had closed ranks. Any meaningful inter-group interaction was prevented. Chances for non-citizens to assimilate indigenous cultures and languages were pre-empted. This was despite the everyday complaints by citizens about *Makwerekwere's* inability to look or sound South African. In the fellowship of non-citizens, the entire worship is conducted in outsider languages to which the established citizenry remains entirely indifferent and aloof.

Other participants indicated they attended exclusively non-citizen religious gatherings, and that citizens formed fellowships in which non-citizens did not dare set foot. Here, too, members of each side of the divide remained oblivious about, and indifferent to, what goes on the other side. No member of one side partakes in the comings and goings of the other. Again, the established do things according to their own cultural logic. The outsiders, too, followed their own cultural logic. Members of each side lived as if members of the other side did not exist at all.

Other participants indicated that they attended the same religious fellowships with the established. They shared the space, songs, sermons, scriptures, and the Eucharist. But that was where it all ended. The interaction did not extend beyond the walls of the place of worship. After worship they parted ways to their normal exclusive lives. The established had not invited the outsiders to their homes to share meals, etc. The outsiders also had not invited any of the established to their homes to share meals. There were no social events outside church business in which members of the two groups came together.

And from what I have witnessed, this social arrangement was not about to change. This type of organization occurred in both the mainline and charismatic churches. The tone of the interviews seemed to suggest that members of the two sides came together in church reluctantly.

Aggressive citizenry

In South Africa aggressiveness is not uncommon but rather ubiquitous – e.g. rape or killing of women and infants in domestic settings; bank armed robberies; holding people at gunpoint; housebreaking and theft; abusive language and threats. The United Nations survey for 1998-2000 ranked South Africa second for murder and first for rape per capita.[93] Some insurance companies have delisted and condemned as unworthy of insurance some types of vehicles for being prone to car-hijack.[94] In a survey by the South African Medical Council, one in four South African men admitted to have raped a woman at least once.[95] South Africa's rate of baby and child rape ranks highest in the world.[96] Hence social commentators have referred to South Africa as having a "culture of violence" as its characteristic feature. This culture of violence mediates the relations between common citizens and foreign nationals. Common citizens often take it upon themselves to rid their communities and spaces of unwanted *makwerekwere*. This happened in October 2001:

> [J]ust a short while after the UN Conference against Racism and Xenophobia has been held in South Africa, Zandspruit, an informal settlement in Johannesburg, erupted in an orgy of looting and destruction… One thousand Zimbabweans were made destitute and residents had torched more than one hundred shacks belonging to Zimbabweans…. Local residents had accused Zimbabweans of being involved in crime and of taking jobs away from South Africans.[97]

Three weeks earlier the residents of Zandspruit had complained to the police about "illegal aliens" with accusations of allegedly committing crimes and stealing jobs from citizens. Leslie Mashokwe, a spokesperson of the Home Affairs, stated that in response to the residents' complaint, "officials from the department of home affairs and labour launched a joint operation called Operation Clean Up with the local people and moved into the area to root out the illegal immigrants," claiming that 600 to 700 "illegals" were

rounded up and deported to Mozambique and Zimbabwe.[98] As non-citizens become vulnerable during violence, citizens display predatory behaviour. A Cameroonian national told how armed men took his belongings at gunpoint:

> I had to sleep outside the [home affairs] office in other [sic] to get a good position in the morning. Other guys from Somali [sic] and Ethiopia later on joined me and we were like six of us. It was raining heavily and we had nowhere to go so we had to wait outsider under the rain. Around 2 am [sic] some four guys joint [sic] us and were speaking in Zulu, trying to find out what we were doing outsider the office. They suddenly took out guns and asked us to give them all what we had. They took our cell phones, money, and a jacket from one of the Ethiopians and left.[99]

This Nigerian national was on his way to home affairs to renew his asylum seeker documents when an armed person robbed him:

> Just before I entered Esselen Street, three guys came out of nowhere and surrounded me. I noticed that one of them was carrying a gun so I stood still. They asked me to give them my cell phone, and the money I was carrying. I gave them my phone and they took Rands 200 [sic] from me. They promised to shot [sic] me the next time they meet me, if I am not carrying enough money with me. After moving some few steps away from me, one of them came back to me and asked me to give him my jacket, which I gave without complaining.[100]

In December 1994 and January 1995 the residents of Alexandra Township in Johannesburg decided to clean "makwerekwere" off their streets and communities. They went on a rampage of attacks against non-citizens. Consider the following incident related in the Human Rights Watch report:

> Over a period of several weeks, gangs of South Africans tried violently to evict perceived "illegals" from the township, after blaming undocumented migrants for increased crime, sexual attacks, economic deprivation, unemployment, and other social ills. The attackers claimed to be members of the ANC, the South African Communist Party, and the South African National Civic Organization… The violent campaign was known as *Buyelekhaya* or "go back home." Other groups linked to the violent protests were the Concerned Residents Group of Alexandra and the Alexandra Property Owners Association. The Alexandra Property Owners Association participated in the removal campaign… saying, "We are simply doing the job for the police by handing them [the undocumented migrants] over and asking them to be deported back to their own countries."[101]

…groups of armed men evicted suspected foreigners from their homes in the township and marched them to the local police station, demanding that they be repatriated. In most cases, it appears that the undocumented migrants were indeed repatriated… The possessions of some suspected undocumented migrants were thrown into the street, while other victims told Human Rights Watch that their possessions had been stolen by members of the armed gangs when they were brought to the police station for deportation. Some of the migrants who were released by the police after proving their legal status returned to their homes only to find the locks changed, or to find armed men preventing them from entering their own homes.[102]

I lived in South Africa when these incidents took place. In 1997 anti-immigrant violence broke out again in Johannesburg, this time involving hawkers who attacked non-South Africans after accusing them of taking their business opportunities. The HRW reported these incidents, including the hate statements:

The situation in Johannesburg has remained volatile since the August protests. On October 23, 1997, approximately 500 hawkers marched again in Johannesburg, chanting slogans such as "chase the *makwerekwere* out," and "down with the foreigners, up with South Africans." At a rally following the march, Manikis Solomon, a representative of the Greater Johannesburg Hawkers' Planning Committee, told the crowd that, "These people are not welcome. No country would allow the mess Johannesburg has come to. We must clean up the streets of Johannesburg of foreign hawkers. The pavements of Johannesburg are for South African citizens and not for foreigners."[103]

A flyer announcing the protest obtained by HRW stated: "We want to clean the foreigners from our pavement." [104]A South African hawker interviewed at the time vowed: "[F]oreigners flocked here after the [1994] elections and took our businesses. We will not rest until they are gone." The chairperson of one local hawking group, the Inner Johannesburg Hawkers Committee, Mr. Mannekie Solomon, told the *Sowetan* newspaper: "We are prepared to push them out of the city, come what may. My group is not prepared to let our government inherit a garbage city because of these leeches."[105]

Employers and exploitation

The fact that non-citizens are positioned as people without rights renders them amenable to being blamed for a host of social problems: Aids, stealing jobs, crime, drug trafficking. This whole anti-immigrant mood puts foreign nationals in a vulnerable position. As a

Congolese participant said: "The citizen works less and gets paid more. You the foreigner work more and get paid less. Companies take advantage of this. Citizens are sick of AIDS and can't work and produce 100 per cent."[106] A Zimbabwean participant explained how an employer avoided paying wages:

> Now I don't have a job. But I used to work for a white man who said he would pay us daily. Each day was R50. The first day he paid us 50. But then he did not pay us for another week. So he owed me 250. He never paid us. He just disappeared. He owed R1200 to some of my friends. He took off just like that without paying us.[107]

Similarly, a female Congolese participant reported the same treatment, except that in her case it was worse, for in addition to not being paid, she was subjected to physical violence and required to pay the employer.

> The guy did not pay us. He always said "Sorry I'll pay you tomorrow." The white man called us one morning to his office. He was angry. He said there was money missing. He accused us of stealing money from the counter. But it was all because of poor management. I told him one time that the way things were done in the shop was unprofessional and he said there was no problem. The South African woman who worked with us accused me of stealing the money. The guy jumped on me and grabbed my throat. He beat me. He threw me to the ground. There were cameras everywhere and they could have checked the taps. But they refused and insisted we had stolen the money. They called the police and the police came. The police sided with the shop owner, telling him that all he had to do was to teach us a lesson by thrashing us. They demanded that I should call someone to bring money. My colleague from Zimbabwe called one of her brothers to bring money. When he arrived he was angry. When he complained the police beat him too much and arrested him and threw him in the police van. My Congolese friend gave them R500 and I still had to give them R500. From me they took my purse and my cell-phone and said I should pay the rest. I could not find the money. Every time I got money I had to give it to them. I've been looking for them to get my cell-phone. Now the store is closed and I can't reach them. My cell-phone is gone.[108]

In some cases, employers hire non-citizens for four- or six-month contract, promising wages at the end of the contract. At the end of the contract, they call the police to report "illegal aliens" working under false pretence. As noted above, some of the Mozambican young men with whom I travelled in the minibus taxi from Ressano Garcia to Maputo on 6 March 2007, claimed they had been arrested and deported under similar circumstances. Their employers, they said, had postponed paying wages for several months. Instead they

were each given five kilograms of maize meal monthly. On expressing their displeasure they were surprised to see the police in their compounds at night.

Another recurrent employer practice in the interviews was the refusal to hire non-citizens simply because they are not citizens. According to the interviewees, this happened frequently in advertised employment. In this case, at the end of the interview process, the employer asked for a South African identity document or work permit. Refugees and asylum-seekers were usually the victims of this practice. Legally, their refugee and asylum statuses allowed them to work. However, employers did not recognize refugee or asylum-seeker documents. Participants explained that employers insisted on the green identity document knowingly that only citizens had the green identity documents. As one Congolese participant explained: "Although asylum seekers are allowed by law to work. But because asylum seeker papers are only good for one month, employers refuse to employ us. Because we have to spend too much time at home affairs every month to renew it. Employers don't want that."[109] Another explained: "Let's say I was a technician or an engineer. I apply for a job. I send all my documents, my c.v. and everything to the company. They look at them and by the time they get to your identity documents they see you're asylum seeker or refugee and they deny you the job."[110]

The participants also said that in cases where the foreign job-applicant had a passport, the employers asked for work permit. However, the home affairs only issued work permits to people who had job offers. When the job-applicants begged for the job offers, which would enable them to apply for work permits, the employers insisted on work permits first before the job offers could be made. One student told a revealing story involving him, his school and an employer:

> I am a student here. At my college they did not find any student among the citizens to represent them at the Toyota Company annual competitions. I was the only one. So they said how can we send a foreigner to represent us? So some said he's the best we have in our school. So they sent me and I won the second place. The first, second and third were to be employed by Toyota. My name is Ilunga and there are no Ilungas in South Africa. So the company asked me if I was legally allowed to work in the country. They asked me if I was a permanent resident. But I told them that if they really want me to work there they can just give me a letter of job offer and I'll go to home affairs. And they said, No. They said I should bring the work permit first. They said they couldn't do that. They

said the opportunity was only for citizens and permanent residents. So they passed me over for a guy in the fourth place because he's a citizen, not because he's better than me or as good as me."[111]

With a tone of resignation, another Congolese interviewee related his experience with employers and job applications:

> I've been to many job interviews. The last time it was in Sandton. They wanted someone who can speak and write French fluently and has computer skills. The interview went well and everything was fine. But then they asked me where I was from. I told them I was from DRC. The manager said: "Sorry we're looking for South African; this job is for South African citizens." But the advert on the newspaper did not specify such conditions. They turned me down because I'm not South African. I sent my CV as via email attachment. As soon as they got my CV they called me, on the same day I sent the CV. They said: "We received your CV and we like it; we think you're qualified; can you come for an interview?" I told them I didn't know the city very well. And they emailed me the directions. The receptionist was a black lady. I arrived there 20 minutes before 10 o'clock. She complicated me that bloody receptionist! Later they wrote me a letter saying according to the law the jobs are for South Africans. It happened many times. Even in Pretoria. It was a French school and they were looking for French teachers. But they refused me because they said I wasn't a citizen. Now I'm discouraged."[112]

This vicious cycle – involving on the one hand the state's insistence on job offers before work permits could be applied for, and on the other hand the insistence on work permits before job offers could be made – ensured that non-citizens, though physically in South Africa, were effectively shut out socioeconomically.

To sum up this section, aversion toward black outsiders permeates many aspects of South African social life. Prejudice towards African foreign nationals is ubiquitous, penetrating South African nationalism and identity. Many South Africans have unwittingly reached the point in which their sense of being as a group, that is, their "we-identity", appears to be increasingly constituted through negative emotions toward anything and anyone from the greater continent. In this context, this chapter discussed the mechanisms of exclusion of black outsiders by the establishment: the state institutions and civil society institutions jointly close ranks to keep non-citizens out. Within state institutions we discussed these attitudes, sentiments and practices are constituted in the department of home affairs, in

133

the national defence force and in the police service. In the civil society I highlighted how the media, the banking industry, churches, workplaces, communities and public/social spaces at large. While the state denies legal status and services to non-citizens, the civil society denies them access to socioeconomic opportunities on the basis of denied legal status. These attitudes and practices contribute for creation and mobilization of the figure of *makwerekwere.* At the same time, the figure of *makwerekwere* feeds back into the attitudes and practices that create it. The theory of the established and the outsiders suggests that the flesh of *makwerekwere* is ultimately the frontier of these exclusion mechanisms. It raises questions about the interpellation of bodies through which both inclusion and exclusion are accomplished. This is what I discuss next.

TOO BLACK TO BE CITIZEN

In his theory of the established and the outsiders, Elias writes explicitly but briefly about a crucial feature of relations of this type, namely that the established often imagine the physical aspect of the outsiders as marks of their inferiority, thus setting them apart as fundamentally different. It is part of "collective fantasy evolved by the established group."[113] On the one hand, the established portray themselves with positive physical attributes as a sign of their superiority: "Almost everywhere members of established groups and, even more, those of groups aspiring to form the establishment, take pride in being cleaner, literally and figuratively, than the outsider groups."[114] And given the inferior and often inhumane conditions in which the outsiders are forced to live, the established are "probably quite often right."[115] This also speaks to the fear of pollution often prevalent among the established groups: "The widespread feeling among the established groups that contact with members of an outsider group contaminates refers to contamination with anomy and with dirt rolled into one."[116] And where the power differentials are great with correspondingly great oppression, "outsider groups are often held to be filthy and hardly human." [117] The wonder and the power of stigmatization of outsiders by the established consist in the magical transubstantiation of establishment fantasy into flesh:

> [T]he social stigma that its members attach to the outsider group transforms itself in their imagination into material stigma – it is reified. It appears as something

objective, something implanted upon outsiders by nature or the gods. In that way the stigmatising group is excluded from any blame: it is not *we*, such fantasy implies, who have put a stigma on these people, but the powers that the world – they have put the sign on these people to mark them off as inferior or bad people.[118]

This chapter is intended to demonstrate how this of established-outsider relations, namely the transformation of establishment fantasy into actuality, plays itself out in relations between citizens and non-citizens. Focus is on the ways in which the citizenry assigns physical attributes to foreign nationals as evidence of their outsider position, strangeness, filthiness, immorality and undesirability.

Racialization of *makwerekwere*

The apparent apartheid distinctions between black nationalities did not allow any of these nationalities to enjoy white privilege. Instead, these distinctions were colonial divide-and-conquer tactics which made these black nationalities into lackeys of white privilege. In the context of white supremacy, none of these nationalities were treated as equals to whites. All variations aside, they all bore the brunt of discrimination and oppression on their bodies. The demise of official apartheid not only represents the shifting of power ratios between social groups but also precipitates the ways in which social groups experience themselves and others, including bodily experiences. The racialization processes have correspondingly undergone metamorphosis within the last decade despite their apartheid reminiscence. At present the old white-over-black processes of racialization occur in tandem with new, complex and yet grotesque processes of racialization. In the post-apartheid racialization processes black bodies are thrown against each other, with some construed as "too dark" or "too black" to belong: "Foreigners seen as most 'different' and in this context are often people who are darker, speak another language, dress differently, are taller, shorter etc would be the likely victims in this scenario."[119] The supposed visibility of these bodies in the mass of black bodies is often cited as the reason why they are selected for aggression and violence. But the question still remains. Why does the visibility of these bodies matter but that of other bodies, white bodies? As Harris writes:

Although the visible otherness of foreign Africans seems to be an important factor behind local hostility, this is not a sufficient explanation for the asymmetrical xenophobia directed towards this group. Biological-cultural factors may stand as indexical markers of difference, but then so do the language, accent, clothing and physical features of white and Asian foreigners. This is not to suggest that these groups are automatically immune to xenophobia, but, relative to African foreigners, they do appear to be at a lower risk for violence.[120]

Economic impotence, feelings of no life, frustrations over unfulfilled expectations and anger over broken promises that are prevalent within the citizenry converge over black bodies forming an emotional thread of hatred that transforms blackness into strangeness. Black bodies are plunged against each other in the frontier of violent construction of citizenship; they become the battleground on which the wars over belonging, and the corresponding material and immaterial spoils, are waged. Thus these bodies are "literal 'text[s]' on which… some of [the] most graphic and scrutable messages"[121] of aversion are written. As Harris candidly indicates:

> The biological-cultural features of hairstyles, accents, vaccination marks, dress and physical appearance can be read as indexical markers or signifiers. They signify difference and point out foreignness in a way that is immediately visible. As signifiers, these features do play a common role in prompting xenophobic actions.[122]

Body looks, movements, sounds and smells are legible as evidence, or not, of imagined citizenship. Failure to live up to this imagined identity attracts negative sanctions, from hate, fear, aggression to violence.

The surveillance of South African social spaces has characteristic features of racialization. The habit and practice of profiling have made imprints not only on the national social habitus but also on its individual elaboration. As I will discuss, this racialization process is animated by an underlying establishment idea that South Africa is the land of light skinned bodies, where dark skin is misplaced, alien and unworthy of citizenship.

What has been reported in the press, human rights reports and theorized as xenophobia amounts to "harassments and violence… towards immigrants from other countries in Africa" wherein "tens, if not thousands, of non-citizens have been killed."[123] As Petkou writes: "Today… negative perceptions South Africans used to have for one

another have been transferred to black immigrants from other parts of Africa."[124] In a joint report by SAMP and SAHRC, Crush indicates similarly that "hatred and oppression of fellow black South Africans is being replaced by hatred of migrants from Africa."[125] He further elaborates that South Africans were not only becoming "increasingly xenophobic" but "a large percentage" of them perceived "especially, almost exclusively black foreigners… as a direct threat to their future economic well being and as responsible for the troubling rise in violent crime in South Africa."[126] These statements suggest that South African attitudes toward Africans in the rest of the continent have characteristic features of projection, whereby one's own negativity is externalized on to the other.

According to the SAHRC, "[p]rofiling of illegal foreigners was allegedly done with skin tone, language, hairstyle and manner of dress being the markers."[127] Bodies are viewed as nation-building blocks subject to an ongoing patriotic process of selection. The bodies caught on the sieve are rejected, labelled coarse and strange, and denied the over-protected belonging. They must not infiltrate South African social spaces. If they do, they must be hunted down and destroyed or removed. Either way, national social spaces must be free from bodies that are too black. This is an ideal of the South African nation. Curiously, although all social groups hold these racializing assumptions, black South Africans tend to be the more vigorously put them to work. This point was recurrent in the interviews with the participants. Thus a Congolese participant registered his disappointment:

> It's sad to see South African blacks doing this to us. White men come here and get everything easily. They don't queue. It's very sad to see blacks treating other blacks like this. In our country we had refugees and they were welcome. We're very disappointed. When I came here I didn't expect this from black South Africans. I thought they were excellent people. I never imagined they're like this.[128]

This sentiment is fairly consistent with intimations of participants in other studies. In one of these studies, a Cameroonian national made a wish: "I wish apartheid can come back to this country because in that way the white people will treat all of us the same. The bad thing is that it is the blacks who treat us like animals just because we are foreigners."[129]

At the same time they claimed to have warm relations with white South Africans. While blacks are viewed as dreadful, whites are viewed as unthreatening.

The bodies of *makwerekwere*

Physical appearances and performances seen to deviate from the imagined standard South African bodily "we-images", "we-ideals" and "we-identities" warrant arrest, detention, deportation, torture, rape, mugging, and vilification. As Harris points out:

> Reading physical features as signifiers of foreignness offers a valuable framework for understanding the significance of these features in xenophobic actions. Biological-cultural markers are significant in generating xenophobia because they point out *whom* to target, i.e. they indicate which particular group of foreigners the South African public dislikes and initiates violent practice against.[130]

But how does this sieve operate in the everyday policing of South African social spaces? How do the gate-keepers go about deciding who are, or not, foreign bodies? There are three mechanisms of this process, all of which involve reading and inspecting bodies, thus rendering them as texts.

