

The Rupture in the Rainbow:
An Exploration of Joburg Pride's Fragmentation,
1990 to 2013

By Nyx (Nicolene Cindy) McLean

Supervisor: Professor Alan Kirkaldy

Thesis submitted for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in History
at Rhodes University

December 2017

DECLARATION

In submitting this thesis electronically and in hard copy, I declare that the entirety of the work contained within is my own, original work, that I am the sole author thereof (unless I have explicitly stated otherwise), that reproduction and publication thereof by Rhodes University will not infringe any third party rights and that I have not previously in its entirety or in part submitted it for obtaining any qualification.

December 2017

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge my supervisor, Professor Alan Kirkaldy, for the academic guidance and support, and the endless conversations over the state of queerness and “where the hell have all the queers gone?!” I value the role you have played in supervising this study but also the companionship and advice you have provided over the years before some media studies punk decided to try their hand at a history thesis.

Thanks must go to my examiners for their insightful comments that shaped the final version of this thesis. I have endeavoured to do justice to your suggestions and guidance, and where I have not directly incorporated comments they have been considered for publications that will follow from this research.

To my partner, Rebecca, I am ever grateful for your support and unending faith in my ability to weave the words of this thesis. You continuously provided an example of troubling structures and systems of inequality and injustice through your own writing. I look forward to now supporting you on your own doctoral journey with countless mugs of tea, keeping the cats at bay, and reading your work.

To Christel, for the reading of this thesis in its various forms, and your amusingly disruptive side-bar comments. Thank you for the countless forest runs, ever-flowing coffee, and stepping-in to teach my programme while I completed this thesis.

I would like to acknowledge my family – both unchosen and chosen – for the different ways you have come to shape my thinking and way of being in the world. To my chosen family, thank you for the innumerable ways that you disrupt, trouble and make queer all that is a little too familiar.

ABSTRACT

In 2012 Joburg Pride was disrupted by the One in Nine Campaign who asked for a moment of silence to honour the lives of victims of hate crimes¹ and violence. This interruption of the parade was met with violence from Joburg Pride organisers, marshals and participants, who explicitly told the campaign's activists that they "had no right to be at the parade."² The activists were predominantly black lesbians and gender non-conforming people. This response suggested that there was no place within Joburg Pride for honouring and mourning the lives of LGBTIAQ people of colour that had been lost to hate crimes. In addition to the call for one minute of silence, the One in Nine Campaign argued that Joburg Pride had become depoliticised as a result of its increased commercialisation.³

This study is motivated by a need to understand this rupture that occurred in 2012, and to situate it within the history of the LGBTIAQ movement in South Africa. In particular, it investigates the argument made by the One in Nine Campaign that Joburg Pride had become depoliticised and commercialised. The tensions that were facilitated by the 2012 clash and the subsequent formation of alternative Pride events in 2013 are interesting in light of current conversations circulating in broader South African discourse around what it means to be a South African citizen. The study applies a poststructuralist, anti-racist queer feminist lens informed by queer theory, critical theory, critical race theory, and whiteness studies to the historical and current fractures within Joburg Pride.

The study analyses *Exit* newspaper articles from 1990 to 2013, alongside interviews with key stakeholders involved in the 2012 clash. The analysis, informed by both thematic and discursive approaches, interrogates the following themes: depoliticisation, commercialisation, "community", assimilation, whiteness, racism, rainbowism and rainbow-washing. In this thesis I argue that the commercial interests and apolitical stance of predominantly white Joburg Pride organisers came to exclude LGBTIAQ people of colour's experiences, at a time when political organising around hate crimes was most necessary. The

¹ Hate crimes are crimes, such as rape and murder, based on prejudice.

² A. Valenza, "One in Nine Campaign," in *ILGA*, 9 October 2012, at <http://ilga.org/one-in-nine-campaign/>.

³ One in Nine Campaign, "Copy of the leaflet distributed at Joburg Pride 2012," 8 October 2012, at www.facebook.com/groups/10123398375/.

analysis further highlights a politics of assimilation rooted in rights-based discourse informed by the Rainbow Nation rhetoric of post-apartheid South Africa. Further, this study problematises the notion of “community”, and discusses its strategic use in assimilationist politics within the LGBTIAQ “community”.

This study shows that the rupture in the rainbow that occurred at Joburg Pride 2012 was constituted by multiple ruptures that exist in South African society. The issues explored in this thesis are therefore not only useful for constructing more inclusive spaces for LGBTIAQ people, but also for the nation building project of South Africa.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Declaration	1
Acknowledgements	2
Abstract	3
Chapter One: Introduction	9
1.1. Contextualising the study.....	9
1.1.1. Defining Pride.....	10
1.1.2. The rupture in the rainbow.....	14
1.1.3. Positioning the self within the rupture.....	15
1.2. Research problem and aims.....	16
1.3. Methodology and research design.....	17
1.3.1. Stage one: Archival research.....	18
1.3.2. Stage two: Interviews.....	22
1.3.3. Data interpretation methods.....	24
1.4. Ethical considerations.....	26
1.5. Who is the “I”? Reflexivity and the “I”.....	27
1.5.1. Writing as resistance.....	31
1.5.2. Strategies.....	32
1.6. A note on language and terminology.....	34
Chapter Two: Theoretical Framework	39
2.1. Introduction.....	39
2.2. Poststructuralism.....	39
2.3. Anti-racist queer feminism.....	45
2.4. Queer theory.....	50
2.5. Critical theory and critical race theory.....	53
2.6. Whiteness studies.....	56
2.7. Conclusion.....	62
Chapter Three: The Depoliticisation of Africa’s First Pride March	66
3.1. Introduction.....	66

3.2.	Making visible the depoliticisation of Joburg Pride.....	68
3.3.	The movement away from the political.....	72
3.4.	For the sponsor: Changing the name.....	77
3.5.	Hate crimes: A moment for re-politicisation.....	84
3.6.	Conclusion.....	89
Chapter Four: “Community” and Assimilation.....		92
4.1.	Introduction.....	92
4.2.	Defining community.....	93
4.3.	Community: Imagined and chimerical.....	95
4.4.	Wispy communities.....	99
4.5.	Community as strategic.....	103
4.6.	Assimilating: Which community? Which homosexuality?.....	107
4.7.	Conclusion.....	113
Chapter Five: The Exclusivity of Whiteness.....		116
5.1.	Introduction.....	116
5.2.	Defining whiteness.....	118
5.2.1	Bastions of the white middle class.....	119
5.3.	Forgetting the past and avoiding politics.....	122
5.4.	Pride is clearly uneven, absurd and inconsiderate.....	130
5.4.1.	Black Pride.....	131
5.4.2.	Diversity.....	133
5.5.	Conclusion.....	136
Chapter Six: The Myth of the Rainbow Nation.....		139
6.1.	Introduction.....	139
6.2.	Rights and citizenship.....	141
6.2.1.	Becoming assimilated citizens.....	144
6.2.2.	Whose rights?.....	146
6.3.	The myth of the Rainbow Nation.....	150
6.4.	Rainbow-washing.....	157
6.5.	Conclusion	162
Chapter Seven: Conclusion.....		165
7.1.	Introduction.....	165

7.2. Summary of the findings.....	165
7.3. Ethical community as a solution.....	169
7.4. Concluding thoughts.....	174
Bibliography.....	177
8.1. Primary sources.....	177
8.2. Secondary sources.....	181

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1. Contextualising the Study

On 6 October 2012, approximately “20 black lesbians and gender non-conforming feminists”⁴ from the One in Nine Campaign,⁵ staged a “die-in”⁶ and halted the annual Joburg⁷ Pride parade. The One in Nine Campaign advocates for the rights of survivors of sexual violence including LGBTIAQ⁸ people. Campaign members distributed flyers at Joburg Pride 2012 in order to clarify what their protest was about.⁹ The leaflets contained information as to why they were staging the die-in, calling for “one minute of silence for the dead.”¹⁰ The content included a list of names of 25 LGBTIAQ people who had died as a result of hate crimes. The activists demanded a minute of silence from the parade, and lay down in the middle of the road with life-sized dolls that represented LGBTIAQ people who had been raped and murdered because of their sexual orientation or gender identity and expression.

Part of this protest was aimed at bringing attention to how “pride has ceased to be a space for charting new futures” and highlighting that “the de-politicisation of most prides has allowed the old, racial apartheid to be translated into a new, economic apartheid, which is clearly evident in many pride celebrations.”¹¹ The Campaign argued that capitalist consumerism and commodification were characteristic of Pride events and LGBTIAQ spaces in South Africa.¹² Their disruption aimed to make clear the links between Joburg Pride’s depoliticisation and the increased commercialisation of Pride. These processes of depoliticisation and commercialisation are particularly significant within the context of South Africa, which is one of the most unequal societies in the world with regards to the distribution

⁴ One in Nine Campaign, 8 October 2012, copy of the leaflet distributed at Joburg Pride 2012, www.facebook.com/groups/10123398375/, n.p.

⁵ The One in Nine Campaign is an organisation formed in 2006 in response to the Zuma rape trial in which South Africa’s then deputy president, Jacob Zuma was accused of rape. It takes its name from the notion that only one in nine women will report their rape to the police. The Campaign is referred to as either “One in Nine” or “the One in Nine Campaign.” (The One in Nine Campaign, at www.oneinnine.org.za.)