The looks of makwerekwer*e*

The interviews with foreign nationals and the aforementioned group of police officers revealed a sieve through which bodies are thoroughly scrutinized for marks of strangeness. As a Burundian participant noted: "They pay too much attention on outward appearance of the person. If they don't like the way you look, they create problems for you. They arrest you only for your looks because they think you have foreign looks."[131] The size and configuration of the body are scrutinized, for in the establishment imagination, foreigners bear physical features that are distinctively strange. Body parts are examined, graded and coded. When my assistant asked a group of police officers how foreigners could be identified, they replied: "It's very easy. People from Nigeria, Ghana, Cameroon and places like that have big noses, big lips, and round heads."[132] Physical self-presentation, what could be called the extended self, is put under scrutiny, graded and coded: e.g. dress style and haircuts. As Congolese participant said: "They use language and the way you look, also the dress code… because people from Congo, from

Nigeria… you can see how they dress."[133] Attention is also paid to the shades of skin color. The idea that foreigners are "too dark"/"too black" is part of the establishment fantasy and imagination. So is the idea that "they dress funny." The criminals also deploy this method to select their victims. As the Human Rights Watch observed: "*Dress and hair* are [also] handicaps in the context of rife street crime."[134] In 1998 the Human Rights Watch found that many detainees at Lindela camp had been arrested because they walked "like Mozambicans" or were "too black" to be citizens:

> Suspected undocumented migrants are identified by the authorities through unreliable means such as complexion, accent, or inoculation marks. We documented cases of persons who claimed they were arrested for being "too black," having a foreign name, or in one case, walking "like a Mozambican."[135]

Similarly, another study reported:

> Appearance is … factor in trying to establish whether a suspect is illegal – hairstyle, type of clothing worn as well as actual physical appearance. In the case of Mozambicans a dead give-away is the vaccination mark on the lower left forearm … [while] those from Lesotho tend to wear gumboots, carry walking sticks or wear blankets (in the traditional manner), and also speak slightly different Sesotho.[136]

In 2001 the SAHRC memo, "Teacher Assaulted for Being too Dark", condemned the police methods of determining citizenship: "[T]heir criteria for judging whether or not a person is a citizen, are highly questionable as it appears that one's skin colour and dress sense serves as the basis for assessing ones legal status within South Africa."[137] Recently a student was arrested on roadblock. The police had concluded after careful examination of the body that the student was not light-skinned enough to qualify for citizenship. "They took one look at me and said I was too dark to be South African," he told reporters.[138] He was detained with intent to deport him to Mozambique, where the police believed he had originated from. The wrongful arrest led a judge to order the Department of Security and Safety to pay the young man R90, 000 (roughly $15,000) in compensation. The reporter's indignation points to the irony in no uncertain terms: "It is self-evident that no one ever has been or will ever be deported from South Africa for being 'too White'."[139]

The movements and sounds of makwerekwere

Bodily movements and performances come through the sieve. The imagined native bodies are expected to produce native sound patterns with authenticity. In contrast, non-native bodies are expected to be incompetent, to produce inauthentic native sound patterns. Thus language and accent are crucial markers and identifiers of imagined native from non-native bodies. Where one is suspected of being "makwerekwere", the gatekeepers of South African social spaces – the police as well citizens at large – initiate communication with suspects in Nguni or Sotho language.[140] When and where the suspect fails to produce Nguni or Sotho sound patterns, the gatekeeper changes his/her demeanour instantly, changes communication from his/her native language to English, and addresses the suspect impolitely and indignantly: "Where is your passport?"; "What do you want in South Africa?"; "Why don't you go back to your country?" I had a personal experience with this in Johannesburg. It happened on 30 October 2006, just twenty days after my arrival. It was a beautiful sunny afternoon. I was in the company of two friends, one black South African, the other white Canadian. We were driving out of Soweto with the South African at the steering wheel. I was on the front passenger seat. The Canadian friend was on the back seat. A group of five policemen travelling in a van on the right lane ordered us to pull over. We obeyed. They stopped behind us and jumped off the van immediately. While four of them came straight to us, one quickly stepped on the sidewalk with an assault rifle pointed at us. "Phumani!" they yelled. We obeyed. The South African got out first. I got out second. The Canadian continued seated in the car. "Nawe mlungu phuma!" they yelled at him. But had not a clue what they were saying. So I translated for him: "You, too, white man get out!" He obeyed. I could see how terrified he was. His was sweating, shivering and becoming increasingly red. It was a moment of reckoning with the difficult labour of repressing one's intense emotions. They ordered us to spread-eagle on the car while they frisked us thoroughly under the watchful eye of the man holding the assault rifle pointed at us. They searched the car voraciously. They checked the engine's serial number. When they found a CD bag under the driver's seat they brightened up, smiled, grabbed it and opened it with visible excitement and eagerness. My instincts told me they felt they were on to something big. Unfortunately, they found nothing but CDs.

Having found nothing satisfactory, two of them yelled at the South African for his ID, driver's license and car registration. He obeyed. They spoke in Zulu and Tswana. The South African was well versed in both. The sound patterns were flawless. Finding no blemish in his speech, the next thing I heard was a loud exclamation: "Your name is Kwenga!" And this is the exchange that followed.

"Yes, I am."

"What! You're Malawian!"

"No, I'm not Malawian."

"So what are you?"

"I'm South African."

"So why are you Kwenga?"

"That's the name my parents gave me."

They grudgingly gave him back his documents. In the meantime two others were dealing with me: "Nimtholaphi lo mlungu?" (*Where did you find this white man?*). I tried to tell them in Zulu that the white man was a friend. This betrayed my inability to perform authentic nativity, for as soon as I opened my mouth to speak, one of them interrupted me immediately. Now his voice changed and became louder and malicious. He could tell that my Zulu was not the best. This was enough evidence that I was a stranger, not a citizen. "Show me your passport!" he yelled at me, now in English, no more Zulu. I handed him my passport. As soon as he saw CANADA on it, he protested: "Damned, are you from Canada?"

"Yes, I am."

"That's impossible!"

"Well, what can I say?"

"You mean to tell me that you're really from there."

"Yes, I mean it."

"Are you sure… sure… sure... you're from Canada?"

"Yes, I'm sure."

In the meantime, the other kept remarking to the rest about my remarkable Nigerian looks: "Mara yoh, lo ufana ni liNigerian nxo!" The other disagreed: "No, he's Congolese." I wanted to tell them that my origins did not concern them. But I knew hell

141

would break lose upon me if I dared. He gave my passport to another who also could not believe what he was hearing. He had to see it for himself. He paged it vigorously from the first to the last page. He bent the passport before giving back to me. I cringed inside.

In the meantime another was questioning the white Canadian. "Can I see your passport?" He handed him the passport. "Oh so you're from Canada!"

"Yes, I am."

"Where did you find these guys?"

"David and I are friends. We met in Canada. I met Kwenga here in Johannesburg. He's is a friend of ours."

This was the case either with the police or with the citizenry at large, as a Nigerian national once found out:

> Once you speak their language they immediately know you are one of them. Once I was drinking in a bar and this South African man was speaking in Zulu to me. I felt so bad because I could not reply in Zulu, when he noticed that I am not South African his reactions towards me changed. He was no longer friendly as he initially seemed.[141]

It often matters little whether the engaged suspect is in South Africa legally or illegally. He/she is hated just the same. However, in cases where the suspect responds in either of these languages, his/her accent will be scrutinized. Ability to communicate in a native South African language is not enough. One's accent must sound native. The speaker must pass both language and accent tests on the spot. However, passing these tests is often not enough either. Therefore, in addition these tests, the suspect must state his/her village of origin about which he/she is also quizzed thoroughly – e.g. "Who's the village chief?"; "What's the name of the village primary school and who's the principal?"; "What's the village high school and who's the principal?" As a Zimbabwean refugee testified:

> The other day they [the police] stopped me and asked for ID. They talked to me in Zulu. If you can't speak Zulu or Tswana they think you're illegal. But I speak Zulu very well because I'm Ndebele. So they said, "Can I see your ID?" I told them I left my ID at home. They didn't believe me. I have South African ID but I avoid carrying it around because I know if they find me they will tear it off. So I leave it at home. So they asked me, "where is your home town?" I told them I was from Newcastle. They asked me for the names of primary school, secondary

school, the principals, the chiefs and all that shit. That's how they got me. I know Newcastle because I have family there and we used to visit them.[142]

The body/language profiling runs through state agencies and the public at large. Practically everywhere black bodies move they must carry documents and be on call to endure obnoxious inquisitiveness. A Cameroonian national commented: "Everywhere you go you carry your documents, a police man sees you, he wants to know everything about you, even where you are going. Apartheid still exists for Cameroonians in South Africa."[143] An informant in Morris' study indicated that:

> At first, when you meet a South African black man, after the greeting we start talking the first question they will ask you is, "Where are you from?" The second one, "Why did you come here?" The third, "When are you going back to your place?" In my country, I have studied with a lot of foreigners from all over, but we never ask them those questions. They are stupid, insulting questions.[144]

The situation is much more aggravated for Francophone foreign nationals. In her comment on the situation of the Francophone Africans in their relations with South Africans, Harris cites Boulloin to the effect that language is a "handicap, as they feel hostility in the way people react when they realise their inability to speak any African South African languages."[145]

The smells of makwerekwere

In addition to specific foreign features, cadence and sounds, in the South African imagination foreign bodies emit characteristically alien odours. In the mind of the establishment, foreign bodies appear raw, rustic and uncultivated. The image resembles not that of noble savage but that of vicious savage. Foreign bodies lack appreciation of technologies of smell, that is, the kind of technologies of self through which subjects cultivate themselves into culturally agreeable bodies. Thus, deodorant is a technology of self through which individuals transform themselves into pleasantly smelling bodies. In the discourse of the establishment, typical foreign bodies are positioned as non-users of this type technology of self, the technology of smell. According to Harris, the Internal Tracing Unit of the South African Police Service adopted *the sniffing out methods* to identify their suspects and victims.[146] In our interviews, the policemen in Johannesburg

claimed they could identify the "illegals" through their smell. "It's easy to smell these people," they said. When asked how, they shrugged in expression of disgust: "Agh… Ba nuka la bantu!" ("Yuck… These people stink!").[147] This belief appears not only to be ubiquitous but also strong. For instance, a South African woman held this belief despite being married to a Nigerian national. "These people smell terribly, to tell you the truth," she said. Then she added: "I don't know why they smell. They don't use cosmetics. I don't know whether it's their nature where they come from."[148]

The deodorant and smell are thus markers of group as well as individual identity, mediating the "we-they" differentiation between citizens and non-citizens. On the one hand, deodorant and pleasant smells are markers of one's membership in the establishment of citizens. They represent the "we-images" and "we-ideals" of citizens. On the other hand, foul smells and lack of access to deodorant are proof of the Others' outsider position to which citizens assigned them in the first place. As we saw earlier, the colonial regime, particularly during apartheid, sought to quarantine blacks in the rural areas, restricted their movements, and illegalized black presence in urban areas.

As I indicated in chapter 4, it is worth recalling that in the course of the struggle for liberation, eventually peasant life stood for oppressed living. In response, blacks rejected peasant life and embraced urbanism as resistance. Exodus from the rural hinterlands and entry into the urban spaces stood as an act of liberation. Within this political and psychosocial context, the migrant worker embodied the oppressed peasant life the freedom fighters had fled from. The presence of peasant-looking-minded and oriented migrants in the urban areas – "the rural in the urban" as Mamdani put it – seemed be a nightmare for the urbanites that had fled the rural hinterlands. In these peasant migrants, the peasant life they had fled and wanted to forget seemed to be stocking them, trailing them right into their place of refuge, the urban space. The African foreign national also came to represent crude, raw and rustic peasant living which the nationals have historically sought to escape by fleeing into the cities. South Africa is both the symbolic and material city where citizens have taken refuge and yet feel under siege of crude, raw, rustic, and rural and peasant Africa. The African foreign national is thus a nightmare weighing heavily in the brains of living South Africans, black and white, but particularly

black. The smelly bodies of African foreign nationals represent crudeness and rawness of rustic peasant bodies – they who haven't discovered the blessings of technologies of pleasant smell. But there is more to this than meets the eye and the nose.

Makwerekwere within self

Heribert Adam and his colleagues put forward an argument that is worth deliberating upon because it illustrates clearly the anatomy of relations between native and non-native blacks in South Africa. In a comparative discussion of German anti-Semitism and South African apartheid, Adam et al. refute the analogies habitually drawn between the anti-Semite and the Afrikaner. They argue incisively that relations between the anti-Semites and Jews were fundamentally different from relations between the coloniser and the colonized. They write:

> In the colonial context, anti-black discrimination has an instrumental function: to exploit, subjugate or dispossess the colonised and legitimate the process with a racist ideology of biological or cultural inferiority. Dominant attitudes are primarily paternalistic. They always distinguish between a majority of "good" and a minority of "bad" blacks. Only those who step out of their assigned place are targets of terror, while the majority like unruly children in need of a stern father.[149]

On the other hand, German anti-Semitism lacked this instrumental function. Rather:

> [It] fulfils primarily psychological needs. The utter irrationality of an imagined Jewish threat contrasts sharply with the more rational behaviour of colonists to secure power and privilege through exclusion. Jews are not merely excluded, but exterminated. Jews do not face paternalistic selected terror, but indiscriminate persecution against all, regardless of their status or behaviour.[150]

They go on to remind us that the Jews had in many ways integrated to the German culture and society so that it was practically impossible to distinguish them from the rest of the Germans. They had in all respects become Germans, and hence accused of being cheats "sneaking about in disguise to hide subversive activities."[151] Adam et al. expound on this analogy of a cheat:

> A cheat is portrayed as being both weak and strong. This contradiction is best communicated with the metaphor of a parasitic vermin. The dehumanised other is dangerous to the body politic if not watched, yet the virus can be stamped out

145

with vigilance and ideological protection. Mobilized against a poisonous cancer, every right minded citizen has a duty to be as watchful as in the protection of individual health.[152]

Since Jews were in all ways truly Germans, "[t]he anti-Semite supremacist [saw] his moral order undermined from within."[153] The anti-Semites felt the Jews were "overdeveloped and their wings [had] to be clipped."[154]

Jewish indistinguishability was cause for anxiety. How would they be identified and isolated for extermination? The answer: invent an ideology of the Jewish body; turn to methods of name and ancestral tracings; and impose the wearing of marks of Jewishness. As Adam et al. write, the Nazis did not "rely on 'watchful eye' but on ancestral records, because Jewishness was not visible but had to be made so by a mandatory wearing of the yellow star."[155] In other words, "[i]t was because European Jews were so well integrated in their host society – as 'German' as their tormentors – that the invisibles were made visible as scapegoats."[156]

Ironically, Adam et al.'s analysis leads us to an uncomfortable ground, for it suggests parallels between anti-Semitism and post-apartheid *makwerekwere* ideology. These parallels issue from the fact that Jewish invisibility had to be made visible through ideology. The invisibles of foreign blackness are made visible through ideology of *makwerekwere*. Freud's observations on the narcissism of minor differences that animate relations between groups of people who look alike find resonance in relations between native and foreign blacks in South Africa. Adam et al. view "rejection of others as resulting from projection of one's dangerous impulses onto others." And this mechanism, they point out, "succeeds best when the other resembles oneself."[157] The South African establishment battles its anxieties about invisible black intruders who not only look and sound like citizens but are in fact citizens. The outsiders are also insiders. The insiders and the outsiders mirror each other. As I indicated in the preceding chapter, citizens are frequently mistaken for *makwerekwere*, arrested and detained for deportation to their presumed "homelands". One possible explanation for these "mistaken arrests" is that *makwerekwere* is South African, and the South African is *makwerekwere.*

Narcissism of minor differences

South African xenophobia is a peculiar phenomenon. According to a Turkish student, the South African idea of foreigner meant black foreign nationals: "It seems as if South Africans, both black and white, their idea of a foreigner is just a black foreigner. They attach all different negative connotations when they speak about foreigners. They forget that there are white–skinned foreigners like myself, who can easily be criminals as well."[158] A Dutch student's observations corroborate this view: "I think South African people are nice people, but it seems like black South Africans do not like other black nationalities, and they seem to show a lot of respect to white people, because to them they are the creators of wealth."[159] Similarly, a Nigerian foreign national stated: "What happens is this; black South Africans are the main cause of xenophobia in the country. You don't experience xenophobia from white South Africans. It is blacks against blacks... If a black South African sees a white foreigner, he says he is a tourist, if it is a black foreigner, he says this is a 'kwerekwere'. *All this leaves ugly scars in your life as a foreigner in the country.*"[160]

This is partially understandable if one considers that competition for power, prestige and survival becomes increasingly intense when more and more major characteristics of the competing groups become more and more similar. In other words, groups that are more alike and less unequal exert greater and tougher competitive pressure on each other. Ignatieff correctly said that the bloodiest of group relations are those in which "the group you are defining yourself against most closely resembles you."[161] As indicated in chapter 2, De Swaan found this phenomenon operational in fanning the Rwandan Genocide, as the Hutus had become Tutsifed and the Tutsis had become Hutufied through centuries of sociocultural interpenetrations. [162] Anton Blok argued compellingly that a pattern exists in ancient and modern human history in which groups that experience reduction of differences are marked by increasing narcissism of minor differences, which often escalates into ethnic cleansings.[163] The haters and the hated became similar so that the hated were accused of being cheats "sneaking about in disguise to hide subversive activities."[164] This suggests that rather than relying exclusively on differences to explain human cruelty, similarities and reduction of

differences – where difference is invented or exaggerated or both – may also provide explanation, particularly in South Africa.

Relations between South Africans and African foreign nationals may be viewed as a case of narcissism of minor differences. Imagined as invisible intruders who look and sound like citizens, and are in fact often citizens, the figures of *makwerekwere* are a source of fears and anxieties. Given the cultural and economic hegemony of South Africa in southern Africa, southern Africans are not easily distinguishable from South Africans. South African languages and their respective cultures, notably Tsonga or Shangaan, Sotho, Tswana, Ndebele and Swazi (both variations of Zulu), are spoken and practiced widely in five other countries in the region, namely Botswana, Lesotho, Mozambique, Swaziland and Zimbabwe. This cultural and linguistic similarity renders invisible the outsiders, stimulates anxiety and paranoia in the South African imagination. It signifies the enemy within who looks like us and who is us. The point is to overcome this problem of similarity and invisibility. The attempt to accomplish this takes the form of the narcissism of minor differences manifest in the ideology of South African exceptionalism in tandem with the ideology of *makwerekwere*, out of which is born the bizarre idea (among others) that South Africans have lighter skins than Africans from elsewhere in the continent. The dynamics of established-outsider figurations that Elias' described as "minority of the best" and "minority of the worst" appear to be work in this case. On the one hand, although the light-skinned constitute a minority among South Africans, their skin colour is used to characterize all South Africans as a nation. On the other hand, the characteristics of the worst minority (e.g. criminals, see preceding chapter) among non-citizens are used to characterize all non-citizens as a group, to create and mobilize the figure of *makwerekwere*.

In summary, I have discussed the voluntary processes of racialization of native and foreign bodies not only by those endowed with the official power to police South African social spaces but also by the citizenry at large. I argued that the invisibility of foreign blackness is made visible through the ideology of *makwerekwere*. Racialization of foreign bodies is the mechanism through which establishment fantasy is transubstantiated into flesh. I also argued that this ideology is animated by the narcissism

148

of minor differences. At this point it is worth asking whether foreign nationals do engage in any form of resistance or retaliation, and if so, then how. This is the question dealt with in the next chapter. Since organization impinges upon a group's ability to resist or retaliate, the social organization of foreign nationals will also be discussed.

NOTES

[1] *Immigration Act* 2002, Republic of South Africa.
[2] *Refugees Act* 1998, Republic of South Africa. The Chapter 2 of the Constitution referred to here is the bill of rights, many of which are violated not only by civilians but also by state agents.
[3] Ibid.
[4] *Constitution of the Republic of South Africa* No. 108 of 1996.
[5] See the video clip: Http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AbYRUJGW99g
[6] Congolese National, Interviews March 2007.
[7] Interviews with seven policemen at Parkstation, Johannesburg, March 2007.
[8] Cited in T. Masuku 2006, "Targeting Foreigners: Xenophobia among Johannesburg Police." Hereafter, "Targeting Foreigners."
[9] L. Landau 2001, *Immigration, Xenophobia and Human Rights in South Africa.*
[10] SAHRC 2000 (B), *Getting to the Crossroads of Detention and Repatriation*.
[11] Ibid.
[12] T. Masuku 2006, "Targeting Foreigners."
[13] Ibid.
[14] Congolese National, Interviews February 2007.
[15] Quoted in C. Petkou 2005, "The Development", p. 146
[16] C. Petkou 2005, "The Development of Ethnic Minorities: A Case Study of West Africans in South Africa", PhD Dissertation, University of the Witwatersrand", p. 146. Hereafter, "The Development".
[17] Ibid. p. 149
[18] Ibid. p. 154
[19] See S. Peberdy 1999, "Selecting Immigrants", p. 303-4.
[20] M. Neocosmos 2006, *From 'Foreign Natives,'* p. 101.
[21] Ibid.
[22] SAHRC 2005, "Report: Open Hearings on Xenophobia and Problems Related to It", Johannesburg.
[23] Harris quoted in H. Shindondola 2003, "Xenophobia in South African and Beyond: Some Literature for a Doctoral Research Proposal." Hereafter, "Xenophobia in SA."
[24] H. Shindondola 2003, "Xenophobia in SA", p. 31.
[25] Ibid. p. 32.
[26] Ibid.
[27] SAHRC 2005, "Report: Open Hearings on Xenophobia and Problems Related to It".
[28] Ibid.

[29] SAHRC 2000 (B), "Lindela at the Crossroad of Detention and Repatriation". Johannesburg, South Africa.

[30] SAHRC 2005, "Report: Open Hearings on Xenophobia and Problems Related to It".

[31] H. Shindondola 2003, "Xenophobia in SA."