⁶ A die-in is a form of protest where activists feign being dead. Die-ins were popular forms of protest among members of ACT UP in the 1980s. ACT UP was an AIDS advocacy group that employed direct action. (J. Taylor, *Playing It Queer: Popular Music, Identity and Queer World-Making*. Peter Lang: Bern, 2012.)

⁷ Joburg is the shortened name for Johannesburg and is used colloquially.

⁸ LGBTIAQ stands for: lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex, asexual, and queer. It is an attempt to be as inclusive of the community of non-heterosexual/normative identities as possible.

⁹ One in Nine Campaign, copy of the leaflet distributed at Joburg Pride 2012, n.p.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Ibid.

of income.¹³ In this context the commercialisation of an inherently political event raises questions and facilitates concerns about who the Pride event may be targeting.

In response to the protest action, Joburg Pride parade organisers and marshals threatened to drive over the One in Nine Campaign activists with their vehicles, while telling the activists they “had no right to be at the parade.”¹⁴ This comment is significant given that the protestors were predominantly LGBTIAQ people and therefore members of the LGBTIAQ “community.”¹⁵ Not only were campaign members threatened but they were also dragged out of the road by members of the organising committee. This can be seen in footage that circulated after the moment.¹⁶ Following this, the Pride organising committee, One in Nine Campaign members and Pride participants became involved in a physically aggressive clash.¹⁷ This clash between One in Nine protestors and Joburg Pride organisers, marshals and participants, and the conversations that emerged as a result of the clash, highlighted tensions around issues of racism, discrimination and exclusion that have surrounded Joburg Pride since its beginning in 1990.¹⁸

1.1.1. Defining Pride

Joburg Pride is an annual celebration held by the LGBTIAQ community which was initiated in 1990. It is South Africa’s longest running Pride event, and is unique in that it was the first LGBTIAQ Pride march in South Africa (and on the continent of Africa) at a time when there were no legal protections for lesbian and gay South Africans.¹⁹ Joburg Pride is an expression of LGBTIAQ identity in Johannesburg and in South Africa, with its history paralleling the history of democracy in South Africa.²⁰ There are several contestations that exist around Joburg Pride that are not unique to South Africa, but what makes them worthy of noting is the post-

¹³ C. Barr, “Inequality index: where are the world's most unequal countries?” in *The Guardian*, 26 April 2017, <https://www.theguardian.com/inequality/datablog/2017/apr/26/inequality-index-where-are-the-worlds-most-unequal-countries>, n.p.

¹⁴ A. Valenza, “One in Nine Campaign,” in *ILGA*, 9 October 2012, <http://ilga.org/one-in-nine-campaign/>, n.p.

¹⁵ Community is written in inverted commas to highlight its problematic usage, particularly in relation to LGBTIAQ people. This is discussed in greater detail later in this chapter, and in chapter four.

¹⁶ *Gay Pride March interrupted by activists*, 7 October 2012, at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LYjp-xbdFS0>.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ E. Craven, “Racial identity and racism in the gay and lesbian ‘community’ in post-apartheid South Africa,” Master’s thesis, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, 2011; S. De Waal and A. Manion, *Pride: Protest and Celebration*, Fanele: Johannesburg, 2006.

¹⁹ It is important to note that the Equality Clause, in essence, provides protection only to lesbian and gay South Africans, while bisexual, transgender, intersex, asexual and queer (BTIAQ) are largely excluded from this – as they are in greater South African discourse.

²⁰ Craven, “Racial identity and racism in the gay and lesbian ‘community’ in post-apartheid South Africa,” p. iii.

apartheid context in which they occur. In particular, the post-apartheid context provides a complex and contradictory space in which people negotiate their identities. This is possibly one of the primary reasons for the tensions that are so prominent in the current manifestation of Joburg Pride.

Globally, Pride began as a movement to make visible the LGBTIAQ struggle and originally took on the form of protest marches in America in the 1970s.²¹ Pride events, in Western countries, have come to be vibrant and colourful parades and street parties that celebrate sexual cosmopolitanism.²² The first Pride event in 1970 commemorated the 1969 Stonewall riots, when patrons of the Stonewall Inn, a New York City gay bar, reacted violently to a police raid at the bar.²³ It was first celebrated in New York City in 1970, with Boston, Dallas, London, Paris, West Berlin and Stockholm following suit in 1971.²⁴ Although Pride originated in the United States, it is now found in other parts of the world such as Canada, Australia, Israel, Russia and South Africa. Pride events serve to make visible LGBTIAQ people and affirm their identities. These events can be considered to be social interventions that seek to reclaim public space while challenging dominant attitudes towards the LGBTIAQ “community”.²⁵ During Pride the LGBTIAQ “community” take over public spaces while relegating the heterosexual mainstream to the margins. These moments can result in social and personal affirmation for people who are generally marginalised.²⁶ However, this understanding does not account for the spectacle or exoticisation of queer bodies that occur in this moment. Pride parades and celebrations are compellingly described by Kates and Belk as being “public carnivalesque festivals, culturally shared rites of passage” which are also “forms of politically motivated consumption-related resistance, and magnets for commercialisation within the context of the festival.”²⁷ What is at risk in these consumption-related resistances and carnivalesque moments is the loss of an emphasis on political equality and political visibility.

²¹ F. Stella, “Queer Space, Pride, and Shame in Moscow,” in *Slavic Review*. Vol. 72 (3), 2013, p. 462.

²² Ibid.

²³ K. M. Bruce, “LGBT Pride as a Cultural Protest Tactic in a Southern City,” in *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*. Vol 42 (5), 2013, p. 613.

²⁴ S.M. Kates and R.W. Belk, “The meanings of Lesbian and Gay Pride Day: Resistance through consumption and resistance to consumption”. In *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*. Vol 30 (4), 2001, pp. 392-429.

²⁵ Bruce, “LGBT Pride as a Cultural Protest Tactic in a Southern City,” p. 613.

²⁶ Kates and Belk, “The meanings of Lesbian and Gay Pride Day: Resistance through consumption and resistance to consumption,” p. 405.

²⁷ Ibid. p. 393.

In some contexts, Pride spaces may be granted to LGBTIAQ people in exchange for the spectacle of queer bodies for the entertainment of the heterosexual centre.

In 1990, Joburg Pride was South Africa and Africa's first lesbian and gay pride parade to take place.²⁸ This first march was intended to be a political protest, as were the few that followed, with themes calling for equality and rights for the LGBTIAQ "community". It was described as having a mood that was daring, bold and festive, where Pride participants marched with the spirit that was instilled in 1990, one of hope and the prospect of transformation, they marched to "demand our rights as full, proud, productive participants in a fully equal society."²⁹ The first Pride march was a political march, it was called a 'march', and informed by the push for equal rights. The post-apartheid era saw the LGBTIAQ "community" granted legal protections under the South African Constitution, and integrated into the country's multicultural nation building project, the Rainbow Nation. However, Joburg Pride has undergone substantial change since 1990 and Craven describes the more recent manifestations of Pride as "massive, commercially marketed and slickly run events."³⁰ Craven continues that Pride events are now so far away from the quintessential image that has come to be associated with Pride 1990 of a few hundred people marching with many of their faces covered with paper bags.³¹

South Africa is often celebrated, both locally and globally, as the champion of LGBTIAQ rights with the country's Constitution being the first in the world to protect people regardless of sexual orientation.³² In addition it was the first country in Africa to pass the Civil Union Act which recognised same-sex unions.³³ However, there is still reason to protest as many LGBTIAQ South Africans continue to face homophobic and transphobic harassment and violence within their communities.³⁴ For some it may be surprising that this is the case, in particular as the increased visibility of LGBTIAQ people creates a false impression that

²⁸ De Waal and Manion, *Pride: Protest and Celebration*.

²⁹ E. Cameron, "Foreword," in S. De Waal and A. Manion (Eds), *Pride: Protest and Celebration*. Fanele: Johannesburg, 2006, p. 4.

³⁰ Craven, "Racial identity and racism in the gay and lesbian 'community' in post-apartheid South Africa," p. 44.

³¹ Ibid.

³² *The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa*, Act 108 of 1996.

³³ *The Civil Union Act*, Act 17 of 2006.

³⁴ N. McLean, "Zwischen Party und Protest," in *Sudlink*, No 174, 2015, p. 17.

homophobia is no more.³⁵ Homophobia, and transphobia, manifest in a number of ways, from verbal abuse to more physical forms of violence such as assault, sexual violence, and murder which are experienced daily by LGBTIAQ South Africans who may be multiply marginalised by racism, poverty and sexism.³⁶ Thoreson presents research from 2003 which showed that 14.9 percent of black lesbian women had been raped, and only half of these cases were reported. The reason for low reporting of sexual violence is the fear of secondary victimisation from the police, medical professionals and the courts.³⁷ However, given the high levels of underreporting due to stigmatisation and secondary victimisation, the occurrence of rape is likely to be even higher than what is reported.³⁸

In reflecting on homophobic violence it is also necessary to consider the added complexity of residual apartheid-borne racism within the LGBTIAQ “community”, which results in many LGBTIAQ South Africans of colour being excluded from predominantly white social LGBTIAQ spaces. The consequence of this is that white LGBTIAQ people may not then come to learn of the lived experiences of LGBTIAQ people of colour. It is for this reason that when writing of the LGBTIAQ “community” we need to account for discrimination that happens within the “community”, as well as the “community’s” partiality to a Western or Global North LGBT history of exclusion.³⁹ The experiences of LGBTIAQ South Africans are diverse and complex, specifically when the role of race, class, and gender is accounted for.⁴⁰ Experiences and identities come to be shaped by South Africa’s distinct history of colonialism and apartheid.⁴¹ It is this history, and the race, gender, and class context of post-apartheid South Africa which was made visible with the disruption of Joburg Pride in 2012. It was through One in Nine’s attempt to honour black lesbians and gender non-conforming people – members of the LGBTIAQ “community” who are largely discriminated against on the basis of race, gender and

³⁵ J. Teal and M. Conover-Williams, “Homophobia without Homophobes: Deconstructing the Public Discourses of 21st Century Queer Sexualities in the United States,” in *Humboldt Journal of Social Relations*, Vol 38, 2016, p. 18.