[32] SAHRC 2000 (B), "Lindela at the Crossroad of Detention and Repatriation", p. 65.

[33] G. Agamben 2005, *State of Exception*, p. 50.

[34] SAHRC 2005, "Report: Open Hearings on Xenophobia and Problems Related to It", p. 36.

[35] According to Human Rights Watch, "Dyambu Trust was created by several prominent members of the ANC's Women's League, including the present deputy minister of the home affairs"; *Prohibited Persons: Abuse of Undocumented Migrants, Asylum-Seekers, and Refugees in South Africa,* p. 70.

[36] M. Neocosmos 2006, *From 'Foreign Natives'.*

[37] Quoted in SAHRC 2005, "Report: Open Hearings on Xenophobia and Problems Related to It", Johannesburg. p. 31

[38] South African Police Service.

[39] South African National Defense Force.

[40] S. Peberdy 1999, "Selecting Immigrants: Nationalism and National Identity in South Africa's Immigration Policies, 1910 to 1998. PhD Dissertation, Queen's University, Canada", p. 302. Hereafter, "Selecting Immigrants".

[41] Ibid. p. 303

[42] Ibid. p. 302

[43] Ibid. p. 303

[44] Apartheid clouded the collective black psyche making it extremely difficult for blacks to imagine themselves as South Africans. To imagine oneself as South African required considerable mental effort. Colonization of consciousness got the best of even the best black politicians, some of whom could imagine nothing greater than the liberation and autonomy of their Bantustans. Such politics has spilled over to the New South Africa. For many black politicians and their followers the idea of Rainbow Nation is simply too difficult to grasp. A. G. Buthelezi is an excellent example. A Zulu prince, he is the leader of Inkhata Freedom Party, a party whose political project is to represent Zulu, not South African, interests.

[45] Http://www.queensu.ca/samp/migdocs/speeches/271101.htm. Retrieved on 12 January 2008.

[46] Http://www.info.gov.za/speeches/1994/251194001.htm. Retrieved 12 January 2008.

[47] Quoted in S. Peberdy 1999, "Selecting Immigrants", p. 275.

[48] M. Neocosmos 2006, *From 'Foreign Natives'*, p. 100

[49] C. Petkou 2005, "The Development"; SAHRC (A) 2000, *Xenophobia: The New Racism*. Johannesburg: Heinrich Boll Foundation.

[50] SAHRC (A) 2000, *Xenophobia: The New Racism*. Johannesburg: Heinrich Boll Foundation, p. 17.

[51] C. Petkou 2005, "The Development", p. 148.

[52] Quoted in HRW 1998, "Prohibited Persons: Abuse of Undocumented Migrants, Asylum-Seekers and Refugees in South Africa". New York: Human Rights Watch.

[53] Quoted in M. Neocosmos 2006, *From 'Foreign Natives,'* p. 99.

[54] M. G. Buthelezi 22 August 2002, "Parliamentary Media Briefing."

[55] M. G. Buthelezi 2001, "6th International Metropolis Conference Remarks."

[56] Quoted in M. Neocosmos 2006, *From 'Foreign Natives,'* p. 99.

[57] Ibid.

[58] Quoted in HRW 1998, "Prohibited Persons".

[59] HRW 1998, "Prohibited Persons".

[60] Ibid.

[61] Quoted in M. Neocosmos 2006, *From 'Foreign Natives'*, p. 100

[62] Quoted in S. Peberdy 1999, "Selecting Immigrants", p. 306

[63] S. Peberdy 1999, "Selecting Immigrants", p. 306

[64] Ibid. p. 307

[65] Ibid.

[66] Quoted in M. Neocosmos 2006, *From 'Foreign Natives,'* p. 99

[67] Ibid.

[68] SAHRC 2005, "Report: Open Hearings on Xenophobia and Problems Related to It", p. 24

[69] I am presupposing a distinction between national social habitus and everyday life/world. I use habitus in the sense of Elias and Bourdeux as the unconscious personality structure, attitude toward life, social character, life orientation and predispositions of a group. Within a social group such as nation there is diversity of individual habituses. However, each individual habitus remains a personal elaboration of what constitutes the social habitus of the group. I use the terms everyday life and everyday world interchangeably to refer to the actual mundane comings and goings of walking, working, sitting, eating, drinking, talking, dressing, making love, buying, selling, etc, etc, the accretion of which reveals patterns of behaviour and cumulative effects on the actors individually and collectively. I draw from Dorothy Smith (1998) who speaks of the everyday world as "that world we experience directly" in which "we are located physically and socially" (p. 89). To be located in the everyday world means to be located in "one's bodily and material existence" (p. 97). Rather than a sociological abstract, the everyday world "is an actual material setting, an actual local and particular place in the world" (p. 97).

[70] SAHRC 2005, "Report: Open Hearings on Xenophobia and Problems Related to It", p. 31

[71] Ibid. p. 24.

[72] A. Rwiyegura 9 March 2005, "I Am Makwerekwere", *Mail & Guardian*.

[73] Congolese National, Interviews January 2007.

[74] According to the theory of the established and the outsiders as described by Elias, gossip has the function to include and exclude, to praise and blame, to idealize and stigmatize. To be effective, gossip must flow seamlessly through its channels. Channels can be homes, bars, clubs, community halls, churches, street corners, parties and meetings where gossip is transmitted through word of mouth. Channels can be radio and television stations, newspapers, magazines, pamphlets, libraries and other means through which gossip is spread. According to the theory of the established and the outsiders, the greater the integration of a society or community the greater the efficiency of its gossip channels. I treat the media here as a network of national gossip channels through South

Africans as a group propagate blame gossip against foreign nationals and praise gossip for themselves. In established-outsider relations, the established maintain control over access to gossip channels.

[75] Quoted in B. Harris 2002, "A New Pathology".

[76] Ibid.

[77] Ibid.

[78] Ibid.

[79] Ibid.

[80] Ibid.

[81] *City Press* 16 November 2002, quoted in "The Development," p. 182.

[82] Http://www.speakersofnote.co.za/list/tim_modise.html. Retrieved 20 January 2008

[83] C. Petkou 2005, "The Development", p. 186.

[84] Ibid.

[85] D. McDonald and R. Danso 2001, "Writing Xenophobia: Immigration and the Print Media in Post-apartheid South Africa."

[86] SAHRC 2005, "Report: Open Hearings on Xenophobia and Problems Related to It", p. 30.

[87] Ibid.

[88] M. Reitzes et al 1996, "One Foot in, One Foot out: *Immigrants and Civil Society in the Winterveld*," p. 25.

[89] SAHRC 2005, "Report: Open Hearings on Xenophobia and Problems Related to It", p. 32.

[90] T. Masuku 2006, "Targeting Foreigners."

[91] Congolese National, Interviews February 2007.

[92] SAHRC 2005, "Report: Open Hearings on Xenophobia and Problems Related to It", p. 30.

[93] See the rankings at http://www.nationmaster.com/red/country/sf-south-africa/cri-crime&b_cite=1.

[94] *The Star* 24 October 2007, "Why Insurance Firm Snubs Citi Golfs".

[95] *BBC News* 18 June 2009, "South African Rape Survey Shock", http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/8107039.stm.

[96] A. Perry 05 Novermber 2007, "Oprah Scandal Rocks South Africa", *Time,* http://www.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,1680715,00.html?xid=feed-yahoo-full-world. C. Dempster 9 April 2002, "Rape – A Silent War of South African Women", *BBC News,* http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/1909220.stm. *News24.com* 22 November 2005, "SA 'rape capital' of the world", http://www.news24.com/News24/South_Africa/News/0,,2-7-1442_1838495,00.html

[97] M. Neocosmos 2006, *From 'Foreign Natives',* p. 101.

[98] Ibid. p. 102.

[99] Quoted in C. Petkou 2005, "The Development", p. 145.

[100] Ibid.

[101] HRW 1998, *Prohibited Persons*.

[102] Ibid.

[103] HRW 1998, *Prohibited Persons.*

[104] Quoted in HRW 1998, *Prohibited Persons*.

[105] Ibid.

[106] Interviews, March 2007.

[107] Interviews, February 2007.

[108] Interviews, April 2007.

[109] Interviews, February 2007.

[110] Interviews, March 2007.

[111] Congolese Student, Interviews, March 2007.

[112] Interviews, March 2007.

[113] N. Elias 1994, "An Essay," p. xxxiv.

[114] Ibid. p. xxvii.

[115] Ibid.

[116] Ibid.

[117] Ibid.

[118] N. Elias 1994, "An Essay", p. xxxiv-v.

[119] SAHRC 2005, "Report: Open Hearings on Xenophobia and Problems Related to It", p. 25.

[120] B. Harris 2002, "A New Pathology."

[121] B. Ashcroft 1995, *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*, p. 322

[122] B. Harris 2002, "A New Pathology."

[123] D. McDonald 2002, "We Have Contacts," p. 101.

[124] C. Petkou 2005, "The Development," p. 173

[125] J. Crush 2001, *Immigration, Xenophobia and Human Rights in South Africa*, p. 31-2.

[126] Ibid. p. 11.

[127] SAHRC 2005, "Report: Open Hearings on Xenophobia and Problems Related to It", p. 32

[128] Interviews, March 2007.

[129] Quoted in C. Petkou 2005, "The Development", p. 180.

[130] B. Harris 2002, "A New Pathology."

[131] Interviews, March 2007.

[132] Interviews, March 2007.

[133] Interviews, March 2007.

[134] HRW 1998, *Prohibited Persons.*

[135] Ibid.

[136] In B. Harris 2002, "A New Pathology".

[137] SAHRC 2001, "Teacher Assaulted for Being too Dark".

[138] *The Star,* March 2008, "Boy 'too Dark to be South African." Http://www.thestar.co.za/index.php?fSectionId=129&fArticleId=2166065

[139] "'Too Dark' Man Gets R90 000." Http://www.news24.com/News24/South_Africa/News/0,,2-7-1442_2285828,00.html.

[140] There are two main groups of African languages in South Africa: the Nguni languages and the Sotho languages. The Nguni languages are isi-Zulu, isi-Xhosa, isi-Swati and isi-Ndebela. The Sotho languages are seTswana, northern and southern seSotho. These languages do not include those of "Bushmen."

[141] Quoted in C. Petkou 2005, "The Development", p. 202

[142] Interview with a Zimbabwean Refugee, May 2007.

[143] Quoted in C. Petkou 2005, "The Development", p. 180.

[144] A. Morris 1999, "Our Fellow Africans Make Our Lives Hell: The Lives of Congolese and Nigerians Living in Johannesburg," p. 1123.

[145] Quoted in B. Harris 2002, "A New Pathology".

[146] Ibid.

[147] Interviews, March 2007.

[148] South African black woman married to a Nigerian national, May 2007.

[149] H. Adam et al. 1998, *Comrades in Business,* p. 38; see also H. Adam 1996, "Anti-Semitism and Anti-Black Racism: Nazi Germany and Apartheid South Africa", Telos 108: 25-46.

[150] H. Adam et al. 1998, *Comrades in Business*, p. 38.

[151] Ibid. p. 47.

[152] Ibid.

[153] Ibid.

[154] Ibid.

[155] Ibid. p. 32.

[156] Ibid. p. 46.

[157] Ibid.

[158] H. Shindondola 2003, "Xenophobia in SA", p. 56.

[159] Ibid.

[160] C. Petkou 2005, "The Development", p. 207; italics added.

[161] Quoted in H. Adam et al. 1998, *Comrades in Business*, p. 46.

[162] A. de Swaan 1997, "Widening Circles of Dysidentification: On Psycho- and Sociogenesis of Hatred of Distant Strangers – Reflections on Rwanda."

[163] A. Blok 1998, "The Narcissism of Minor Differences."

[164] H. Adam et al., *Comrades in Business*, p. 47.

VI. RESISTANCE AND RETALIATION

This chapter deals with the question of how black foreign nationals respond to attitudes and practices that (re)configure the as *makwerekwere*. How do they react to blame-gossip and the ideology of foreign bodies on which the policing of South African social spaces is predicated? The chapter also discusses the social organization of foreign nationals as a group, and how this organization influences their ability to resist or retaliate.

The ideology of *makwerekwere* that the citizenry constructs and mobilizes is reflected on the ways in which African foreign nationals behave themselves in South Africa. The attempts by those who are imagined as *makwerekwere* to blend in with citizens, their strivings to become invisible, seemed to be a direct response to this ideology. For example, a Cameroonian national explained his demeanor: "In South Africa I behave like a South African, and in Cameroon I behave like a Cameroonian. I know both countries well enough."[1] Another example is that of the inoculation mark that has made Mozambican foreign nationals an easy target by the police. The mark is located under the elbow of the left arm. As we have seen in chapter 6, the police read this vaccination mark as a signifier of otherness. As a Mozambican national who lived in South Africa for seven years, and who bears the same mark, I have firsthand knowledge of how my compatriots respond. First, more and more of them acidize or burn their left arms in an attempt to erase or obliterate this mark, resulting in an enormous scar. They wear shirts with long sleeves even during hot weather. Or they do both: burn the arms and wear long-sleeve shirts. As an insider to this group, Mozambicans did not hesitate to indicate that they behaved in this manner in order to avoid being identified as outsiders, arrested, detained and deported on that account.

As I indicated, the presentation of self through dress and body styling is a fundamental feature of profiling of foreign bodies. Thus, after their arrival, foreign nationals soon realize that their tastes of dress and hair styling put them in a position of vulnerability, at odds with the establishment. Petkou also found trends along the same direction. Foreign nationals made adjustments to their self-presentation, dressing, speaking, listening to music and dancing to blend in. One of them put it this way: "I am forced to dress like a South African because I have to avoid problems with the police.

You see, when I am like this people think I am from SOWETO and some of them are even scared to come closer to me."[2]

THE LANGUAGE PROBLEM

In their bid to present themselves in South African self-presentation, foreign nationals have also responded with attempts to mimic South African languages (including accents), demeanour and habits. Culturally and linguistically, foreign nationals from southern Africa have an advantage over those from farther afield. The long history of migrant work in southern Africa, with South Africa as the epicentre, contributed for the spread of South African languages and cultures throughout the region.

The Zulu wars in the 1820s contributed for the Zulufication, to some extent, of a considerable portion of southern Africa. The cultural and economic shadow of South Africa which projects itself throughout southern Africa through media, cyberspace and travel tends to stimulate diminishing contrasts between the cultural and economic landscapes in the region. With this advantage, foreign nationals from southern Africa have, to some extent, perfected this skill of mimicry. It is easier for foreign nationals from southern Africa than those from farther afield to learn South African languages.

South Africa has a number of languages that are also spoken outside its borders. Ndebele is a variation of Zulu spoken both in South Africa and Zimbabwe. Thus, in principle, one cannot be suspected or accused of being "makwerekwere" for speaking Ndebele. Zulu and Ndebele ethnic groups are more likely than other groups to differentiate between their respective languages. To many within the citizenry the two languages are indistinguishable. Further, Ndebele speakers from both sides of the border are more likely than others to discern the subtle differences between South African and Zimbabwean Ndebele speechmaking. The same applies to Zulu and Swazi. Swazi is spoken both in South Africa and Swaziland. Non-Swazi and non-Zulu speakers can barely distinguish between the two languages. Thus in principle, one should not be arrested for speaking Swazi. South African Swazi and Swaziland Swazi are almost indistinguishable. The same applies to Tswana, which is spoken in South Africa and Botswana – with Sotho, which is spoken both in South Africa and Lesotho – with Tsonga or Shangana, which is spoken in South Africa, Mozambique and Zimbabwe. Seasoned

speakers of these languages are more likely than the rest of the citizenry to capture the subtle distinctions within each of the languages. In South Africa alone there are two versions of Sotho: The Southern and Northern Sothos. Southern Sotho is more akin to the Sotho of Lesotho. Tsonga is in many ways similar to Zulu, Ndebele, Swazi and Xhosa, which makes it relatively easier for Tsonga speakers, including those from Mozambique and Zimbabwe, to learn them. South African Tsonga speakers are more able than other South Africans to distinguish between South African Tsonga and Mozambican Tsonga. Consequently, anyone who speaks Tsonga is believed to be *Makwerekwere* from Mozambique. According to the Zimbabwean nationals I interviewed, Shona-speaking Zimbabweans can pass as Vendas. He claimed that there were many similarities between Shona and Venda, that they understood Venda easily, and that they could learn it without difficulty.

Foreign nationals from beyond southern Africa, particularly those from French-speaking countries, found the mimicking of South African self-presentation quite daunting. The inability to speak South African languages is aggravated by the multidimensional divide – geographical, social and psychological – between the citizenry and foreign nationals. However, this inability also aggravates the divide.

SOCIAL INTERACTION

Another response was avoidance or minimization of social interaction. Interaction between African immigrants and South Africans was limited to brief, flat and superficial contact. This was the case even where members of both sides of divide worked together. Thus, when asked if they visited with their South African coworkers, the response was negative. A Congolese national said: "No I have not, sometimes we talk through telephone. But I've never been in their house. They never visited me. And they never came to visit me. Our relations end at work."[3] Another of Burundian nationality said: "I think there is the problem of competition. They think we come to take their jobs and their wives and become friends with white people. We're driven apart from them. So we end up making friends with white people. They hate us saying we prefer white people than them."[4] Even in church gatherings where brotherly/sisterly love was supposedly exuded, interactions remained at a minimum necessary. In fact, one Congolese respondent went as

far as saying: "I do have some South African friends in church. But they are also bad. They can insult you and shame you publicly. They can tell you in your face: 'What are you doing in South Africa?'; 'Go back to your country!'"[5]

In my interviews with the Congolese, I asked if they had friendships among South Africans, and if so, whether they visited each other in their homes. To my surprise, only five of the 56 Congolese respondents reported having South African friends. However, when I asked whether their South African friends had ever invited them to their homes and vice-versa, the five respondents responded negatively. They had never been invited to the homes of their South African friends and they, in turn, had never invited their South African friends to their homes. There was an atmosphere of distrust and suspicion among foreign nationals, an atmosphere in which anything citizens did or said was viewed as insincere and superficial, rather a ploy to take advantage of foreign nationals. The general sentiment was that such friendships could not be trusted or relied upon in times of need. In their own words: "It's not a bad thing to have friends. But we can't trust them. It's not easy to learn to trust these guys."[6] Another said: "They always ask you things about your life trying to know where you get your money. So you're afraid that they're spying on you."[7] Another said: "Our own friends say to us, 'Man the war is finished, the war is finished; you have to go back home'… what kind of friendship is that?"[8] Another stated: "South Africans like to take advantage of us because we're foreigners. And they say so if you ask them. I asked my South African friends from church why when we meet people I get treated differently. They said 'it's because you're a foreigner.'"[9] A Cameroonian national also said: "Once they see you, they see a criminal; they will only come near you when they need something from you."[10] Another put it this way:

> These guys don't like to associate with us because they say we behave in other ways. Usually they converse here with you friendly but when they're among themselves they speak badly about us. A few of them are good and they try to help. But most of them tell us that the war is finished and we should go home.[11]

About South African girlfriends, this Congolese national's response was typical: "You can't trust these guys. The women can't just love you. They want something from you.

Unless you agree to give them cash they can't love you."[12] Another Congolese national agreed: "No cash, no love and no friends."[13]

Another observation worth making pertains to the antagonism between members of both sides of the divide along gender lines. It appeared that foreign men felt less intimidated by South African women. On the contrary, they felt more intimidated by South African men. As a Burundian respondent said: "If I want directions I don't dare to ask a guy. I just ask a lady. Ladies don't have many problems."[14] It also appeared that foreign men were more likely to have female than male South African friends. As a Congolese national said:

> Yesterday I was coming from Parktown. I was coming with a South African lady. So she asked me to wait for her white she asked the taxi driver about something about taxis. And the guy was so rude to her. He yelled and insulted her in Zulu. The lady came back to me and she told me he was rude to her because she was with me and he didn't like it. She said: "He can see you're a foreigner."[15]

When asked if he had South African friends, the same participant said: "Some of us do have South African friends." However, he quickly added:

> But I must emphasize one thing. It's easier to make friends with South African women than with South African men. In most cases ladies are very good in relating to us. For guys, we're competitors who take away their women. And for ladies, they are proud to have a friend from another country. Women, if you have a problem they understand. South African women believe that foreigners are good. They like our manners. They like the fact that we like to dialogue. They take into account your personality, your manners, how you treat them. That's why they would happily marry you as a foreigner. But with South African men it's dictatorship and violence. [16]

These indications also suggest that the antagonism between the men from both sides of the divide was more pronounced than between foreign men and South African women. Claims that foreign men are competitor not only for "our jobs" but also for "our women" seem to suggest this.

COUNTER-BLAME GOSSIP

Among foreign nationals there was a stock of negative perceptions about citizens –
ignorance, parochialism, chauvinism, carelessness, cruelty, impoliteness, inconsideration,
sloth, rudeness, thoughtlessness, want of manner, uncaring, unloving, cultural
tastelessness, aggressiveness and violence and lack of self-restraint – all of which
constituted retaliatory blame-gossip. In a recent commentary on the established-outsiders
theory, Mennell writes: "It is a general principle that one group's *'we-image'* is defined
in large measure in relation to its *'they-image'* of another group or groups."[17] Or, to be
more precise:

> The intellectual and emotional construction of a group's 'we-image' and 'we-
> feelings' always takes place in tandem with the construction of a 'they-image'
> about the other or groups of people, and with the development of feelings about
> them. The other groups may be stronger or weaker, and will simultaneously be
> forming their own we- and they-images in relation to the first.[18]

Likewise, in South Africa citizens and non-citizens are interlocked in a similar
figurational dynamic. As I indicated earlier, relations between citizens and non-citizens
are replete with anti-immigrant blame-gossip both on local and national scales. I have
discussed how foreign nationals are blamed for crime, diseases, unemployment,
prostitution, dirt, disorder, dishonesty, being smelly (no deodorant), unintelligible speech
(Makwerekwere), uncivilized (Africans from the north). I have also discussed how South
African exceptionalism is a good example, i.e. they are more economically and
technologically advanced and civilized than the rest of Africa, and have the lightest skin
complexions in the continent.

The outsiders are not without attack or defence mechanism of their own. On the
contrary, in attempting to ward off the attacks levelled against them, they respond or
retaliate with praise-gossip and blame-gossip of their own. As they retaliate against
blame-gossip aimed at them by the citizens, their own "we-images" and "they-images"
crystallize and harden with time. When I asked about what the negative treatment did to
them, my participants showed no sign of internalized oppression. On the contrary, one of
them said: "It encourages me to love my country even more. I know I'm suffering
because I'm out of my country. It gives me a nationalistic feeling, that pride in being

Congolese."[19] Another said: "We are honest people. They are criminals. Even their government is full of criminals."[20] This is in sync with Morris' conclusion that superiority feelings and attitudes were forming among foreign nationals as a result of discrimination:

> The harsh treatment has… encouraged a tendency to view South Africans as the inferior 'Other'. The Nigerians and the Congolese interviewed generally exuded self-confidence and were often disparaging about the local Africans. There is little doubt that this combination further alienates the local black population from them.[21]

However, lacking in dense established networks – and by default lack in access to gossip channels and other sources of power – their retaliation is often more circumscribed to the outsider circles, evaporates before finding its way into the national gossip channels. It is deprived of flows and speed necessary to flood the consciousness of the established. Consequently, counter blame-gossip only reaches the consciousness of the citizenry in small trickles, with lessened impact, power and sting. Nonetheless, negative stereotypes about South Africans abound among foreign nationals, often tinged with anger, disappointment and feelings of rejection. Foreign nationals believed strongly that the relations within which South Africans stood with each other were uncivilized both in terms of civility and culture or honour and dignity. This could not have been clearer than during my interviews with foreign nationals. Similarly, studies on South African xenophobia have consistently found this to be the case.[22]

A current existed within foreign opinion in which South Africans were positioned as ignorant. A respondent attributed anti-immigrant attitudes to ignorance: "The problem with South Africans is that they don't know what's happening in other countries. They're ignorant."[23] In a response to a question about love with South African women, one participant said: "For me South African women have to go back to school and learn how to love before she can be with me. They're so ignorant. Just like their men. They have no manners."[24] Another said:

> One guy came to me the other day and said: "You're not a South African!" And I said: "Yes, I'm not a South African." And he said: "Are you Nigerian?" And I said: "No, I'm not Nigerian." And he said: "No, you're Nigerian for sure. If you're not a South African, you're a Nigerian!" So I said to myself: "You fucker

don't even know geography!" So he said: "If you're not from Nigeria, where are you from?" You see, these people don't know geography. It's the problem of level of education. It's too low. These people are ignorant. I said: "I'm from DRC." So he said: "Is that in Zimbabwe!" Can you imagine such stupidity and ignorance![25]

In a different study, a Cameroonian national made it clear that ignorance and lack of understanding among South Africans turned him off:

> There are those who are so ignorant that they don't understand anything. For example, one will look at you and someone from Ethiopia who is different from you, and would think that you are both from the same country. There are some are ignorant and those who understand. Generally I don't like going near them because I know they don't like me and they don't know anything about me or where I come from.[26]

While they bear in mind that such ignorance is the product of apartheid, foreign nationals cited it as a turn off nonetheless, as a Lesotho national suggested: "The apartheid wounds are still fresh. It will take longer to heal. Maybe the next generation would be more welcoming. Because of lack of education, and because they have not been outside this country, their thinking is very narrow and limited."[27] According to a Cameroonian national, "apartheid did not expose them to the outside world. When I tell them I speak French, they ask whether Cameroon is in France, or whether it's closer to Belgium. What type of ignorance is that?"[28] An informant in Morris' study expressed amazement at what he understood as South African ignorance while acknowledging that apartheid may have been responsible for the damage: "It's because of apartheid. They've been closed for a long time; they don't know anything about other countries. I was amazed when one student asked me if Zaire is in Egypt. Can you believe that?"[29]

Related to the idea of South African ignorance is another established idea of South African parochialism, which was also attributed to South Africa's past. As a Zimbabwean national commented: "I do not understand some of the people here in South Africa. They are so closed-minded. I believe that apartheid corrupted their minds and thinking… they either have a superiority complex or a very threatened attitude towards foreigners… apartheid has done that to them."[30] The discourse on South African chauvinistic preference to South African languages reinforces both ideas. For example, in my interviews, a Congolese national commented that:

162

[M]any citizens don't know even how to speak English because from primary school they learn everything in Zulu or Xhosa or something maybe until metric [sic]. And they don't want to learn English. I mean they don't want. And they all think they can make it without English… They'll speak with you all the way to Durban in Zulu; and it doesn't matter whether you understand or not.[31]

A Zambian national corroborated: "They're saying they're proud to be real Africans, to speak one language, and if you express yourself in English, they say: 'No, are you in England or in London? This is Africa. Why don't you join us and speak our Zulu or what not."[32] A Rwandan participant added: "To make things worse, they are even using Zulu at home affairs. And we don't understand it when we go there. So when we speak in English at home affairs they always reply in Zulu knowingly that we don't understand it."[33]

Ideas of ignorance, parochialism and linguistic chauvinism go hand in hand with the notion that South Africans are careless, cruel, impolite, inconsiderate, lazy, rude, thoughtless, wanting in manners, unloving, uneducated, culturally uncultivated and tasteless. In Morris' study, virtually all informants portrayed South Africans in that light. For example, a Congolese informant commented with certainty: "They are not used to culture. They don't know very well culture. For us it's very different because we know even [though] I've never been to France… I can tell you how French people are living. I can tell you how people in Brazil are. That's something about education."[34] In my interviews, the participants echoed the same views. For example, they attributed their language and communication problems to citizens' chauvinism, impoliteness and thoughtlessness. In my interviews, a Congolese national stated:

I joined a construction company. I was the only foreigner in that company. I could not communicate with anyone in the company. I was just quiet, quiet, quiet all the time. The guys didn't want me to say a word. The people, my fellow workmen, did not want to communicate with me in English. They said they were not white men. They said: 'Why are you trying to be white man?' They wanted me to speak an African language, which I don't know. I have my own African language, which they can't understand.[35]

The same problem prevented him from getting around, causing him to lose his job:

I didn't know my way around. And when you don't know a South African language, whom are you going to ask for information or directions. If you are sent to a new construction site, whom are you going to ask and how? You can't go to a taxi-rank to ask, where can I take a taxi to go to this place? Because they say: 'You're not white and we're not white; we don't speak English; so we cannot answer you.' But they're saying all this in English. So I decided to quit because I could not work without communication. I got a new job. But I had the same problem of language. I lost it too.[36]

With the charges of carelessness, habitual disinclination to self-exertion, infidelity and instant sexual gratification, the respondents took pointed aim at South African men. For example, in Morris' study, a Congolese married woman had this to say about South African men: "Black South Africans are not good. The men of South African, because they don't go to school to study, and they drink a lot… don't respect a wife. In our country if you've got a husband or wife, you've got one husband or one wife."[37] Another respondent tied crime and violence to sloth of citizenry:

> People here – some of them are very lazy. Some never went to have a job so they always believe in crime, robbery and all that. You see these chaps here are very lazy people. They believe in getting somebody now, taking away from him what he has right now, and, when it's finished, they go off. And when a great number of the population of a particular country is indulging in crime I wonder the future of such country.[38]

Another current running though the opinion of non-citizens positions South Africans as violent types. In the interviews, a Congolese national suggested that the difference between his in-group and the out-group, the South Africans, was the latter's habitual propensity to violence:

> South Africans think we behave in different ways. I agree. For example, when we the Congolese hear that South Africans rape babies of two months, it's shocking to us. We tell them that when we grew up we did not rape. When it comes to sex we always negotiate. You don't need money to negotiate. A woman can agree if she likes you or if she wants. These guys don't understand that.[39]

In a study on xenophobia at university campus, respondents were quick to point out that South Africans were prone to violent against each other and against outsiders. A Zimbabwean national held this view, pointing out he felt compelled to distance himself.

I socialise most of the time with non-South Africans. You can never trust this people. It is not safe to socialise freely with them. They are very sensitive. What is a joke to me might mean something serious to them. With them you say one word, it might lead to a fight on the spot. That might end with a bullet in one's head. That is why I try to stay away from them as far as possible.[40]

Similarly, a Congolese national spoke gorily about a South African culture of blood: "Most of my fellow countrymen, especially physicians, just studied the different types of wounds in theory back home, but they came to see them in real here. These people are violent among themselves, and they turn to other people, especially foreigners. They have a culture of blood and violence."[41] According to Congolese respondent in my interviews, violent habits and attitudes (real or mimetic) permeate South African everyday life. This could be seen in South African play:

I had a Zulu friend but his way of joking worried me. He always talked about guns and all that. You can't trust these guys. We're scared of them, our own friends. Sometimes he comes and points the gun at you and says, "Man give me all the money you have today." And you worry because you don't know if he's serious or just joking.[42]

This thread also runs through the participants in Morris's study. "In South Africa, black people, they are very, I mean, they kill, they kill a lot", said one.[43] "It's not a good country. I don't like South Africa. Too much killing. Always black men," said another.[44] "In this society you have no brother's keeper… there are so many very, very outrageous things (happening here)… It's a very violent place," said yet another.[45] At the same time foreign nationals also linked what they viewed as violent character to tribalistic attitudes, often citing both as turn offs. A Cameroonian national tied what he saw as South Africans' propensity to violence to tribal mindsets: "I have spent a whole year here in South Africa without friends. People here identify themselves according to tribes. I was once in a taxi, I was almost stabbed, because I could not speak any of the languages here."[46] Likewise, another Zimbabwean national felt that "[t]he African society is still divided along tribalistic lines. There is still a division between blacks and whites. By mixing with whites, I have been called names such as coconut, referring to me as being black on the outside and white on the inside."[47] Another Congolese national stated his views as follows: "People have apartheid in their heads. Whites… do not want to mingle

with blacks. Blacks… have an inferiority complex. I think the Sotho are… friendlier than the Zulus. Every time I tried making friends with a Zulu person, they asked me questions that made me feel uncomfortable."[48]

Another current seemed to suggest that South Africans were slaves of emotions, particularly envy and jealousy. The respondents claimed they were victims of South Africans' inability to withstand the pangs of envy and jealousy. According the respondents, the South African belief that foreign nationals take jobs, flats and women breeds uncontrollable jealousy among citizens. In fact, as I indicated earlier, this belief has often led state agencies and the public at large to take aggressive or violent measures against perceived foreign nationals. This is how a Zambian national explained it:

> South African men get jealous, because they think their women find foreign men more attractive. They say we take their women, flats and houses. At a certain point they were saying foreigners should leave all the flats in Hillbrow, Yeoville and Berea, for the locals to move in. Some foreigners moved out, but they (the locals) ended up moving out as well, because they thought foreigners lived there for free. They actually have a wrong view about freedom.[49]

Similarly, in his study, Morris points out that one of the stereotypes that shaped the interactions between citizens and foreign nationals was that foreign nationals "commandeered local women," and "[a]lmost all the interviewees mentioned that this was a source of tensions."[50] For example, a Nigerian informant wondered: "Why do people here see people from the north as their enemies? Most of them are not friendly… You look at the papers and they say the foreigners are taking their jobs, or that they're being arrogant to them. They're even taking their women."[51] These explanations seem to resonate with Cohen's observation that in established-outsider relations of this type, "[t]he stranger is thought ungrateful because he fails to acknowledge and affirm the culture that has given him shelter and protection."[52]

FEELINGS OF REJECTION

As I indicated in the previous chapters, citizens hold strong anti-immigrant attitudes and sentiments through the construction and mobilization of the image of *makwerekwere*. I have argued that, within the established-outsider frame, these attitudes and sentiments

coalesce as blame-gossip, with the long-term potential to produce sentiments of group-disgrace among foreign nationals. At the time I conducted this study, when the studies I hitherto cited were conducted, there was no evidence that such blame-gossip was producing an inferiority complex among non-citizens, despite the asymmetric power rations between the citizens and foreign nationals in favour of the first. It will take a few decades of continued blame-gossip and power asymmetry for foreign nationals to accrue negative views about themselves. However, it is evident that in the short-run the negative treatment of foreign nationals produced anger and feelings of rejection. The sense of rejection was evident in the interviews with the participants. One of them said:

> When we come here we come with rich backgrounds. I am a nurse. I worked as a nurse in DRC. I came here because of the war. It's not easy. It's very complicated. The government doesn't care. We try and try but nothing works. We try to be domestic workers. But even menial jobs like this can be denied to you because you're a foreigner. If you're looking for medical care they refuse to help you. I ask myself what kind of life are we living in South Africa. I don't know in other countries, but here we are the underclass. Even in the government there are criminals who treat us badly. I don't understand why they treat us like this. We're disappointed.[53]

Another participant, a Congolese national, told a story about his shame when a bus driver and passengers mocked and ridiculed him:

> I was going to visit my friend. When I got into the bus everybody knew I was a foreigner. The bus driver talked to me in Zulu. I didn't know how to respond. So they shouted Kwerekwere! And everybody went crazy laughing at me. I was ashamed asking myself what I have done. I just got into the bus like everybody else but they treated me like that. I was ashamed.[54]

Again, another Congolese participant told a story of humiliation at a hospital:

> The other day I went to Hillbrow hospital in Johannesburg. I met a doctor and she started to question me. She asked me why I was in SA; why I was not going back to my country; why I was spoiling South Africa by my presence. "Don't staying in South Africa! Don't spoil out country! This is not rubbish country! And we don't accept rubbish! Why are you spoiling our country?" That's what she said. I was very disappointed. You can imagine. To live in these conditions is impossible.[55]

Other studies also found that feelings of rejection overlaid foreign national opinion. A Zimbabwean national talked bitterly about uninvited unpleasant attention: "One day I

167

was walking in Smith Street, Greater Jo'burg when a group of women started shouting at me. They said to me: 'you dirty makwerekwere, come here, you fucking piece of shit.'[56] An Angolan national said:

> These people are very rejecting. I find it difficult to integrate because of the way I am treated by South Africans. They treat us like parasites. They look at us [foreigners] with reservation. Once they realize that you are foreigner, they think you fled your country due to economic problems, hunger or unemployment. They do not even think that one could flee because of civil war. The only thing they think about is that we are here to compete with them for jobs and other state benefits.[57]

One respondent who claimed he had been hired to teach computer programs to native students said: "The South Africans felt superior saying that I am Makwerekwere, that I'm a black guy and all that. And they refused to take instructions from me. But I was there to teach them computers. The company ended up getting rid of me." After this he got another teaching job where he was met with the same resistance: "The students didn't take me seriously. They had an attitude. They looked down on me. They would refuse to listen to me. They complained to the company saying that they didn't want Makwerekwere teaching them. So the company got rid of me again."[58] Another said: "When I see ignorant men despising me like that it affects me badly."[59]

Elsewhere a Swazi national felt "[t]hey are very haughty. They look down at other people. They really do not show respect for others. They think better of themselves than anybody else. They are inhospitable, really cold towards foreigners."[60] A Rwandan national complained angrily that "[t]here are a lot of Europeans here, Chinese and even African Americans, but they are not treated like us black foreigners. Black South Africans have a superiority complex. Just because I am from a poor country, I am looked down upon."[61] A Nigerian national reported that "when you walk into a supermarket, they serve a white man before you because you are a black and a non-South African. When a non South African drives a car in the country it is a big deal, when it is a South African it is normal."[62] Superiority attitudes and rejection were expressed through insults, slanders and slurs. Thus, complaints about verbal abuse in the hands of the citizenry abounded. In Morris' study, the informants expressed the same sentiments of rejection. "When I was in primary school we used to contribute money to fight apartheid…. these

are the same people who are not treating us like shit, especially black South Africans. If I had to go back to Nigeria and saw a South African begging on the street I wouldn't even give him a cent for the brutality that my brothers and sisters have suffered here."[63] Another said: "One night I was walking in Hillbrow and this woman started shouting at me: 'I know you're not from this country. Just go back. We don't need you here. We don't like you here'."[64] This problem was aggravated by language and communication problems, as Shindondola points out: "The inability to speak an indigenous language is a major obstacle in terms of integration. This often sets the stage for xenophobic tendencies." A Congolese student who participated in Shindondola's study indicated: "One day I was in a taxi and I was almost stabbed because I could not understand what the driver was saying to me."[65]

When measured against reality, such stereotypes are nothing less or more than myths, yet their emotive power to divide and generate hatred on both sides of the divide remains unabated. These myths produce emotionally powerful knowledge, whether such knowledge is fictitious or not, factually verifiable or not. "Myths have a unique capacity of conveying a sense of belonging and continuity through successive generations," writes Conversi, noting that they "powerfully carry and disseminate the distinction between in-group and out-group, which is the essential function of boundaries, even in the absence of promptly visible ethnic makers.[66]

OUTSIDERS DIVIDED

Some indications seem to suggest that retaliation, the counter blame-gossip, tends to backfire to some degree, which in turn hurts non-citizens even more. Reaction against counter-blame gossip appears to be stronger among South African men and it is directed against male foreign nationals. As I pointed out, the charges of aggressiveness, violence, promiscuity, disrespect for wives and sloth were levelled against them. First, the sensitivity toward these charges suggests that they have a stinging power which South African men find particularly intolerable. Secondly, the sensitivity to the charges also appears to suggest an existence of a precarious, fragile and weak sense of security among citizens. Thirdly, the sensitivity suggests that the power ratios between the multitude of poor citizenry and the expatriate community are less uneven. The ability of foreign

169

nationals to weather the storms of blame-gossip, aggressiveness and violence blown against them – that is, the ability to resist effectively – and their ability to deliver emotionally stinging counter-blame-gossip against their attackers – that is, their ability to retaliate forcefully – depends to a greater or lesser extent on their in-group social organization.

As a social group, black foreign nationals are far from being an organized and integrated community. Ethnic, linguistic and national diversities are sources of bickering and divisions within the multitude of African foreign nationals. Immigrant associations organized along nationalistic and ethnic lines at odds with each other have crystallized. There is an association of Ghanaians; an association of Nigerians; an association of Cameroonians; an association of Zimbabweans; an association of Congolese. Further, within these national groupings there are internal ethnic divisions. Among the Nigerians there are Igbo and Yoruba cultural associations. An internal antagonism exists between them. Among the Cameroonians there are two internal divisions, that of the English-speakers that of the French-Speakers. The two groups are at odds with each other, among the Congolese there are internal ethnic divisions. On the one hand, the Kongo distrust the Luba and the Mongo. On the other hand, the Luba distrust the Kongo and the Mongo. In turn, the Mongo distrust the Kongo and the Luba. This distrust is accentuated where members of any of these ethnic groups do not speak the language of one or the other ethnic group. Among the Zimbabweans there are the Ndebele who view the Shona with contempt and suspicion. The Shona on their part view themselves as authentic, superior Zimbabweans, and the Ndebele as invaders and therefore illegitimate Zimbabweans. With one single association, the Ghanaians seem the least divided. "We essentially take care of one another and make sure that we are out of problems in South Africa," said the secretary of their association.[67] Nonetheless, an overview of African foreign nationals as a group shows no sign of anything resembling an end to their disunity, let alone the formation of these rival sub-groups.

A detailed study of the organization of West African foreign nationals found that West African groups were well organized, forming intra-ethnic or intra-nationalistic dense networks and gossip channels through which information was distributed far and wide with greater efficiency.[68] In the 1990s, Morris' study of Johannesburg inner-city

communities found that news travelled very fast among Nigerians. Although his study included the Congolese, he could not make the same claim about them. In fact, when I interviewed them, the Congolese themselves expressed admiration for Nigerian organization and unity, whilst lamenting the lack thereof among themselves. As an indication of their disunity, the Congolese respondents blamed their plight to their own compatriots. As one said: "Our countrymen are not honest. They like secrecy. They would rather help their own tribesmen than any other Congolese. The Nigerians are much well organized. Nobody messes with them."[69] Another said: "This is what happens with us the Congolese. If he has a job he doesn't care about others. And if he knows about an opportunity he only tells those who come from his tribe. If there is no one from his tribe he doesn't tell anyone even if he knows many Congolese who need jobs."[70] In 2004, a student wrote: "Being wary of other Congolese is another means of ensuring survival. They are usually very suspicious of one another, especially those that come from other regions of the Congo."[71] On this score he cited one of his respondents:

> It is not easy to trust others, except for a few. If a Congolese is aware that you are going to get money from home with which to pay your rents, for instance, he may arrange for you to get robbed so he can get a share from the 'tsotsis'. Congolese have become so 'money hungry' that they would do anything for money even if it means hurting their own brother. This is what happened to me.[72]

When I asked whether they felt united as Congolese nationals, the respondents replied negatively. My Congolese informant/interpreter could not mention a single organized Congolese community. He mentioned the association of Francophone Africans, of which the Congolese were supposedly part. However, he was not sure whether such an organization existed. The same was true of a Congolese old man I interviewed. When asked if there was a Congolese community in Johannesburg, he imagined an association of Francophone Africans: "I think there is this Francophone association," he said with obvious uncertainty. When asked if he knew the president's name, he replied that he did not. Frankly, the old man did not seem to care to know, coming across as a cynic. Things were going well for him and his family. He had no need for such an association.