³⁶ R. Thoreson, “Somewhere over the Rainbow Nation: Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Activism in South Africa,” in *Journal of Southern African Studies*, Vol. 34 (3), 2008, p. 695.

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Rape Crisis Cape Town, Annual Report 2015/2016, 2016, p. 2.

³⁹ A. Tucker, “Framing Exclusion in Cape Town’s Gay Village: The Discursive and Material Perpetration of Inequitable Queer Subjects,” in *Area*, Vol 41 (2), 2009, p. 192.

⁴⁰ H. Wells and L. Polders, “Anti-Gay Hate Crimes in South Africa: Prevalence, Reporting Practices, and Experiences of the Police,” in *African Feminisms* Vol 2 (3), 2006, p. 21.

⁴¹ F. Reygan and A. Lynette, “Heteronormativity, homophobia and ‘culture’ arguments in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa,” in *Sexualities*. Vol 17 (5), 2014, p. 719.

class – that “the faultlines of race, privilege and politics” of Joburg Pride, and the LGBTIAQ “community”, became visible.⁴²

It is important to note that the disruption of Pride events is not new or unique but rather occur frequently. Scott suggests that regardless of location, whether it be in North America, Europe or South Africa, there exists a common thread that runs through many of the Pride disruptions.⁴³ Those responsible for the disruptions are protesting against the increased commercialisation of Pride and asking that it be more than a party; that it adopts a more serious and political tone.⁴⁴

1.1.2. The rupture in the rainbow

A disruption is a moment in which something is caused “to break apart, to cause a rupture, to throw into disorder, to prevent something – a process or a system.”⁴⁵ Thus the disruption of Joburg Pride in 2012 can be seen as a moment in which the usual flow of participants through the streets of Johannesburg were forced to stop, thrown into disorder, and through this tensions with regard to the Pride festival were rendered visible. This moment could quietly have passed as an event in Pride history receiving a mention in *Exit*⁴⁶ as every Pride event had in years before. However, there was something about this moment, something about the violence of the event that brought attention to the tensions between Pride organisers, participants and protesters that revealed the complexity of the problem. Perhaps it is this violence that has facilitated a sense of urgency to understand why the disruption occurred, as well as its larger implications.

Foucault writes that a rupture is not “a sort of great drift that carries with it all discursive formations at once,”⁴⁷ it is not an indistinguishable break between two periods that then presents two distinct stages on either side of the break. Rather, it is a break that is identified

⁴² M. Van Zyl, “A Sexual Politics of Belonging: Same-Sex Marriage in Post-Apartheid South Africa,” Doctor of Philosophy thesis, Stellenbosch University, Stellenbosch, 2015, p. 258.

⁴³ L. Scott, “Gay Pride: The politics of disruption,” 19 June 2017, <http://queerconsciousness.com/gay-pride-the-politics-disruption/>, n.p.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ Many articles in *Exit* are not attributed to an author. This usually occurs when the content has been produced by a staff reporter.

⁴⁷ M. Foucault, *Archaeology of Knowledge*, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2002, p. 195.

through several moments of transformation. Therefore, in essence, a rupture is not a singular moment but rather a series of moments leading to a final breaking apart. Thus, within this understanding, this study is not only interested in the disruption of Joburg Pride by the One in Nine Campaign but also the rupturing of the sense of unity created by the concept of the Rainbow Nation. Central to this study is the notion that the rupture was not necessarily one great moment but rather a series of moments, small disruptions, and transformations within the LGBTIAQ “community”, and South Africa more broadly, that resulted in the moment in 2012 that came to be defined as the disruption of Joburg Pride.