Perhaps another factor accounting for Congolese fragmentation is the geography of Congo. Congo is the third largest country in Africa, after Sudan and Algeria, a fact the

Congolese in Johannesburg liked to brag about. The communication systems are largely underdeveloped, thus keeping the country fragmented, regions and territories largely autonomous, and ethnic groups isolated. This makes the widening of circles of mutual identification extremely difficult. The southern Congolese do not mutually identify with their northern counterparts, nor do the easterners see their western counterparts as compatriots.[73] The Congolese from one region see their counterparts from another region as aliens. As Atam found out:

> [I]n the case of the Congolese in Johannesburg, weak ties are very loose and not frequent. There is high level of mistrust and isolation, which leads to a tendency to bond in small groups of confidants. They seem to feel more comfortable in pockets of smaller networks, in which they can interact, bond and trust one another.[74]

It is this process of mutual identification and des-identification which colours Congolese social relations in Johannesburg. Although mutual des-identification and distrust exist within other African nationalities in Johannesburg, they appear to be extreme among the Congolese. The isolation of the Congolese and extreme culture of suspicion among themselves are insurmountable difficulties for recourse and redress. Again, to cite Atam:

> This isolation… does not play to their advantage, and that is perhaps one of the reasons why they find it so hard to adapt fast enough into South African society. Some of the respondents themselves made mention of the solidarity that existed in other communities, because they were able to create bigger, more useful networks. This disadvantage on the part of the Congolese seems to be compounded by the fact that they have limited interactions with members of other communities, including their South African hosts.[75]

The impact of the asymmetric power balance between the citizens and foreign nationals in favour of the first is worth commenting on. First, this power asymmetry ensures that citizens maintain the monopoly of sources of power. By fashioning and championing an ideology of citizenship predicated on nativity to the soil, they have accrued this upper hand advantage. Second, among other things, this enabled them to form dense and wide social, psychological, political and economic networks, which now enable them to close ranks against foreign nationals. Third, this power asymmetry operates as a protective psychological insulation against the sting of counter-blame-

gossip, making it almost impossible for counter-group-stigma to stick on the citizens. Fourth, in tandem with this, the disunity of foreign nationals impinges upon their ability to resist blame-gossip, aggressiveness and violence on the one hand, and their ability to retaliate with forceful counter-blame-gossip on the other? Their fragmentation means that rather than forming inclusive dense and wide social, psychological, political and economic networks, they form short and narrow networks. They build gossip channels that are clogged and chocked up by ethnic disunity, distrust and suspicion, which obstructs rather than permits swift flows of information. The channels undercut the legitimacy of their grievances.

In this chapter I discussed the coping or resistance mechanisms with which foreign nationals seek to avoid being identified as alien bodies and targeted for violence. I also pointed out that foreign nationals retaliate with blame-gossip of their own. In so doing they seek to construct group-stigma and try to make it stick on their hosts. Whether this retaliation is effective, and whether the counter-stigma sticks on the established, remains to be seen in the long run. However, I also suggested that the absence of dense social networks among foreign nationals, their lack of access to gossip channels (the media, in this case) and sources of power, their retaliation remains ineffective at large.

NOTES

[1] Quoted in C. Petkou 2005, "The Development", p. 199
[2] Ibid.
[3] Interviews, March 2007.
[4] Interviews, March 2007.
[5] Interviews, January 2007.
[6] Interviews, January 2007.
[7] Interviews, March 2007.
[8] Interviews, January 2007.
[9] Interviews, January 2007.
[10] C. Petkou 2005, "The Development", p. 179.
[11] Interviews, January 2007.
[12] Interviews, January 2007.
[13] Interviews, January 2007.
[14] Interviews, January, 2007.
[15] Interviews, March 2007.

[16] Interviews, March 2007.

[17] S. Mennell 2008, *The American Civilizing Process*, p. 19.

[18] Ibid. p. 40.

[19] Congolese National, Interviews, March 2007.

[20] Congolese National, Interviews, March 2007.

[21] A. Morris 1998, "Our Fellow Africans".

[22] See A. Morris 1998, "Our Fellow Africans"; C. Petkou 2005, "The Development"; H. Shindontola 2003, "Xenophobia in SA".

[23] Congolese National, Interviews, January 2007.

[24] Congolese National, Interviews, February 2007.

[25] Congolese National, Interviews, February 2007.

[26] C. Petkou 2005, "The Development," p. 179.

[27] H. Shindondola 2003, "Xenophobia in SA", p. 57.

[28] Ibid.

[29] A. Morris 1998, "Our Fellow Africans", p. 1125.

[30] H. Shindondola 2003, "Xenophobia in SA", p. 56.

[31] Interviews, January 2007.

[32] Interviews, January 2007.

[33] Interviews, January 2007.

[34] A. Morris 1998, "Our Fellow Africans", p. 1128.

[35] Interviews, January 2007

[36] Interviews, January 2007

[37] A. Morris 1998, "Our Fellow Africans", p. 1127.

[38] Ibid.

[39] Interviews, January 2007.

[40] H. Shindondola 2003, "Xenophobia in SA", p. 64.

[41] Ibid.

[42] Interviews, January 2007.

[43] A. Morris 1998, "Our Fellow Africans", p. 1127.

[44] Ibid.

[45] Ibid.

[46] H. Shindondola 2003, "Xenophobia in SA", p. 64.

[47] Ibid.

[48] Ibid.

[49] Ibid. p. 52.

[50] A. Morris 1998, "Our Fellow Africans", p. 1124.

[51] Ibid. p. 1123-4.

[52] Ibid. p. 1126.

[53] Interviews, March 2007.

[54] Interviews, March 2007.

[55] Interviews, February 2007.

[56] H. Shindondola 2003, "Xenophobia in SA", p. 53.

[57] Ibid. p. 52.

[58] Interviews, March 2007.

[59] Interviews, March 2007.

[60] H. Shindondola 2003, "Xenophobia in SA", p. 52.

[61] Ibid.

[62] C. Petkou 2005, "The Development", p. 207.

[63] A. Morris 1998, "Our Fellow Africans", p. 1123.

[64] Ibid. p. 1123.

[65] H. Shindondola 2003, "Xenophobia in SA", p. 53.

[66] D. Conversi 1999, "Nationalism, Boundaries and Violence", p. 560.

[67] C. Petkou 2005, "The Development", p. 210.

[68] Ibid. Petkou lists six West African associations including the Association of English Speaking Cameroonians in South Africa (AESCA-SA), Association des Cameroonais en Afrique du Sud (ACAS), Association des Ivoiriens en Afrique du Sud (AIAS), The Nigerian Family Meeting in South Africa (NFMSA), The Association of Momo-Elits South Africa (AMESA), and the Ghanaian Association in Johannesburg (GHAJOSA), p. 209.

[69] Interviews, February 2007.

[70] Interviews, March 2007.

[71] M. Atam 2004, "Networks as a Survival Strategy of New Arrivals: A Study of Congolese Asylum Seekers in Johannesburg," p. 49. Hereafter, "Networks as Survival."

[72] M. Atam 2004, "Networks as Survival", p. 49. The ways in which Congolese nationals viewed and related to each other in South Africa rings true to Barth's views who said an ethnic formation is "largely biologically self-perpetuating, shares fundamental cultural values, realized in overt unity in cultural forms, make up a field of communication and interaction and has a membership which identifies itself, and is identified by others, as constituting a category distinguishable from other categories of the same order" (Barth 1996: 75).

[73] S. Jackson 2007, "Of 'Doubtful Nationality': Political Manipulation of Citizenship in the D. R. Congo"; S. Jackson 2006, "Sons of which Soil? The Language and Politics of Autochthony in Eastern D.R. Congo".

[74] M. Atam 2004, "Networks as a Survival", p. 58.

[75] Ibid. p. 59. It is quite possible that factors external to South Africa could be at work against the Congolese. Congo is a vast territory with a weak central state. The Congolese state lacks the monopoly of the means of violence and taxation necessary to contain centrifugal tendencies. In Congo there are no efficient road and communication systems. My respondents told me that it was impossible to drive from Lubumbashi to Kinshasa. There was no road connecting the two cities, they said. The rainforest has engulfed the one road the Belgians built in the colonial days. Only air-travel links the largest cities of the country, they said. One informant said it would take a month to drive from and to either city. The central government in Kinshasa is unable to exert pressure and influence equally throughout the Congo. It is unable to position itself as a unifying central force by pacifying the country and building and maintaining roads and communication networks. The different warlords and fiefdoms scattered across the Congo remain largely autonomous. The neighbouring nationals, particularly the Ugandans and Rwandans, make periodic looting excursions into the Congo. With disintegrated ethnic groups scattered throughout, Congo is a territory of strangers often hostile to each other. This historical social structure of the Congo has left a distinctive mark on the Congolese social habitus.

This social habitus, this trait of personality structure, now structures the Congolese everyday world in a strange land, preventing the widening of circles of mutual identification.

> Almost all South Africans, black and white, have heard of the square kilometre space that makes up Hillbrow. The mention of Hillbrow invariably produces a slightly anxious titter. It has always had the reputation of being a neighbourhood on the cutting edge, a neighbourhood populated by the more deviant segments of the society and a locality where many dubious activities occur. This perception is due to its enormous concentration of residents – the common view is that it is the most densely urban space in South Africa. Relative to other neighbourhoods, large numbers of Hillbrow's population have been transient and unfettered by family and responsibility. This has contributed towards a concentration of unconventional behaviours in Hillbrow, with many residents having no need or desire to conform to mainstream life-styles, dress codes or bodily aesthetics.[1]

As I indicated in chapter 2, two theoretical threads – namely *dyscivilization* and *liminality* respectively – are woven in a discussion of three interrelated issues – namely the spaces with high concentration of foreign nationals; the condition of relations between citizens and foreign nationals in these spaces; and the condition within which foreign nationals live. Based on elaboration on Elias' theory of the civilizing process, the notion of dyscivilization will shed light on the nature of relations between citizens and foreign nationals as well the spaces within which these relations are produced. This discussion will be taken a step further with the metaphorical representation of the status of African foreign nationals with the concept of *liminality.*

DECIVILIZATION OF RELATIONS AND SPACES

To revisit De Swaan's deliberations, dyscivilization is compartmentalization of cruelty: "Compartmentalization is the social arrangement and psychic defence mechanism *par excellence* in a dyscivilizing society. To maintain it requires both rigid separations and carefully staged passages between the different emotional and interactional domains."[2] In relations between citizens and non-citizens, such passages between the different emotional and interactional domains may involve swift alternations of identification and dysidentification, delight and disgust, love and hate, benevolence and malevolence, good-

will and ill-will, kindness and hostility, friendliness and unfriendliness, humanity and inhumanity, goodness and badness, sympathy and antipathy, kindness and unkindness, philanthropy and misanthropy, compassion and indifference, warm-heartedness and cold-heartedness, "civil" to "dyscivil" conduct, etc.

Compartmentalization of cruelty is well illustrated in what Loic Wacquant described as 'ghettoization' of American inner cities. According to Wacquant, the black American ghetto represents the reversal of the civilizing process. To digress, one might add that according to Elias, one of the hallmarks of the civilizing process was state formation – i.e., the monopolization of the means of violence and taxation – the state's involvement in people's lives as an external constraint that repressed aggressiveness, tamed the warrior classes and turned them into courtiers, pacified human relations, and propelled the widening of circles of mutual identification between formerly rival groups. According to Wacquant, the black American ghetto emerged in the 1960s as a result of state withdrawal from spaces where blacks were highly concentrated, America's inner cities.[3] This ensured the "disintegration of public space and social relations in the urban core."[4] This structural shift went hand in hand with the demonization of the black "sub-proletariat" with ideologies of the "underclass", the "gang banger", and the "welfare mother." All this is illustrated by "the *depacification of everyday life, social dedifferentiation leading to organizational desertification* and *informalization of the economy.*"[5] According to Wacquant, "each of these processes is set off and abetted by the collapse of public institutions and by the ongoing replacement of the 'social safety net' by the 'dragnet' of police, courts, and prisons."[6] De Swaan elaborates: "[A]s the state withdraws from the inner-city areas, chains of interdependence break down, self-restraints disintegrate, 'depacification' proceeds and violence proliferates without the police intervening anymore, social differentiation is reversed as only informal economic activities remain."[7]

A dyscivilizing process has befallen social spaces with high concentration of black foreign nationals in South Africa. The inner city neighbourhoods of Hilldrow and Yeoville in Johannesburg represent these dyscivilizing trends. In his book *Bleakness and Light,* Morris begins the first chapter with a bleak description of Hillbrow that is worth citing at length:

Contemporary Hillbrow is a neighbourhood of contrasts. On a summer evening one can see smartly dressed middle-class residents walking past poverty-stricken street children sniffing glue and adult hoboes directing cars into parking bays. A few meters on, a sex worker dressed in a microscopic outfit is openly trying to lure customers to her flat. Her abode is in a dingy block of flats consisting of single rooms, all of which are occupied by sex workers. Across the road, in fenced off cul-de-sac, many white and a few black pensioners can be seen sedately sipping tea under steel umbrellas. On either side of this old-age home, there is a two-metre high steel-spiked fence to protect the residents. The pensioners are the only white people visible. The small block of flats next door to the well-maintained old-age home is occupied by many sex workers. Across the road is a large block of flats that is heaving under the strain of its numerous tenants. Washing and people are draped over most balconies and there is a constant stream of people coming and going. The paint is peeling off and the façade is dirty.[8]

Businesses disinvested from inner city and retreated to the suburbs, notably Sandton. The banks redlined the inner city, declaring it a danger zone for business and investment. Banks stopped offering credit not only to businesses in these places but also to landlords for the maintenance of residential buildings. The condition of buildings deteriorated. The value of property declined. Sellers could not sell and buyers could not buy. As formal businesses packed and left, informalization of the economy set in. Street vending and hawking sprang and are now the main occupation. The pleasure industry expanded and prospered.

As a consequence of the state turning its back on Hillbrow and Yeoville, these neighbourhoods became increasingly depacified, everyday life in these places became more and more aggressive and violent. The infrastructures – public spaces such as schools, parks, streets – were neglected. In the public discourse, inner city Johannesburg was positioned as the hotbed of crime and iniquity. This view was championed in the media and eventually crystallized and ossified into public common sense. The high concentration of black foreign nationals in these places aggravated their disrepute. Morris indicates that one of the main demographic shifts in Hillbrow, but also in Yeoville, in the second half of the 1990s has been "the inward movement of a substantial number of Africans from countries north of the neighbouring states, most notably Nigeria and the Democratic Republic of Congo (IDR)."[9] The incoming foreign nationals and the

incoming rural citizens were plunged together in disinvested, neglected, stateless spaces. Subjects in these zones now live in deplorable conditions, i.e. poor housing, overcrowding, unhygienic conditions, poor sanitation, rampant unemployment and underemployment.

All participants that I interviewed lived in crowded spaces with their compatriots. The chains of interdependencies have broken down and mutual identification between groups has been replaced by mutual distrust and fear. This fear grips foreign nationals more than citizens since aggressiveness and violence (crime) are meted more against the former than the latter, usually by the latter.

LIMINALIZATION OF RELATIONS AND SPACES

It is important to note here that liminality is a symptom of dyscivilization, more notably compartmentalization of cruelty. Johannesburg inner city spaces with high concentration of black foreign nationals, particularly Hillbrow and Yeoville, have a liminal atmosphere. They are ambiguous, bizarre, confusing, unstructured zones. The foreign nationals in these spaces are caught up and taken over by the liminal cloud that hovers over them. Such an atmosphere subdues them with a gloomy mood. This heavy air does not simply reflect the stigma and blame gossip with which the natives imagine and define foreign nationals. It is an atmosphere that steams up in tandem with growing compartmentalization of cruelty. It is the product of emotional work of demonization and vilification. The withdrawal of the sate and businesses from these zones means that the zones are plunged in an indefinite state of exception wherein the rule of law is suspended, chains of interdependences between people cease to be reliable, distrust and fear deepen, aggressiveness and violence escalate, the value of human life plummets, circles of mutual identification between people shrink, consideration for others withers away. Morris's study shows clearly that it is common for police officers to disregard the rule of law in these zones; to engage in criminal acts directly; to collaborate with criminals, e.g. by renting out police uniform and equipment for a price. As a participant stated:

> So the problem here is kidnapping. They stop you and they take you to Soweto. They are using police cars and ID. When they come to you they show you the police ID. You have to surrender yourself to them. They say they will take you to

the office for some explanation. In the car you will be tied with something over your eyes and you don't know the place you are taken to. They will tell you to phone and request a certain amount. When this amount is given to them they will let you go without you being tortured.[10]

Morris heard stories like this from all the participants he interviewed. In fact, the anti-structure, the ambiguity, the bizarreness, and the confusion inherent in these zones are such that it is often impossible to distinguish between criminals and police officers. The participants in Morris' study reported that they could no longer tell the difference between genuine police and criminals because they spoke alike, acted alike and had similar objectives. The participants in my study had these very same concerns. For instance, one said:

> The police, the community itself, they are almost the same. The police arrested my friend. They took my friend's phone. After taking his phone they told him he could go. So the following day we went looking for them and we found them in the morning at park station. They were assembled and when we arrived we asked about the cell-phone. The commander warned us that the policeman who took the phone could shoot and kill us if he found out we were there. He said: "I advise you to leave right now before he shows up."[11]

With blame gossip, citizens also cast a spell of liminal personae onto black foreign nationals. It is noticeable that in the blame gossip (media and word of mouth) foreign nationals are often positioned as illegal subjects. They are denied legal documents and subsequently portrayed as "undocumented" or "illegal" and thus unnameable and unidentifiable. This assigned illegality disguises them, positioning them as ambiguous and unknowable figures. A study of construction of identity in African cities revealed that South African public narratives tended to liminalize black foreign nationals. For example, a respondent in Johannesburg claimed that, due to their invisibility, black foreign nationals committed crime without leaving traces behind:

> They just sell drugs... and another thing they are also used by some of us to destroy our community. They tell a foreigner that 'we give you R400.00, remove this person.' The foreigners will kill that person because *it will be unknown; these people do not have an identity.* We can see that this one is a foreigner but home affairs *do not have these people's identity. So it is easier for us to be arrested in such cases. But it is not easy for them to be arrested.*[12]

181

These respondents also criticized the government for failing to implement tougher immigration laws. This criticism was crafted in terms that characterized foreign nationals as shady figures:

> The responsibility of our government is to see to it that the citizens of this country are protected… How do you expect *a person who is untraceable, a foreigner for that matter,* who has done something wrong to taste the cost of justice?... if am a SA citizen, I know if I am doing crime out there, one day I am going to be traced and I'll have to face the law. The problem with these people is that they are doing crime knowing very well that nothing is going to happen to them.[13]

As targets of compartmentalization, foreign nationals carry everywhere their liminal being in the world. They embody society's dyscivilization. They attract unwanted attention and uncivil conduct from the citizenry. The figure "makwerekwere" keeps them outside the bounds of normal, civilized, human relations. Blame gossip – notably that they commit crimes, that they steal jobs from citizens, that they snatch women from native men, that they bring diseases such as AIDS, that they stink, that they litter the cities and so on – accomplishes the socio-emotional work of dysidentification necessary to cloud them with a decivilized and liminal aura, which then permits citizens to unleash aggression and violence against them without guilt feelings. Thus, as a citizen, one is permitted to take on dyscivil conduct as one enters into contact with black foreign national, and to take it off and replace it with civil conduct once that contact ends. Subsequently one re-enters once again into relations with fellow citizens as if nothing happened just a few minutes or hours before. This practice repeats itself to the point in which it becomes routinized and feels effortless, seamless and normal. Face to face with foreign nationals, life is decivilized. Face to face with fellow citizens, life is civilized. Once this pattern takes hold, to quote De Swaan again, "[n]o doubt, the onset of dyscivilizing process already exists. The transition from almost lethal neglect to actual extermination, however, would require many further momentous steps."[14] The dyscivilized conduct of citizens in their relations with non-citizens is liminal because it is betwixt and between the bounds, the transitional realms, of civility required in citizen-citizen relations. Within the bounds of citizen-foreigner relations compartmentalization

relieves citizens from the demands of civilization, relaxes the pressure of sublimation, sets citizens free to let lose, let go, give in to destructive drives and passions which are not tolerated in the bounds of citizen-citizen relations.

Turner makes the important point that liminal subjects (or transitional beings) "*have* nothing", "no status, property, insignia, secular clothing, rank, kinship position, nothing to demarcate them structurally from their fellows."[15] Similarly, in dyscivilizing societies, the target populations are stripped off whatever possessions they may have before they are herded to archipelagos of enclaves of cruelty. Many black foreign nationals in South Africa lack, or have a few, possessions. This is more so with asylum seekers and refugees, for many of whom the body and the clothes on it are the only possessions. However, citizens often want even the few possession that foreign nationals own. In South Africa, reliable and secure residential spaces for African foreign nationals remain a wish. This is the case in Johannesburg inner city where foreign nationals' residences are frequently raided by the police and civilians alike. Consequently, black foreign nationals often take their most valuable possessions everywhere they go, the most import of which are personal documents and money, which makes them perfect targets for criminal activities.