1.1.3. Positioning the self within the context of the rupture

This being an anti-racist queer feminist study, particular emphasis is placed on acknowledging the position of the researcher. Bhavnani writes that feminist and queer approaches are best for positioning the role of the researcher in the production of knowledge.⁴⁸ I recognise that my identity as a feminist researcher has implications for how the study has been conducted, including the manner in which data has been collected and analysed. For this reason it is necessary that I disclose that I am a queer non-binary white South African who has had to, and continues to, navigate complex discrimination and privileges. I discuss this in greater detail after a discussion of the research problem, aims and design. Further, it must be noted that I am involved in queer spaces, and that in 2013 I had been involved in the Johannesburg People’s Pride movement which saw the development of an alternative Pride space to Joburg Pride. This happened as a result of hearing of the dissolution of the Joburg Pride Committee and an opening up of dialogue space in Melville at a restaurant called Melon to discuss the future of Joburg Pride. I was, at the time, involved as an interested member of the LGBTIAQ “community” attending meetings held in Johannesburg to discuss what would happen to Joburg Pride post the organising committee’s dissolution. It was through this that I became involved with the Johannesburg People’s Pride movement. I was primarily a participant who attended regular meetings at Constitutional Hill and the Women’s Jail before the first People’s Pride march on 5 October 2013. What intrigued me was the commitment to running Pride differently, and the sense of belonging I felt among the group that gathered on weekends.

⁴⁸ K. Bhavnani, “Tracing the contours: feminist research in Ireland: developing policy and practice with men who batter,” in *Administration*. Vol 43 (3), 1993, pp. 57-81.

I decided to step away from the People's Pride meeting participation to begin work on this Pride study and in order to position myself as an observer and removed from the internal politics and conversation of the organisers of Pride marches, parades and events in Johannesburg. However, I do acknowledge that one cannot be removed entirely from a process and that all positioning is political.

Having outlined the history, development and rupture of Joburg Pride, what follows is a discussion on the research problem and aims; methodology and research design; positioning the researcher; a note on language and terminology; and a chapter overview.

1.2. Research Problem and Aims

The research seeks to understand the particular moment of Joburg Pride 2012, and to situate this moment within the history of the LGBTIAQ movement in South Africa. In particular, my interest in this topic was ignited by the argument made by the One in Nine Campaign that Joburg Pride had become depoliticised and commercialised. In addition, the hostile manner in which parade organisers, marshals, and participants reacted to campaign members suggested that the disruption represented an important moment, deserving of more exploration. The tensions that arose out of the 2012 event and the formation of different Pride events in 2013 are interesting to this study in light of current conversations circulating in broader South African discourse around continuing racial and economic exclusion. Thus, the study seeks to explore the history of Joburg Pride in order to understand the relationship between the history of Joburg Pride and the history of South Africa in the post-apartheid context.

The research aims to contribute new insights to the history of social movements within South Africa in its exploration of the tensions present during Pride's history, tensions that may be emblematic of the broader post-apartheid South African society. The research intends to contribute to an understanding of the historical and socio-political context of Joburg Pride through exploring the key themes that arose from the coverage of Pride (and its disruption). Further, it seeks to investigate the existence of broader tensions around South African citizenship and national identity, and whether the tensions within the LGBTIAQ "community" can be understood as representative of, and constituted by broader tensions. Through these investigations this study comes to unpack queer citizenship, the LGBTIAQ "community"

project, and the national project. The work aims to contribute to the fields of queer studies, LGBTIAQ history, and the history of social movements in South Africa by providing an understanding of Pride in South Africa within the broader context the country's historical, social, economic and political context; as well as situating it firmly within the context of the African and the international LGBTIAQ movement.

1.3. Methodology and Research Design

The study is informed by a qualitative approach, and employs archival research and interviews to explore the depoliticisation of Pride from 1990 to 2013. It is positioned within the interpretivist paradigm which places emphasis on the meanings that people assign to their lives. The study focuses on how people construct their social world through interactions and shared meanings within particular social contexts, in the case of this study, post-apartheid South African society.⁴⁹ It further takes the stance that there exists “no single reality” but rather that there are multiple interpretations of a moment or meaning that is being studied, and thus multiple realities.⁵⁰ It proposes that no research is objective or value free, and rather emphasises the exploration of research participants’ meaning-making.⁵¹ This is particularly useful when considering the national historical context within which Joburg Pride is situated and how the participants make sense of their lived experiences in relation to Joburg Pride, and the history of Pride in South Africa within the context of the country’s transition to democracy.

Data collection was divided into two stages. Stage one consisted of archival research conducted in 2014 and stage two consisted of interviews conducted in 2015 and 2016. Archival research was conducted at the Gay and Lesbian Archives (GALA) where data was collected to investigate Joburg Pride events from the very first Joburg Pride march in 1990 until the Joburg Pride clash of 2012.⁵² Content was primarily gathered from Pride articles found in the *Exit* newspaper, South Africa’s oldest gay publication. This was because *Exit* provided the most consistent coverage of Joburg Pride as compared to any other publication.

⁴⁹ J. Nieuwenhuis, “Qualitative research designs and data gathering techniques,” in K. Maree (Ed.), *First Steps in Research*. Van Schaik Publishers: Pretoria, 2011, pp. 70-97.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ S. McKenna, S. “A critical investigation into discourses that construct academic literacy at the Durban Institute of Technology,” Doctoral thesis, Rhodes University, Grahamstown, 2004, p. 35.