STRUCTURAL INVISIBILITY AND ISOLATION

An important aspect of dyscivilization, to revisit De Swaan's point, involves the isolation of the target population. Similarly, in his discussion of the liminal phase in rites of passage, Turner makes the point that as prohibited or tabooed beings, society strives to render liminal subjects invisible, isolate them:

> The neophytes are sometimes said to 'be in another place.' They have physical but not social 'reality,' hence they have to be hidden, since it is paradox, a scandal, to see what ought not to be there! Where they are not removed to a sacred place of concealment they are often disguised, in masks or grotesque costumes or stripped with white, red, or black clay, and the like.[16]

Structural invisibility of foreign nationals manifests itself in a variety of ways, particularly in relations to access to socio-economic opportunities, the means of power and prestige. In the job interviews the ambiguity of the applicant will be invoked to

justify denial of hiring. As I indicated earlier, there are many instances in which black foreign nationals are denied access to resources and services for no other reason than the fact of being immigrants.

Structural invisibility translates in isolation of foreign nationals. The relations between citizens and foreign nationals are clearly an expression of this problem. Foreign nationals with school-age children reported lack of meaningful interaction between their children and native children. Studies that sought to measure the social integration of foreign nationals in South Africa found the interaction between foreign and native children to be very minimal, often reserved and limited to schools.[17] Immigrant and local children rarely "hanged out" or "chilled out" together; rarely went side by side to malls or movies; rarely visited each other in their homes; rarely dated each other. Immigrant children barely spoke local languages, making more meaningful interaction particularly difficult – let alone local children's ability to speak foreign languages. Shindondola's study of international students' experiences of xenophobia at the University of Johannesburg revealed that African foreign students lived in isolation. There was minimal interaction between domestic students and African international students.[18]

The anti-African sentiments and attitudes as well as the accompanying compartmentalization of incivility, aggression and violence against black foreign nationals permeate many aspects of social life; it colours everyday comings and goings; it structures social classes and institutions (both private and public). A Congolese participant, for example, related this account: "In my job I was supposed to teach students computers. But they didn't want to learn from me because they said I was makwerekwere. They complained that it was not good for the company to employ me. The company ended my contract."[19] Just as neophytes in rites of passage are tabooed, viewed as polluting subjects, foreign nationals are illegalized, prohibited and isolated. Offering them services is illegal and subject to blame gossip. Taking services from them is illegal and subject to blame gossip. Their lives are illegal. The anti-immigrant sentiments and attitudes, along with the respective compartmentalized behaviour, throw foreign nationals into an emotional wilderness of isolation and loneliness. This process produces and escalates social and psychological distances between citizens and foreign nationals, widens the circles of dysidentification between these two groups, and at the

same time strengthens social and psychological identifications between the established groups that make claims to South African citizenship and nationality. De Swaan makes the point that both at personal and group levels, "compartmentalization proceeds though *dysidentification* from the designated victim population, the withdrawal of identificatory affect, the denial that the target population might be similar to oneself and the repression of emotions that result from identification, such as sympathy, pity, concern, jealousy, etc."[20] By closing ranks, citizens distance themselves from foreign nationals, pushing them as far as possible from the sources and means of power, prestige and survival. A culture of witch hunting, of investigating suspects to expose their presumed foreign origins, is growing. The unlucky are deported to their supposed 'homelands'. African foreign nationals are denied jobs regardless of their legal status or qualifications. They are denied legal status which is subsequently used as a pretext for denying them social and economic opportunities. Legal status is also used to deny them access to services such as bank accounts, social assistance, health services and education. I encountered a case of a Congolese refugee who, for ten years, has been trying to get university admission to no avail.

As I indicated, friendships between citizens and foreign nationals tend toward brittle bonds. As far as foreign nationals are concerned, South African friends cannot be trusted. Foreign nationals do not feel they can turn to a South African friend in times of need. Such friendships do not guarantee mutual identification and understanding, and they are at best unpredictable. A South African friend is just as dangerous as a criminal, or perhaps even more so, just as the police are as untrustworthy as criminals. Marriage between male foreign nationals and female citizens are also viewed with suspicion. The conception that South African women love money and love for money is widespread. An interviewee summed up: "No money, no love."[21] A strong sense of distrust abounds between citizens and foreign nationals. Foreign nationals, regardless their status, are constantly vigilant, watching their backs, their whole social spaces, against citizens. Citizens are construed as treacherous predators that befriend foreign nationals for opportunistic purposes – they befriend only to pounce when occasion arises.

The decivilization of their social lives and spaces, the decivilization of relations they have with natives, the compartmentalization of the citizens' behaviour toward

foreign nationals, suggests that the ambiguity of liminal personae has befallen black foreign nationals. Many foreign nationals who participated in this study were overwhelmingly in this position. This was evident among asylum seekers and refugees. In South Africa an asylum seeker is viewed as "someone who applied for protection as a refugee and is awaiting the determination of his or her status, while a refugee is someone who has already been granted legal protection by a state."[22] Many Congolese nationals I interviewed were in the asylum seeker status indefinitely, some for five or even ten years.

> [I]t takes some asylum seekers years before their status is being determined [sic]. Several immigrants interviewed in this research who entered South Africa in the early 1990s were still asylum seekers when this research was been [sic] conducted. A Nigerian Immigrant responded as follows when asked if he would like to get a formal job in South Africa: "Getting a formal job is out of the question. We came here as asylum seekers and remain like than for years. You can't get a job with a refugee paper. I came here in 1998 and up until today I am still an asylum seeker.[23]

The Asylum Seeker Temporary Permit (ASTP) instituted in Section 22 of the new Refugee Act of 1998 stipulates that its holder can take up employment or study. However, employers and state institutions disregard it. Educational institutions and the police have no respect or use for it. Speaking of it, a Burundian foreign national said:

> They don't allow us to use this paper which we got from their own home affairs. Yet I slept two nights outside in rainy season to get this in Pretoria. The papers the home affairs give us are useless. You can't even open a bank account with this. And if the police find you with this they tear it up when they want and say they don't recognize it. So that's why we don't walk around with our documents. We make photocopies just in case the police decide to tear them up.[24]

This created the problem of not being able to plan for one's future or the future of one's children. The granting of refugee status does not follow any apparent time-frame of procedure. The refugee status appears to be granted randomly and in many cases it involves bribery with home affairs officials. Asylum seeker status remains a liminal status in which many foreign nationals remain trapped.

The liminal status to which foreign nationals are relegated negates them freedom, denies them life without fear. The fearful and the uneasy with which they navigate social

spaces is clearly an indication of this. Travelling or walking within the city is a dreadful experience. As one foreign national stated, "We walk everyday with our hearts in our hands because we expect it anytime."[25] The means of transportation have been notable dreadful spaces:

> I don't like the taxi because when you are in a taxi the first thing you will find is that people will do their best to ask you questions in their own languages. They ask you questions and when you don't know to answer those questions it's not good. Some of them are saying bad things to me, like "go home" or "*makwerekwere*".[26]

This sentiment was consistent in my interviews, with participants reporting avoiding taxis for fear of citizens' aggression and violence. According to the participants, travel by taxi requires avoidance of interaction with fellow passengers, since accent or inability to speak a local language often betrays one's strangeness. For foreign nationals the social organization of taxi rides and language incompetence constitute a set up, a trap, for aggression or outright violence with possible deadly consequences. As a result, they avoid taxis. Or avoid speaking once they are trapped in a taxi despite the fact that travel in South African taxis is structured in such a way that passengers must speak. Avoidance of speech in a taxi is accomplished through good understanding of how taxi rides are accomplished. Therefore, a brief digression to describe the structure of South African taxi travel is useful to give a useful "feel" of the subtle ways in which the *makwerekwere* figure is constructed through discourse and practice.

The South African taxi, not taxicab, has 18 seats, excluding the driver's seat. On the left of the driver's seat there are two passenger seats. Behind the driver's seat there are four rows of seats. Each row has four seats. The taxi does not leave the rank until all the 18 seats are occupied. As the taxi departs, passengers begin to pay their fares. However, passengers do not pay their fares individually directly to the driver. Fare payment is done through a *collection and relay process*. The fares are paid row by row. Usually the passengers in the back row pay first, followed by the passengers in the following row and so on. In each row one passenger collects the fares from all passengers in the row; counts the collection to ensure it is correct and complete; then relays the collection hand to hand until it reaches the driver. As he/she sends the money hand to

hand to the driver, the collector shouts out loud the amount paid by each passenger in his/her row. For example, if one passenger pays R5.00 and three pay R6.00 (depending on their destination), the collector shouts: "One 5, Three 6!" Each subsequent passenger who relays repeats the message, "One 5, Three 6!" as the collection travels hand to hand all the way to the driver. However, the driver usually does not receive the fares directly from the back. He (they are usually men) must concentrate on driving. Instead, one of the two passengers sitting on the driver's left receives all collections; confers them and relays them to the driver who in turn confers them. If the driver decides the fares are incomplete – which happens from time to time – the collectors must explain. When this happens tensions can flare up and escalate to violence. Foreign nationals caught up in the middle are easily scapegoated. This happened to a Congolese student:

> One day I was in a taxi with my uncle. Whilst there we noticed that something was wrong. The people in the taxi started talking to each other really loud. It was all noisy we could not understand what was going on. We could only hear them saying 'Kwerekwere'. It was only later that the driver said, he's short of money. One person did not pay and he believes it's us because we are 'kwerekwere'. He said we should pay, so we ended up paying double.[27]

A respondent in my interviews gave an example of a female foreign national who dared to speak at a taxi rank and as result was deliberately misinformed and mislead:

> There are places where we foreigners can't walk. For example you can't take courage to go to Soweto. A woman took a taxi to Soweto by mistake. They deliberately showed her the wrong taxi. She didn't know. When she arrived she asked for directions. They beat her badly and took everything she had.[28]

The structure of South African taxi travel is accomplished through communicative interaction and dialogue between passengers. In short, the passengers must speak. Given the xenophobic condition, this structuring of taxi travel is an unbearable weight for foreign nationals. Foreign nationals who dare to travel in South African taxis must do so with caution. They must avoid speaking. This means keeping interaction with fellow passengers to an absolute minimum. They must avoid being collectors. They must avoid seats which would easily position them as collectors. These are the front seats on the left side of the driver, and corner seats. They must bring the exact fare to avoid asking for

change. The mantle of collecting often falls on the last or slow passengers to pay. In order to avoid collecting, foreign nationals often come ready to pay first. Taxis are examples of enclaves of compartmentalization of cruelty.

With the construction and mobilization of the figure of *makwerekwere,* black foreign nationals are positioned as liminal subjects, figures of the underbelly and underside, darkness and invisibility. The citizenry views them with suspicion, contempt and revulsion. Their moral integrity is questioned. The gossip channels of the established, notably the media, are filled with grotesque and monstrous ideas and images of *makwerekwere*, "the foreigners." The monstrosity of *makwerekwere* is well captured in Phaswane Mpe's novel *Welcome to Our Hillbrow.*[29] The novel translates popular cultural perceptions of Hillbrow as a shadowy place, populated with shadowy figures (the foreigners) and bursting with perversions and immorality. Hillbrow is hell on earth, the hellishness of which is attributed to the monstrosity of the foreigners. The ambiguous, the grotesque, the monstrous, the ugly and the shocking images of *makwerekwere* in the city – the Congolese, the Mozambicans, the Nigerians and the Zimbabweans – travel through gossip channels such as word of mouth or press or television to the remotest villages of rural South Africa. This imbuing of foreign nationals with negativity was until 1998 enshrined in the South African immigration policy which defined non-citizens, particularly African foreign nationals, in negative terms. They were "prohibited persons" or "aliens" and were treated as such.[30] With or without a permit to be in the country, one was a "prohibited person" as long as one lacked the status of citizen. The granting of a residential permit did not absolve one's "prohibited person" status. The name of the permit indicated: "Temporary Permit to Prohibited Persons" or TPPP. Without citizenship, one remained a tabooed individual. Today, ten years after changes in the language of the immigration policy, the treatment of African foreign nationals still positions them as "prohibited," "aliens," *personae non grata*.

Rob Shields makes the important point that liminal spaces are both danger and pleasure zones.[31] Hillbrow and Yeoville are places on the margins of South African civilization, places where the police, on or off duty, go to make extra cash or have fun. The criminal elements within the citizenry also view these places as zones of opportunity. An enduring belief exists among foreign nationals that the police and criminals operate in

collaboration. Since early 1990s studies on South African xenophobia report the common cliché among the police: "Foreigners are walking ATMs." This cliché has since been canonized in the stock of common sense knowledge of the citizenry. Zones with high concentration of black foreign nationals are held under siege, raided not only by the police but also by the citizenry.

African foreign nationals have carved their own social spaces within Johannesburg. This is the case throughout South African major cities. These zones can be experienced as both danger or pleasure zones. They are danger zones for the most vulnerable in society, notably foreign nationals who, in the popular opinion, have no rights in the country. They are pleasure zones for the rough section of the citizenry, notably the police and gang-bangers (the *tsotsis*) for whom the vulnerable, particularly foreign nationals are walking ATMs and sexual objects. Police and criminal raids in immigrant dwelling quarters alongside raping immigrant women bear testimony to this. Foreign nationals have come to accept aggression and violence against them as their fate. Many of them have given up reporting offences against them to the police. Right and wrong are defined along citizenship. The settling of grievances between citizens and foreign nationals is filtered through citizenship status. One is right or wrong by virtue of one's citizenship status. Merit and aid are mediated through perceptions of citizenship status. For example:

> If South Africans shout for help, you will see how the people respond. They will pursue the criminal until they find him and they will beat him up. But you foreigner can shout and they don't care. They want you to shout in Zulu so that they can help you. You shout in English, they say sorry we're not white; we can't hear you… unless you shout in their language. I have seen this for several times.[32]

The nation's threshold of moral indignation shortens when the human dignity and physical integrity of foreign nationals are violated. It lengthens when citizens' rights and dignity are violated.

In this chapter I discussed the dyscivilization of relations between citizens and African foreign nationals, and the dyscivilization of spaces in which these relations are produced. I argued that although the construction and mobilization of the figure of *makwerekwere*,

and compartmentalization of cruelty by citizens is stronger in spaces with high concentration on foreign nationals, notably Hillbrow and Yeoville, this psychosocial phenomenon itself is not confined to, but transcends, any spatial boundaries so that the entire nation, both actual and virtual, is a field of compartmentalization of cruelty. I introduced Turner's concept of liminality, taking the discussion a step further and suggested that foreign nationals are indefinitely condemned to bizarre and unstructured existence spaces, the betwixt and between zones of danger and pleasure, the margins and thresholds of South African civilization, where they are rendered structurally and personally invisible and lead structurally uncertain lives. The public discourse creates and activates the image of *makwerekwere* against African foreign nationals, which consequently positions them as liminal, ambiguous and bizarre figures. This writes off the humanity and dignity of African foreign nationals, represses the thought that citizens and non-citizens might be more alike than they are unlike, and enables citizens to engage in aggressive and violent behaviour without feelings of guilt.

NOTES

[1] A. Morris 1999, *Bleakness and Light,* p. ii.
[2] A. de Swaan 2001, "Dyscivilization", p. 270.
[3] L. Wacquant 2004, "Decivilizing and Demonizing: The Remaking of the Black American Ghetto." Hereafter, "Decivilizing and Demonizing."
[4] Ibid. p. 95.
[5] Ibid.
[6] Ibid.
[7] A. de Swaan 2001, "Dyscivilization", p. 271.
[8] A. Morris 1999, *Bleakness and Light,* p. 1.
[9] Ibid. p. 307.
[10] Ibid. p. 320.
[11] Congolese National, Interviews February 2007.
[12] In A. Leilde 2006, "What Is an African? Narratives from Urban South Africa, Gabon and Togo," p. 215; italics mine. Hereafter, "What Is an African?"
[13] Ibid. p. 216; italics mine.
[14] A. de Swaan 2001, "Dyscivilization", p. 271.
[15] V. Turner 1987, "Betwixt and Between", p. 8.
[16] Ibid.
[17] R. Hlobo 2004, "Local Integration as Durable Solution: A Study of Congolese Refugees in Johannesburg." Hereafter, "Local Integration." See also M. Atam 2004, "Networks as a Survival"; V. Nzayabino 2005, "The Role of Refugee Established

Churches in the Lives of Forced Migrants: A Case Study of Word of Life Assembly in Yeoville, Johannesburg."

[18] See H. Shindondola 2001, "Xenophobia in South Africa: The Views, Opinions and Experiences of International Students at the Rand Afrikaans University", MA Thesis, Rand Afrikaans University, Johannesburg", MA Thesis, University of the Witwatersrand.

[19] Interviews, Jan 2007.

[20] A. de Swaan 2001, "Dyscivilization", p. 269.

[21] The portrayal here of South African women as predatory could be a contradiction within the foreign national social imaginary. I would not haste, however, to such conclusion. The literature and my interviews do indeed indicate that foreign nationals feel far less threatened by South African women than by South African men. This minimal sense of threat, however, does not free South African women from the established-outsider figuration in which citizens and non-citizens are locked. Because these women are citizens, foreign nationals allow them an absolute minimum of the benefit of the doubt. They still view the women in the same way they regard citizens generally.

[22] C. Petkou 2005, "The Development", p. 29.

[23] Ibid. p. 142.

[24] Interviews, Jan 2007.

[25] Congolese National, Interviews February 2007.

[26] A. Morris 1998, "Our Fellow Africans," p. 1124.

[27] H. Shindondola 2003, "Xenophobia in SA", p. 54.

[28] Interviews, January 2007.

[29] P. Mpe 2001, *Welcome to Our Hillbrow*.

[30] C. Petkou 2005, "The Development", p. 129.

[31] R. Shields 1991, *Places on the Margins: Alternative Geographies of Modernity.*

[32] Interviews, January 2007.

VIII. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

My objective has not been to again describe the existence, depth and breadth of aggression against foreign nationals in South Africa as others have done. Neither was the objective to prove that South African anti-immigrant aggression is essentially anti-African. The documents that I cited have demonstrated that that is the case. My participants corroborated these studies. My objective was to look beyond what these documents have demonstrated, and open up a discussion about the ways in which the figure of *makwerekwere* has emerged and has been mobilized.

The contributions of this study can be summed up in three main points. First, the attitudes towards African foreign nationals appear as an extension of internalized apartheid aggression; projection of apartheid collective-self negativity onto the similar collective-other; which in the end may reflect Afrophobia. While the social structure of apartheid has been greatly dismantled, the psychic structure of apartheid and its concomitant social habitus remains alive, structuring to a greater or lesser degree the relations between the former victims of apartheid and African foreign nationals.

Second, the construction of post-apartheid South African national identity is to a greater or lesser degree accomplished through violent Afrophobia which masks itself as violence towards the African other. It is a collective African self-identity that is to a greater or lesser extent constituted through negative attitudes towards the African others. The negative view of the African other also compensates for the lack of common, shared and agreed upon national mythologies on the basis of which nations are imagined and held together.

Therefore, third, this study goes against the grain of established wisdom of visible differences; it departs from the habitual explanations of human cruelty on basis of differences between social groups. More specifically, while studies of South African xenophobia have relied exclusively on taken for granted visible differences between citizens and non-citizens, on that which "obviously" divides citizens and non-citizens to explain citizens' hostility toward non-citizens, this study has taken a different theoretical view that deconstructs differences, namely that similarities and reduction of differences are fundamental stimuli of aggression and violence against African foreign nationals.

193

I argued that by virtue of becoming citizens, the former outsiders have joined the establishment. The process of transformation of outsiders into the established is a socioemotional process in which the outsiders identify with the established. The rising outsiders adopt the code of conduct of the establishment to organize their everyday world. At the same time the establishment opens itself only enough to adopt a few drips of the code conduct of the mutating, up and coming, outsiders. Part of the code of conduct and feeling of the establishment that the up and coming outsiders take in en route to the establishment is South African exceptionalism vis-à-vis Africa, including the superiority feelings based on ascription other than achievement. The state-led nation-building project provides for mutual identification of groups that have been historically at odds with each other. It invents traditions, creating myths and symbols that produce and nurture patriotic feelings required to bind these groups together as a nation: the glue of the nation. The hungry and the poor may have nothing to show for their patriotism, may have feelings of no life, but they take comfort in knowing that as citizens, they are at least superior to *makwerekwere*.

The projection in establishment gossip of fantasy on the bodies of foreign nationals, the transubstantiation of ideology of the foreign body into physical actuality of the foreign body, suggests that in constructing their identity as exceptional, clean Africans, citizens need the regular dirty Africans. The fact that physically, socioeconomically, culturally and linguistically, the natives resemble their victims perhaps should not be baffling. Freud's idea of the narcissism of minor differences might be helpful in thinking through what is going on. History shows that the deadliest conflicts also occur between groups that strongly resemble each other. When differences between groups diminish, when power differentials between them diminish, competition and conflict between them increases. When the Jews had become indistinguishably assimilated to German society their invisibility had to be made visible. When the Tutsification of the Hutus and the Hutufication of the Tutsis had led the groups to higher levels of integration the little differences became deadly. It is as if in looking at members of the other group, members of one group see the better versions of themselves. Narcissism of minor differences may take successive spurts of aggression and violence that may escalate into annihilation of one group by another. If anything, the nationwide

outbreak of violence against African foreign nationals in May 2008 is an indication that perhaps the threshold of genocide is not as far as we would like to believe, even in our exceptional African nation.

The anti-African nature of South African patriotism cannot be adequately understood without taking into account the long-term process of South African habitus formation. What we are witnessing in South African anti-immigrant sentiments and attitudes is the shadow of apartheid social conscious and unconscious. South Africans live in the shadows of their history as this very history lives on in them. As such, we are witnessing the effects of the imprints of the past, the imprints of apartheid ethos, on South African social habitus. The establishment strove to perfect segregation. Superiority of whites over everyone else was at the core of economic, political, geographical, psychosocial construction and organization of reality. The apartheid ethos permeated the mundane and minute details of everyday life. The apartheid ethos, notably white superiority and black inferiority, were nothing less than technologies of self and power through which subjects on both sides of the divide produced themselves as superior and inferior subjects. This raises the question of internalization of social structure, of the outsiders identifying with the established and measuring their self-worth by the standards of the established. In the social psychology literature, this idea is a cliché. And herein lies an important limitation of this study: the substantive study of the long-term process of habitus formation, the social conscious and unconscious that facilitate anti-African xenophobia.

Immigrant life-worlds are decivilized. The fact that relations between citizens and non-citizens are more decivilized than relations among citizens bears sufficient testimony. The dyscivilization of immigrant life-worlds is accomplished through two mechanisms: (1) the socioemotional work of dysidentification with foreign nationals through blame-gossip (disgracing and stigmatizing the other); and (2) compartmentalization of cruelty, a psychological defence mechanism that permits citizens to adopt grotesque incivility, aggressiveness and violence vis-à-vis non-citizens without the emotional sting of guilt or remorse. I have also argued that compartmentalization of cruelty casts a cloud of liminalty over the lives of non-citizens. This does not only mean that the life-worlds of immigrants are rendered liminal but also

that the liminal persona becomes their identity, carrying it with them wherever they go. Paradoxically, precisely because of their invisibility they are made visible for purposes of exclusion which is itself structural invisibility – that is, exclusion from the means of power, prestige and survival requires that be visible to be made invisible, trapping them betwixt and between the life-worlds of places of origins and their host society. While they have left the places of origins, have physically arrived at their destination, structurally they remain distant. Physically they live in South Africa. Economically, psychologically and socially they are still miles away from South Africa. South Africa is not simply a physical place. It is also the hope of peace and prosperity. However, as hope South Africa remains illusive.

As I stated at the beginning, this study was animated by the theory of the established and the outsiders put forward by Norbert Elias. Drawing from Michael Burawoy's methodological procedure of the extended case, I set out to extend the theory of the established and the outsiders. The extended case procedure involves four movements of extension.

The first movement extends "the observer into the world of the observer." Although Burawoy speaks of extension in the context of participant observation, the case can be made for other research methods. My study involved not only participant observation, but also the so-called secondary data analysis, focus groups and in-depth interviews. All these methods transport the researcher from his/her academic comfort zone into the life-worlds of the subjects of his/her study. True – participant observation and interviews bring the researcher physically to the life-worlds of his/her subjects. Secondary data analysis enables the researcher's vicarious participation in the life-worlds of his/her research subjects. By being in South Africa, automatically I became a participant whether I liked it or not, both observing and living the life of a foreign national to some degree. As noted, I was profiled, stopped and searched three times by the police. The first time I was in a car with two friends. The second time I was in a taxicab. The third time I was stepping out my door. In all cases I was suspected of being Nigerian, in this case a codeword for drug dealer. In all cases I was questioned. Why was I in South Africa? What was I doing there? Where was I going? Where was I coming

from? Who was I with? How long was I in South Africa? How long was going to be there? My extension to the research site gave me a taste of living in South Africa as an outsider.

The second movement extends the researcher's observations over time and space. As participant observer, the researcher spends considerable length of time on the research site following the lives of subjects and learning their ways. The researcher renders orderable the seemingly chaos of the everyday world of his/her subjects as social processes. That is, looking for structure in the disorder, for patterns in the confusion, for trends in the mundane. From 1994 to 2000 I lived in South Africa as an outsider from Mozambique. I returned to South Africa in 2006 for ten months of fieldwork. As a researcher, my sociological imagination enabled me to relive my previous outsider experience in perspective.

The third movement extends the microcosm of the observed life-worlds into the greater social macrocosm, "from the space rhythms of the site to the geographical and historical context of the field."[1] The everyday world of foreign nationals on the pavements of Johannesburg, their mundane comings and goings, their fears and hopes, their movements in space, their face-to-face relations with members of the citizenry, all occur in the shadow of South African history. Making sense of the current relations between citizens and foreign nationals, notably the anti-African aggression and violence, requires the recognition that, to a greater or lesser extent, the history of white supremacy generally and the history of apartheid in particular live on within the South African citizenry. One must recognize that these histories put a stamp of South African social habitus. They still weigh heavily on South Africa's social unconscious and memory. In addition, the study cast the anti-immigrant aggression in the perspective of history of humanity, pointing out that the deadliest rivalries in human history occur between groups that strongly resemble each other.

The fourth movement involves the extension of theory to the field. In this case the idea was to extend the theory of established-outsider relations generally. The power differentials between social groups endow the relations between the groups with an established-outsider dynamic, no matter the specific type of relations. Such relations could be gender relations, race/ethnic relations, international relations, personal relations,

197

etc. What endows a group with the status of the establishment is its power superiority in relation to other groups. This holds true in relations between citizens and non-citizens in South Africa. Overall, the general characteristic features of established-outsiders relations as described by Elias – praise gossip, blame gossip, gossip channels, group charisma, group stigma, minority of the best, minority of the worst, power differentials – hold in the relations examined in this study. But rather than enumerating the theoretical propositions that hold true in the theoretical extension, it is more efficient to discuss those that do not hold.

The first is the proposition that the outsiders tend to measure their self-worth by the standards of the established, that they internalize the disgrace with which they are construed. This proposition did not hold in this study. Although the power balance was tilted in the direction of citizens, the lifespan of relations between the groups has not been long enough for the outsiders to accrue disgrace to their individual and collective self-images. It is also possible that the citizens are not sufficiently integrated to effectively exert their power over the outsiders. After all, contact between citizens and non-citizens normally occurred in urban areas where individualization and atomization of individuals from both groups tended be to be higher than in other parts of the country. Foreign nationals exuded pride and superiority feelings over citizens. The fact that they felt more cultured, cultivated, refined, civil, polite and educated than their hosts is a testimony to this.

The second is the implicit assumption in Elias' theory that established-outsider relations are social properties of small neighbourhoods in which different groups coexist. This is not necessarily the case. The fact that Elias himself felt that nations or groups of nations could be locked in established-outsider relations contradicts this assumption. In South Africa citizens partake in the stigmatization and vilification of foreign nationals, participate in the dissemination of blame-gossip against them, without interaction with them. A great multitude of citizens experiences aversion to foreign nationals without having met or seen a single foreign national. This is accomplished through gossip channels. In this global age, electronic gossip channels (radio, television, email and internet) have diminished the necessity of space and place of face-to-face interaction for circulation of information, gossip, lies and rumours. Since Elias wrote his essay, the

landscapes of social life, of communication and electronics, have changed dramatically, revolutionizing flows of ideas and fantasy.

The third is a dynamic of established-outsider relations that is not envisioned in Elias' essay, namely that a set (or sets) of established-outsider relations can overlay pre-existing, receding yet explosive sets of established-outsider relations. This is the case in South Africa. The relations between citizens and non-citizens overlay older relations between different groups of citizens. Relations between blacks and African foreign nationals overlay relations between blacks and whites. The former set of relations grows on the ruins of the latter. Behaving like a parasite, it nourishes itself and thrives at the expense of pre-existing but receding or simply mutating set of relations. The old relations overshadow the new ones. The two sets mirror each other in significant ways. In other words, there are layers of established-outsider relations at work at the same time. I left the coloureds and Indians out for the sake manageability of the study. But their figurational presence is not without significance. The figuration in which each of them is locked with other groups merits a project of its own. In the past the coloureds were a little too black to be white, while presently they are a little too white to be black. Afrikaans is widely viewed as the symbol of apartheid. It is despised by the English and hated by the rising black social groups. The coloured identity is intricately tied to this language. Consequently, the coloureds are viewed as traitors, having consorted with the oppressor. The Indians are subject of aversion among blacks. Despite their presence in the land for multiple generations they are viewed as outsiders. Cultural expression (music) and literature of hate against Indians abound in South Africa. There is a complex polyphony of established-outsider relations between at least five social groups: Blacks, Afrikaners, English, Coloureds and Indians. But each of these groups is hardly homogeneous. Each has its own subdivisions, with some members of one group forming alliances with members of other groups.

Related to the issues addressed in this study is the existence of mixed marriages between native women and foreign men. These families have figurational dynamics of their own, yet these dynamics are symptoms of established-outsider relations between citizens and non-citizens in the wider South African figuration. The fact that these women married into the outsider group means they have committed the unforgivable sin

not only to their maiden families but also to the wider family of patriots. They have betrayed the nation, for which they bear the brunt of blame-gossip as punishment. These marriages bring relations between native men and non-native men into sharper focus. And where do the offspring fit into all this? These are issues that could be taken up fruitfully in further research explorations.

Elias points out that there are times "in which movements of former outsider groups into positions of power multiply."[2] Such moments bring into sharper view the concealed established-outsider figurational dynamics:

> [The] complex polyphony of the movement of rising and declining groups over time – of established groups which become outsiders or, as groups, disappear altogether, of outsider groups whose representatives move as a new establishment into positions previously denied them or, as the case may be, which become paralysed by oppression."[3]

The collapse of apartheid in South Africa represents these shifts in the asymmetric power balance between social groups, with formerly established groups declining while the formerly outsider groups join the establishment. These transformations come with a price tag not only for the declining groups but also for the rising ones. There is an increasing uneasiness among young urban Afrikaners about identifying with their traditions, particularly the Afrikaans language.[4] As for the blacks, notably the elite, they have since learned that assumption of power comes with an emotional price of alienation from the masses that now see them with contempt. Blacks who have been eagerly flocking to previously whites-only-areas have found themselves dealing with the problems of isolation, loneliness and rootlessness. They are facing an identity crisis of their own. Now they must make an effort not to lose their roots, to teach indigenous languages and traditions to their offspring. Failure to do so requires them to assume the roles of translators, translating between their suburban offspring, the so-called generation C, and their grandparents. These are some of the directions which further research may take.[5]

Doing adequate justice to the sociological problems addressed in this study ideally requires a long-range historical analysis. Such an analysis would have to examine at least three interrelated and interwoven socio and psychogenetic processes – the structural features of South Africa's development both as a state and as a nation – the

habitus formation since, at least, the birth of the Union in 1910, paying attention to the processes leading up to this moment, notably the Boer War and its aftermath and the emergence of the Movement for the Closer Union – and the development of group relations. There is no illusion of absolute beginnings of these social processes. However, an undertaking of this sort warrants a project of its own and it is therefore beyond the scope of this study. Nonetheless, the sociological problems considered in this study – the interweaving of patriotism and aggression in relations between citizens and foreign nationals – are both part and result of long chains of interrelated events in the history of South Africa. Surely, these chains of events made indelible imprints on the social habitus of South Africans, their "behaviour and feelings and social character."[6] Such (un)characteristic habitus may help, in part, explain what is going on.

NOTES

[1] M. Burawoy 2000, *Global Ethnography*, p. 27.
[2] N. Elias 1994, "An Essay," p. xxxv.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Y. Groenewald 16 February 2007, "The De la Rey Uprising", *Mail & Guardian*, http://www.mg.co.za/article/2007-02-16-the-de-la-rey-uprising; F. Blandy 25 March 2007, "Afrikaners ride airwaves to new nationalism", *Mail & Guardian*, http://www.mg.co.za/article/2007-03-25-afrikaners-ride-airwaves-to-new-nationalism; A. Krog 01 April 2007, "De la Rey: Afrikaner absolution", *Mail & Guardian*, http://www.mg.co.za/article/2007-04-01-de-la-rey-afrikaner-absolution.
[5] See *Business Day* 02 April 2007, "Wealth need not be ubuntu's nemesis"; *Weekend Post* 26 May 2007, "Black diamonds are not all sparkle"; *The Star* 19 April 2007, "White no more the colour of luxury in SA"; *Weekend Post* 26 May 2007, "Emergence of 'Black Diamonds' does not add shine to everything"; *Sunday Times* 28 Jan 2007, "Kind of the hill, top of the heap"; *City Press* 28 November 1999, "Spare a coin, my brother"; *Financial Mail* 29 October 1999, "The burdens of success"; *Business Day* 08 July 1999, "'Buppies under strong pressure as new elite"; *The Sunday Independent* 03 October 1999, "Africanism must support all Africans"; *Sunday Times* 21 November 1999, "The black middle class has a guilt-edged lining".
[6] S. Mennell 2007, *The American Civilizing Process,* p. ix.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adam, H. et al. 1998 *Comrades in Business: Post-Liberation Politics in South Africa.* Cape Town: Tafelberg Publishers Ltd.

Adam, H. 1996 "Anti-Semitism and Anti-Black Racism: Nazi Germany and Apartheid South Africa", *Telos* 108: 25-46.

Adam, H. 1971, *Modernization Racial Domination: The Dynamics of South African Politics,* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Adam, H. and Gilliome, H. 1979, *Ethnic Power Mobilized: Can South African Change?* New York: Yale University Press.

Armer, J. 1987 "Provincialism and Internationalism in American Universities", *International Sociology* 2(3): 315-314

Adedeji, A. 1996 "Within or Apart?" in Adebayo Adedeji, ed. *South Africa and Africa: Within or Apart?* London: Zed Books.

Agamben, G. 2005 *State of Exception.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Aitchison, J. and Harley, A. 2004, *South African Illiteracy Statistics and the Case of the Magically Growing Number of Literacy and ABET Learners.* Centre for Adult Education, University of KwaZulu Natal. Http://www.ukzn.ac.za/cae/caepubs/JJWAAH04.pdf.

Algotsson, E. December 2000, *Getting to the Crossroads of Detention and Repatriation*, South African Human Rights Commission. Www.sahrc.organisation.za.

Alreck, P. and Settle, R. 1995 *The Survey Research Handbook: Guidelines and strategies for conducting a survey.* Chicago, IL: Irwin.

Anderson, B. 1991 *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism,* New York: Verso.

Ashcroft, Bill et al. 1995 (eds), *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader.* London: Routlede.

Atam, M. 2004 "Networks as a Survival Strategy of New Arrivals: A Study of Congolese Asylum Seekers in Johannesburg", MA Thesis, University of the Witwatersrand.

Atkinson, P. and Coffey, A. 2002, "Revisiting the Relationship Between Participant Observation and Interviewing" in J. Gubrium and J. Holstein (eds) *Handbook of Interview Research: Context and Method.* London: Sage.

Baines, G. 1998 "The Rainbow Nation? Identity and Nation Building in Post-Apartheid South Africa", *Mots Pluriels* 7. Http://motspluriels.arts.uwa.edu.au. Retrieved on 29 November 2007.

Banton, M. 2005 "Historical and Contemporary Modes of Racialization". In K. Murji and J. Solomos (eds) *Racialization: Studies in Theory and Practice.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 51-68.

Banton, M. 1998 *Theories of Race.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Barth, F. 1996 "Ethnic Groups and Boundaries", in J. Hutchinson and D. A. Smith (eds.) *Ethnicity.* New York: Oxford University Press.

BBC News 18 June 2009, "South African Rape Survey Shock", http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/8107039.stm.

Bhavnani, R. 2006 "Ethnic Norms and Interethnic Violence: Accounting for Mass Participation in the Rwandan Genocide", *Journal of Peace Research* 43(6): 651-669.

Black, D. and Nauright, J. 1998, *Rugby and the South African Nation: Sport, Culture, Politics and Power in the Old and New South Africa,* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Blandy, F. 25 March 2007, "Afrikaners ride airwaves to new nationalism", *Mail & Guardian*, http://www.mg.co.za/article/2007-03-25-afrikaners-ride-airwaves-to-new-nationalism.

Blok, A. 1998 "The Narcissism of Minor Differences", *European Journal of Social Theory* 1(1): 33-56.

Bordo, S. 1993 *Unbearable Weight: Feminism, Western Culture, and the Body.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Brodkin, K. 1998 *How Jews Became White Folks and What That Says About Race in America.* New Branzwick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.

Bryman, A.1988 *Quantity and Quality in Social Research.* London & New York: Routledge.

Burawoy, M. 2000 *Global Ethnography: Forces, connections, and imaginations in a postmodern world.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Burawoy, M.1998 "The Extended Case Method", *Sociological Theory* 16 (1): 4-33.

Business Day, 02 April 2007, "Wealth need not be ubuntu's nemesis";

Business Day, 08 July 1999, "'Buppies under strong pressure as new elite".

Buthelezi, M. G. 1994 "Budgetary Appropriation: Review of Policy". Http://www.info.gov.za/speeches/1994/251194001.htm. Retrieved on 12 January 2008.

Buthelezi, M. G. 22 August 2002 "Parliamentary Media Briefing". Http://www.info.gov.za/speeches/2002/02082214461001.htm. Retrieved on 12 January 2008.

Buthelezi, M. G. 2001, "6th International Metropolis Conference Remarks". Http://www.queensu.ca/samp/migdocs/speeches/271101.htm. Retrieved on 12 January 2008.

Cape Argus, 14 December 2001.

Chavez, L. 1992 *Shadowed Lives: Undocumented Immigrants in American Society*, Orlando: Harcourt Brace Jovanovitch College Publishers.

Chavez, L. 1991 "Outside the Imagined Community: Undocumented Settlers and Experiences of Incorporation", *American Ethnologist* vol. 8: 257-278.

City Press, 28 November 1999, "Spare a coin, my brother".

Cole, E. 1967 *The House of Bandage.* New York: Randon House.

Comaroff, J. and Commaroff, J. 2001 "Nurturing the Nation: Aliens, Apocalypse and the Postcolonial State", *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 27 (3): 627-651.

Coversi, D. 1999 "Nationalism, Boundaries and Violence." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 28(3): 553–584.

Constitution of the Republic of South Africa No. 108 of 1996.

Crotty, M. 1998 *The Foundations of Social Research: Meaning and Perspective in Research Process.* London: Sage Publications.

Crush, J. 2008 *The Perfect Storm: Realities of Xenophobia in Contemporary South Africa,* Southern African Migration Project. Cape Town: Idasa.

Crush, J. 2001 *Immigration, Xenophobia and Human Rights in South Africa*, Southern African Migration Project. Cape Town: Idasa

Dalal, F. 2002 *Race, Colour and the Processes of Racialization: New perspectives from group analysis, psychoanalysis and sociology.* Hove and New York: Brunner-Routledge.

Davies, R. 1996 "South Africa's Economic Relations with Africa: Current Patterns and Future Perspectives," in Adebayo Adedeji, ed. *South Africa and Africa: Within or Apart?* London

Dempster, C. 09 April 2002, "Rape – A Silent War of South African Women", *BBC News,* http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/1909220.stm.

Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. 2003 "Introduction: The Discipline and Practice of Qualitative Research", N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln (eds) *The Landscape of Qualitative Research.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Des Forges, A. 1999 *Leave None to Tell the Story: Genocide in Rwanda.* New York: Human Rights Watch.

De Swaan, A. 2001 "Dyscivilization, Mass Extermination and the State", *Theory, Culture and Society,* 18(2-3): 256-276.

De Swaan, A. 1997, "Widening Circles of Disidentification: On Psycho- and Sociogenesis of Hatred of Distant Strangers – Reflections on Rwanda", *Theory Culture and Society* 14(2): 105-122.

Dingwell, R. 1997 "Accounts, Interviews and Observations" in Gale Miller & Robert Dingwall (eds), *Context and Method in Qualitative Research.* London: Sage.

Donnan, H. and Wilson, T. M. 1999 *Borders: Frontiers of Identity, Nation and State.* Oxford and New York: Berg.

Du Bois, W. E. B. 1920 "The Souls of White Folk". Http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1132/is_6_55/ai_111269074/print. Retrieved on 9 March, 2006.

Du Bois, W. E. B. 1990[1903] *Souls of Black Folk.* New York: Vintage Books.

Dunning, E. and Waddington, I. 2003 "Sport as a Drug and Drugs in Sport", *International Review of the Sociology of Sport* 8(3): 351-368.

Edwards, M. 2004 *Civil Society*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.

Elias, N. 2000 *The Civilizing Process.* London: Blackwell.

Elias, N. 1998 *On Civilization, Power, and Knowledge.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Elias, N. 1996 *The Germans.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Elias, N. and Scotson, J. 1994 *The Established and the Outsiders.* London: Sage.

Elias, N. 1994 "Introduction: A Theoretical Essay on Established and Outsider Relations" in N. Elias and J. Scotson *The Established and the Outsiders.* London: Sage.

Elias, N. 1987 "The Retreat of Sociologists into the Present", *Theory, Culture & Society* vol. 4: 223-47.

Elias, N. 1978 *What Is Sociology.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Emerson, R. et al. 1995 *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Emery, A. 2004 "Sources of Social Power and Democratization in South Africa", Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, San Francisco, CA, August 14. Http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p110809_index.html.