⁵² The Gay and Lesbian Archives. Website: <http://www.gala.co.za/>.

Interviews were conducted with individuals identified as key stakeholders in the *Exit* newspaper articles analysed.

1.3.1. Stage one: Archival research

Data was collected from GALA, based at the University of the Witwatersrand and the content they had available on Joburg Pride from 1990 to 2013.⁵³ GALA was selected as the archive because of its mandate to collect and house gay and lesbian history in South Africa. It provides an institutional home for the protection and storage of existing LGBTIAQ records and documents.⁵⁴ GALA is considered to be both an academic resource and an archive serving the LGBTIAQ “community,”⁵⁵ and serves to “preserve materials excluded from the mainstream repositories.”⁵⁶ For these reasons GALA was the best suited archive for investigating the recorded history of Joburg Pride.

The study made use of the archive because of its historical content related to the research topic. Mbembe writes that the archive is not only about what can be observed and engaged with but also evidence that an event took place, an individual lived or decisions were reached; the archive, therefore, operates as a kind of proof.⁵⁷ GALA was selected specifically because of the exclusion of LGBTIAQ content from general archives. The exclusion of material from an archive risks silencing and obliterating the historical moment from memory.⁵⁸ This is because what is housed within the archive is presented as a whole, and what is outside of the archive is repressed and denied an existence and relegated to oblivion.⁵⁹ In the case of South Africa and apartheid history, this is important to note because material may have not been recorded previously. This is because material on lesbian and gay people may have been suppressed or

⁵³ G. Davidson and R. Nerio, “Exit: Gay publishing in South Africa,” in M. Gevisser and E. Cameron (Eds), *Defiant Desire: gay and lesbian lives in South Africa*, Ravan Press: Braamfontein, 1994, p. 225.

⁵⁴ G. Reid, “The History of the Past is the Trust of the Present’: Preservation and Excavation in the Gay and Lesbian Archives of South Africa,” in C. Hamilton., V. Harris, J. Taylor., M. Pickover., G. Reid., and R. Saleh (Eds), *Refiguring the archive*, David Philip: Cape Town, 2002, p. 194.

⁵⁵ Ibid. p. 203.

⁵⁶ C. Hamilton., V. Harris. and G. Reid, “Introduction,” in C. Hamilton., V. Harris, J. Taylor., M. Pickover., G. Reid., and R. Saleh (Eds), *Refiguring the archive*, David Philip: Cape Town, 2002, p. 11

⁵⁷ A. Mbembe, “The power of the archive and its limits,” in C. Hamilton., V. Harris, J. Taylor., M. Pickover., G. Reid., and R. Saleh (Eds), *Refiguring the archive*, David Philip: Cape Town, 2002, p. 20.

⁵⁸ B. Harris, “The Archive, Public History and the Essential Truth: The TRC Reading the Past,” in C. Hamilton., V. Harris, J. Taylor., M. Pickover., G. Reid., and R. Saleh (Eds), *Refiguring the archive*, David Philip: Cape Town, 2002, p. 165.

⁵⁹ Ibid.

excluded as a result of moral censorship. Reid speaks to the power of archivists in choosing what material to include or to exclude.⁶⁰

This argument highlights the significance of an archive like GALA which is LGBTIAQ focused in a world where information on LGBTIAQ experiences in existing archives is limited and sporadic such that whatever does exist, whether it be inaccurate, moralistic or biased, is considered valuable because it is so rare.⁶¹ However, this study recognises that archives are not neutral,⁶² but are about judgement of what is “worthy of preserving” and storing in public place, with not all documents being considered archivable.⁶³ The archive comes to be an additional site of discrimination because in the selection of material for archiving, only some written documents are deemed worthy, and granted the status of archivability. Those who are not granted this status are excluded, and so, as Mbembe argues, the archive is about status and not only about data and the preservation of documents.⁶⁴

In light of this, it is risky to assert generalisations from the archived material analysed as this material is but a fragment of the historical moment.⁶⁵ Harris argues that the archive cannot be said to mirror reality because it is a recording of reality.⁶⁶ Thus the archive is “but a sliver of social memory,”⁶⁷ and cannot be said to be a true or full reflection of a particular historical moment.⁶⁸ Rather it is best to think of the archive as a space for the imagination because it cannot house all that has occurred within society. It cannot capture its entire history but it can provide a sliver of the moment through which one could imagine the whole.⁶⁹ The documents archived are but samples of a history. Further, in considering what has been discussed above regarding archives, I acknowledge that my own understanding of Joburg Pride comes to be shaped by what is documented. My understanding of the material gathered and analysed is shaped by my social position and the lens through which I view the material.