Ernst, S. 2003 "From Blame Gossip to Praise Gossip? Gender. Leadership and Organizational Change", *The European Journal Of Women's Studies* 10(3): 277-99.

Fanon, F. 1990, *The Wretched of the Earth.* London: Penguin Books.

Fanon, F. 1967 *Black Skins, White Masks.* New York: Grove Press.

Ferguson, James 1999 *Expectations of Modernity: Myths and Meanings of Urban Life on the Zambian Copperbelt*. Berkeley: UC Press.

Filatova, I. 1997 "The Rainbow Against the African Sky or African Hegemony in a Multi-Cultural Context?" In P. Werbner and T. Modood (eds.) *Debating Cultural Hybridity: Multi-Cultural Identities and the Politics of Anti-Racism.* London: Zed Books.

Financial Mail, 29 October 1999, "The burdens of success".

Fine, M. et al. 2003 "For Whom? Qualitative research, representations, and social responsibilities" in N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln (eds) *The Landscape of Qualitative Research.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Foucault, M. 2003 "Technologies of Self" in P. Rabinow and N. Rose (eds.) *The Essential Foucault.* New York: The New Press: 145-169.

Fowler, F. 1993 *Survey Research Methods.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Freud, S. 1949[1922] *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego*, London: The Hogarth Press.

Geschiere, P. and Jackson, S. 2006 "Autochthony and the Crisis of Citizenship: Democratization, and the Politics of Belonging", *African Studies Review* 49(2): 1-14.

Gieryn, T. F. 2002a "Give Place a Chance: Reply to Gans", *City and Community*, 1(4): 341-343.

Gieryn, T. F. 2002b "What Buildings Do", *Theory and Society* 31: 35-74.

Gilliomee, H. 2003 *The Afrikaners: Biography of a People.* Cape Town: Tafelberg Publishers.

Gilroy, P. 2000 *Against Race: Imagining Political Culture beyond the Color Line.* Cabridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Goldberg, D. 2002 *The Racial State*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Graves, Jr., J. 2004 *The Race Myth: Why We Pretend Race Exists.* New York: Plume/Penguin Books.

Groenewald, G. 16 February 2007, "The De la Rey Uprising", *Mail & Guardian*, http://www.mg.co.za/article/2007-02-16-the-de-la-rey-uprising.

Gupta, A. and Ferguson, James 1997 "Discipline and Practice: 'The field' as Site, Method, and Location in Anthropology." In A. Gupta and J. Ferguson (Eds.) *Anthropological Locations: Boundaries and Grounds of a Field Science.* Berkeley: UC Press.

Habib, A. 1996 "Myth of the Rainbow Nation: Prospects for the Consolidation of Democracy in South Africa," *African Security Review* 5(6). Http://www.iss.co.za/Pubs/ASR/5No6/Habib.html. Retrieve on 29 November 2007.

Hage, G. 2004 'White Self-racialization as Identity Fetishism: Capitalism and the Experience of Colonial Capitalism' in K. Murji and J. Solomos (eds) *Racialization: Studies in Theory and Practice*, Oxford University Press.

Hamber, B. 2002. "'Ere their story die': Truth, Justice and Reconciliation in South Africa", *Race and Class* 44(1): 61-79.

Hamber, B., Nageng, D. and G. O'Malley 2000, "'Telling it like it is…' Survivors' Perceptions of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission", *Psychology in Society* 26: 18-42.

Harris, B. 2001 "A Foreign Experience: Violence, Crime and Xenophobia during South Africa's Transition." *Violence and Transition Series* 5.

Harris, B. 2002 "Xenophobia: A New Pathology for a New South Africa?" in D. Hook and G. Eagle (eds.) *Psychopathology and Social Prejudice*. Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press. Http://www.csvr.org.za/papers/paphar1.htm. Retrieved on 1 March 2006.

Hlobo, R. 2004 "Local Integration as Durable Solution: A Study of Congolese Refugees in Johannesburg", MA Thesis, University of the Witwatersrand.

Hobsbawn, E. and Ranger, T. 1983 *The Invention of Tradition* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Holstein, J. and Gubrium, J. 2002 "Active Interviewing" in D. Weinberg (ed.), *Qualitative Research Methods*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Hopper, E. 2001 "The Social Unconscious: Theoretical Considerations", *Group Analysis* 34(1): 9-27.

hooks, b. http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OQ-XVTzBMvQ&feature=related. Retrieved on 6 February 2008.

Hornberger, J. 2008 "Nocturnal Johannesburg" in S. Nuttall and A. Mbembe (eds) *Johannesburg: The Illusive Metropolis*. Durham: Duke University Press, 285-296.

HRW March 1998 "Prohibited Persons: Abuse of Undocumented Migrants, Asylum-Seekers and Refugees in South Africa". New York: Human Rights Watch. Http://www.hrw.org/reports98/sareport. Retried 12 January 2008

Ignatiev, N. 1995 *How the Irish Became White*. New York: Routledge.

Immigration Act 2002, Republic of South Africa.

Jackson, S. 2007 "Of 'Doubtful Nationality': Political Manipulation of Citizenship in the D. R. Congo", *Citizenship Studies* 11(5): 481–500.

Jackson, S. 2006 "Sons of which Soil? The Language and Politics of Autochthony in Eastern D.R. Congo", *African Studies Review* 49(2): 95-123.

Junod, H. 1935[1912] *The Life of a South African Tribe,* Vol. I. New York: University Books Inc.

Katzenellenbogen, S. 1982 *South Africa and Southern Mozambique: Labour, Railways and Trade in the Making of a Relationship*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Kincheloe, J. and McLaren, P. 2003 "Rethinking Critical Theory and Qualitative Research" in N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln (eds.) *The Landscape of Qualitative Research: Theories and Issues.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Klaaren, J. 2000 "Post-Apartheid Citizenship in South Africa", in D. Klusmeyer and T. Aleinikoff *From Migrants to Citizens: Membership in a Changing World.* Washington DC: Bookings Institution Press, pp. 221-52.

Krog, A. 01 April 2007, "De la Rey: Afrikaner absolution", *Mail & Guardian*, http://www.mg.co.za/article/2007-04-01-de-la-rey-afrikaner-absolution.

Kupferberg, F. 2003 "The Established and the New Comers: What makes Immigrant and Women Entrepreneurs so Special", *International Review of Sociology* 13(1): 89-104.

Landau, L. 2006 "Transplants and Transients: Idioms of Belonging and Dislocation in Inner-City Johannesburg", *African Studies Review* 49(2): 125-145.

Landau, L. 2001 *Immigration, Xenophobia and Human Rights in South Africa*. Southern African Migration Project. Cape Town: Idada.

Lazarus, N. 2004 "The South African Ideology: The Myth of South African Exceptionalism, the Idea of Renaissance," *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 103(4): 607-28.

Leilde, A. 2006 "What is an African? Narratives from Urban South Africa, Gabon and Togo", in S. Bekker and A. Leilde (eds.) *Reflections on Identity in Four African Cities*. South Africa. African Minds.

Leonhardt, A. 2006 "Baka and the Magic of the State: Between Autochthony and Citizenship", *African Studies Review* 49(2): 69-94.

Lincoln, Y. and Guba, E. 2003 "Paradigmatic Controversies, Contradictions, and Emerging Confluences" in Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln (eds.) *The Landscape of Qualitative Research: Theories and Issues.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publication.

Magubane, B. 1968 "Crisis in African Sociology", *East Africa Journal* 5: 21-40.

Magubane, B. 1971 "A Critical Look at Indices Used in the Study of Social Change in Colonial Africa", *Current Anthropology* 12(4/5): 419-445.

Mail & Guardian 31 May 2008, "Toll From Xenophobic Attacks Rises".

Mail & Guardian, 21 May 2008.

Mamaila, K. 19 June 2001 "The Message Is Passing the Ordinary Voter by", *The Star*.

Mamdani, M. 2001 *When Victims Become Killers: Colonialism, Nativism, and the Genocide in Rwanda.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Mamdani, M. 1996 *Citizens and Subjects: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Maphalala, J. 28 February 1999 "African Intellectuals Must Talk to the Masses in Their Home Languages", *City Press*.

Marshall-Fratani, R. 2006 "The War of 'Who Is Who'" Autochthony, Nationalism, and Citizenship in the Ivorian Crisis", *African Studies Review* 49(2): 9-43.

Mason, J. 1996 *Qualitative Research.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Masuku, T. 2006 "Targeting Foreigners: Xenophobia among Johannesburg Police", *Crime Quarterly* 20. Http://www.iss.co.za/pubs/CrimeQ/No.15/Masuku.html. Retrieved on 18 May 2007.

Mathers, K. and Landau, L. 2007 "Natives, Tourists, and *Makwerekwere*: Ethical Concerns with 'Proudly South African' Tourism, *Development Southern Africa* vol. 24(4): 524-37.

Mattes, R. et al. 2000 "South African Attitudes to Immigrants and Immigration", in D. A. McDonald (ed.) *On Borders: Perspectives on International Migration in Southern Africa.* Kingston: Southern African Migration Project.

Mattes, R. et al. 1999 *Still Waiting for the Barbarians: South African Attitudes to Immigrants and Immigration* – Southern African Migration Project. Cape Town: Idasa.

May, D. M. 2004 "The Interplay of Three Established-Outsider Figurations in a Deprived Inner-city Neighbourhood", *Urban Studies* 40(11): 2159-2179.

Mbeki, T. 1998 "The African Renaissance." Http://www.anc.org.za/ancdocs/history/mbeki. Retrieved on 5 December 2007.

Mbeki, T. 1996 "I Am an African." Http://www.anc.org.za/ancdocs/history/mbeki. Retrieved on 10 December 2007.

McDonald, D. 2002 "We Have Contact: Foreign Migration and Civic Participation in Marconi Beam, Cape Town", in J. Crush and D. A. McDonald (eds.) *Transnationalism and New African Immigration to South Africa*. Cape Town: Southern African Migration Project.

McDonald, D. and Danso, R. 2001 "Writing Xenophobia: Immigration and the Print Media in Post-apartheid South Africa", *Africa Today* 48(3): 14-137.

Mennell, S. 2007, *The American Civilizing Process.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Mennell, S. 1992 *Norbert Elias: An introduction.* Dublin: University College Dublin Press.

Mennell, S. and Goudsblom, J. 1998 "Introduction" in N. Elias *On Civilization, Power, and Knowledge.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Montgomery, K. 2005 "Banal Race-thinking. Ties of Blood, Canadian History Textbooks and Ethnic Nationalism", *Paedagogica Historica* 41(3): 313-336.

Moodie, T. and Ndatse, V. 1994 *Going for Gold: Men, Mines and Migration.* Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.

Morgan, D. 2002 "Focus Group Interviewing" in J. Gubrium and J. Holstein (eds) *Handbook of Interview Research: Context and Method*. London: Sage Publications.

Morris, A. 1999 *Bleakness and Light: Inner-City Transition in Hillbrow, Johannesburg*. Johannesburg: University of Witwatersrand Press.

Morris, A. 1998 "'Our Fellow Africans Make Our Lives Hell': The Lives of Congolese and Nigerians Living in Johannesburg," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 21(6): 1116-1136.

Mpe, P. 2001 *Welcome to Our Hillbrow*. Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press.

Murji, K and Solomos, J. 2005 "Introduction: Racialization in Theory and Practice". In K. Murji and J. Solomos (eds) *Racialization: Studies in Theory and Practice.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 1-27.

Nationmaster.com/red/country/sf-south-africa/cri-crime&b_cite=1.

Ndebele, N. S. 1994 *South African Literature and Culture: Rediscovery of the Ordinary.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Neocosmos, M. 2006 *From 'Foreign Natives' to 'Native Foreigners': Explaining Xenophobia in Post-Apartheid South Africa*. Dakar: CODESRIA.

Newman, W. 2000 *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

News24.com 28 March 2008, "'Too Dark' Man Gets R90 000". Http://www.news24.com/News24/South_Africa/News/0,,2-7-1442_2285828,00.html. Retrieved on 27 March 2008.

News24.com 22 November 2005, "SA 'rape capital' of the world", http://www.news24.com/News24/South_Africa/News/0,,2-7-1442_1838495,00.html

Nyamjoh, F. 2007 "From Bounded to Flexible Citizenship: Lessons from Africa", *Citizenship Studies* 11(1): 73-82.

Nyamnjoh, F. 2006 *Insiders and Outsiders: Citizenship and xenophobia in contemporary southern Africa.* London and New York: Zed Books.

Nzayabino, V. 2005 "The Role of Refugee Established Churches in the Lives of Forced Migrants: A Case Study of Word of Life Assembly in Yeoville, Johannesburg", MA Thesis, University of the Witwatersrand.

O'Connell, B 1999 *Civil Society: The Underpinnings of American Democracy.* Medford, MA: Tufts University Press.

Olesen, V. 2003 "Feminisms and Qualitative Research at and Into the Millennium" in N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln (eds.) *The Landscape of Qualitative Research: Theories and Issues.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Open Society Justice Initiative 2004a *The Africa Citizenship and Discrimination Audit Preparatory Meeting.* Report of a conference held in Dakar, Senegal, on July 19-20, 2004. Http://www.justiceinitiative.org/db/resource2/fs/?file_id 1/4 14358.

Open Society Justice Initiative 2004b *Racial Discrimination and the Rights of Non-citizens.* Http://www.justiceinitiative.org/db/resource2?res_id 1/4 101639.

Oxford Advanced Lerner's Dictionary of Current English 1997, Fifth Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Peberdy, S. 1999 "Selecting Immigrants: Nationalism and National Identity in South Africa's Immigration Policies, 1910 to 1998. PhD Dissertation, Queen's University, Kinston.

Perry, A. 05 Novermber 2007, "Oprah Scandal Rocks South Africa", *Time.* http://www.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,1680715,00.html?xid=feed-yahoo-full-world.

Petkou, C. 2005 "The Development of Ethnic Minorities: A Case Study of West Africans in South Africa", PhD Dissertation, University of the Witwatersrand.

Pilley, S. 21 May 2008 "The Picture of Things to Come?" *Mail & Guardian.*

Pollock, G. 2001 "Civil Society Theory and Euro-Nationalism", *Studies In Social & Political Thought*, 4: 31-56

Potter, J. 1997 *Representing Reality.* London: Sage Publications.

Rattansi, A. 2005 "The Uses of Racialization: The Time-spaces and Subject-objects of the Raced Body". In K. Murji and J. Solomos (eds) *Racialization: Studies in Theory and Practice.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 271-301.

Refugees Act 1998, Republic of South Africa.

Reitzes, M et al. 1996 "ONE FOOT IN, ONE FOOT OUT: *Immigrants and Civil Society in the Winterveld"*, Johannesburg: Centre for Policy Studies.

Rwiyegura, A. 9 March 2005 "I Am Makwerekwere", *Mail & Guardian*. Http://www.mg.co.za/articlePage.aspx?articleid=199203&area=/insight/insight__comment_and_analysis. Retrieved January 17 2008.

SAHRC 2005 "Report: Open Hearings on Xenophobia and Problems Related to It", Johannesburg. Www.sahrc.org.za/sahrc_cms/downloads/Xenophobia%20Report.pdf

SAHRC 2001 "Teacher Assaulted for Being too Dark". Http://www.sahrc.org.za/sahrc_cms/publish/printer_97.shtml. Retrieved on 27 March 2008.

SAHRC(A) 2000 *Xenophobia: The New Racism*. Johannesburg: Heinrich Boll Foundation.

SAHRC(B) 2000 "Lindela at the Crossroad of Detention and Repatriation". Johannesburg, South Africa. Www.queensu.ca/samp/migrationresources/xenophobia/reports/sahrc1.pdf.

SAHRC 1999 "Report into the Apprehension and Detention of Suspected Undocumented Migrants". Johannesburg: South African Human Rights Commission. Http://www.queensu.ca/samp/migrationresources/xenophobia. Retrieved on 1 March 2006.

Seal, C. 1999 *The Quality of Qualitative Research.* London: Sage Publications.

Shields, R. 1991 *Places on the Margins: Alternative Geographies of Modernity.* London : Routledge.

Shindondola, H. 2003 "Xenophobia in South Africa and Beyond: Some Literature for a Doctoral Research Proposal", Rand Afrikaans University, Johannesburg.

Shindondola, H. 2001 "Xenophobia in South Africa: The Views, Opinions and Experiences of International Students at the Rand Afrikaans University", MA Thesis, Rand Afrikaans University, Johannesburg.

Silverman, D. 1993 *Interpreting Qualitative Data: Methods for analyzing talk, text and interaction.* London: Sage Publications.

Simpson, G. 1996 "Explaining Violence in South Africa," Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation, Johannesburg, South Africa. Http://www.csvr.org.za/wits/papers/papendem.htm. Retrieved 18 January 2008.

Smith, D. 2002 "Institutional Ethnography," in T. May (ed.), *Qualitative Research in Action.* London: Sage Publications.

Smith, D. 1998 *The Everyday World as Problematic: A Feminist Sociology.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Smith, L. 1999 *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples.* London and New York: Zed Books.

Spector, P. 1992 *Summated Rating Scale Construction: An introduction*. Newbury, Ca: Sage Publications.

St Louis, B. 2005 "Racialization in the 'Zone of Ambiguity'". In K. Murji and J. Solomos (eds) *Racialization: Studies in Theory and Practice.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 29-50.

Stacey, J. 1988 "Can There Be a Feminist Ethnography?" *Women's Studies Int. Forum,* 11(1), 21-7.

Sowetan, 23 September 2004.

Speakers of Note. Http://www.speakersofnote.co.za/list/tim_modise.html. Retrieved 20 January 2008.

Statistics South Africa 2006, *Mind-year Population Estimates.* Http://statssa.gov.za/publications/P0302/P03022006.pdf.

Sunday Times, 28 Jan 2007, "Kind of the hill, top of the heap".

Sunday Times 21 November 1999, "The black middle class has a guilt-edged lining".

Sunday Tribune, 21 September 2003.

Sutton, P. W. and Vertigans, S. 2002 "The Established and Challenging Outsiders: Resurgent Islam in Secular Turkey", *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions* 3(1): 58-78.

The Sunday Independent, 03 October 1999, "Africanism must support all Africans"

The Star, March 2008, "Boy 'too Dark to be South African". Http://www.thestar.co.za/index.php?fSectionId=129&fArticleId=2166065.

The Star, 24 October 2007, "Why Insurance Firm Snubs Citi Golfs".

The Star, 19 April 2007, "White no more the colour of luxury in SA".

The Star, 22 September 2003.

Teo, T. and Febbraro, A. 2003 "Ethnocentrism as a Form of Intuition in Psychology", *Theory & Psychology* 13(5): 673-694.

Tshetlo, T. 18 May 2008 "Xenophobia Epidemic Spreads", *The Citizen.* Http://www.citizen.co.za/index/article.aspx?pDesc=65822,1,22

Turner, V. 1987 "Betwixt and Between: The Liminal Period in the Rites of Passage", in L. C. Mahdi, S. Foster and M. Little (eds.) *Betwixt and Between: Patterns of masculine and feminine Initiation*. La Salle, Illinois: Open Court.

United Nations 2001 "Declaration on World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance". Www.unhchr.ch/pdf/Durban.pdf.

Valji, N. 2003 "Creating the Nation: The Rise of Violent Xenophobia in the New South Africa," Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation. Http://www.csvr.org.za/papers/papnv1.htm. Retrieved on 29 November 2007.

Van Den Bergh, V. B. (n. d.) Http://www.norberteliasfoundation.nl/index_FS.htm. Retrieved on 28 March 2006.

Van Stolk, B. and Wouters, C. 1987 "Power Changes and Self-Respect: A Comparison of Two Cases of Established-Outsider Relations", *Theory, Culture and Society* 4: 477-88.

Wacquant, L. 2004 "Decivilizing and Demonizing: The Remaking of the Black American Ghetto" in Stephen Loyal and Stephen Quilley (eds.) *The Sociology of Norbert Elias*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Weekend Post, 26 May 2007, "Black diamonds are not all sparkle".

Weekend Post, 26 May 2007, "Emergence of 'Black Diamonds' does not add shine to everything".

Westney, D. 1989 "Sociological Approaches to the Pacific", *The Annals of the American Academy* 505: 24-33.

White, K. 2009 "Scourge of Racism: Genocide in Rwanda", *Journal of Black Studies* 39(3): 471-481.

Whiteker, B. 2005 "Citizens and Foreigners: Democratization and the Politics of Exclusion in Africa", *African Studies Review* 48(1): 109-226.

Williams, V. 2008 "Xenophobia in South Africa: An Overview and Analysis", *Perspectives* 3(8). Www.migration-boell.de/downloads/migration/HBS_Perspectives_03.08.pdf. Retrieved on 01 Septembre 2008.

Wouters, C. 2004 *Sex and Manners: Female Emancipation in the West 1890-2000*. London: Sage.

Wouters, C. 1998 "Etiquette Books and Emotion Management in the Twentieth Century: American Habitus in International Comparison", P. Stearns and J. Stearns (eds.) *An Emotional History of the United States*: 283-304.

Www.queensu.ca/samp; www.allafrica.com/stories/200408300448.htm. Retrieve on 10 January 2005.

Young, M. 2004 "Revisiting Nationalism and Ethnicity in Africa", UCLA International Institute, James S. Coleman African Studies Center. Http://repositories.cdlib.org/international/asc/jscmls/Nationalism.

Zukin, S. 2002 "What's Space Got to Do with It?" *City and Community* 1(4): 345-348.