⁶⁰ Reid, “The History of the Past is the Trust of the Present’: Preservation and Excavation in the Gay and Lesbian Archives of South Africa,” p. 200.

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² M. Tamboukou, “Archival research: unraveling space/time/matter entanglements and fragments,” in *Qualitative Research*, 2013, p. 7.

⁶³ Mbembe, “The power of the archive and its limits,” p. 20.

⁶⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁵ Harris, “The Archival Sliver: A Perspective on the Construction of Social Memory in Archives and the Transition from Apartheid to Democracy,” p. 135.

⁶⁶ Ibid. p. 136.

⁶⁷ Ibid. p. 135.

⁶⁸ Ibid. p. 136.

⁶⁹ Mbembe, “The power of the archive and its limits,” p. 21.

I acknowledge this because researchers cannot be said to be outside of or removed from their object of study. Instead they bring to the material their own history, that which has constituted them, and will come to inform how they interrogate the material before them and influence their interpretation of the documents.⁷⁰ For instance, I am aware that I brought to the archive my position on Joburg Pride and this may have impacted on my understanding and interpretation of the material, and subsequently the shaping of my historical telling of Joburg Pride. As an anti-racist queer feminist my reading was one which actively sought moments where articles troubled and contested Pride, and spoke to the tensions that exist within the community, as well as South Africa.

In the archives at GALA, the most consistent coverage of Joburg Pride came from *Exit*, South Africa's longest running "gay" publication. *Exit* is the only publication that has appeared continuously on the South African gay scene since the mid-1980s.⁷¹ There have been others but none as consistent as *Exit*. The publication emerged in 1985 after the Gay Association of South Africa's publication, *Link/Skakel* was dissolved. It was taken up by Dawid Moolman, a professional journalist. Moolman decided to bring out a private gay publication, and the first *Exit* was published in July 1985.⁷² The emphasis of "gay" when referring to the paper shows *Exit* to be possibly, as Cooper has suggested, a publication "for the boys."⁷³ The newspaper came to replace, unintentionally, *Link/Skakel* as it made use of its mailing list, and was staffed by the same writers, and distributed to the same gay bars and clubs.⁷⁴ *Exit*, as a result, continued to serve the agenda of GASA's founders and members, and thus continued to refuse to take a political stance, and thus steered clear of commentary on the anti-apartheid struggle. Davidson and Nerio suggest that the reason for this was that GASA's members were conservative white gay men who saw any form of political agenda as being sympathetic with the liberation struggle.⁷⁵ If any political matters were covered, they were covered in a way that suited the membership of GASA because, "in truth, *Exit* defined politics as white."⁷⁶ It is particularly important to note this as it shapes the content produced by the publication

⁷⁰ V. Harris, "A shaft of darkness: Derrida in the Archive," in C. Hamilton., V. Harris, J. Taylor., M. Pickover., G. Reid., and R. Saleh (Eds), *Refiguring the archive*, David Philip: Cape Town, 2002, p. 65.

⁷¹ Davidson and Nerio, "Exit: Gay publishing in South Africa," p. 225.

⁷² Ibid. p. 227.

⁷³ S. Cooper, interview with researcher, Pietermaritzburg (Skype), 3 February 2016.

⁷⁴ Davidson and Nerio, "Exit: Gay publishing in South Africa," p. 227.

⁷⁵ Ibid. p. 227.

⁷⁶ Ibid. p. 228.

and the manner in which events and issues were interpreted and presented. In light of this (limited) engagement, interviews were later selected as a methodology to accompany archival research for the purpose of gathering more tellings and voices on Joburg Pride that may not have received coverage or space in *Exit* newspaper.

When collecting data, I went through every edition of *Exit* newspaper produced between 1988 and 2014. I chose to collect data from the time before and after the research period of the study which is 1990 to 2013 in order to gather any information that may have spoken to or supported the content from 1990 to 2013. The research period was selected because 1990 was the year of the first Joburg Pride and 2013 saw the disbanding of the Joburg Pride Committee after the 2012 Pride clash. I read through all newspaper editions during the time frame of 1988 to 2014 in order to identify all articles which mentioned “Pride” and “Joburg Pride”. Each of these articles was then scanned and coded in the following way: year, month, page, edition, and where there was an author, the author’s name. The articles were then printed out and re-read. During this re-reading I focused on commentary that was critical, and engaged with the political contestations around Joburg Pride; frequency of words mentioned; mentions of individuals; discussions around Pride, protest, commercialisation, route, South Africa, what it means to be gay, the concept of community, the idea of nation and a national identity. I selected these topics as they related to the conversations that arose out of the 2012 clash. I focused on these particular areas of content in order to investigate whether these tensions have always existed within Joburg Pride, with the 2012 disruption representing an outlet of these tensions in the form of physical violence. I grouped the content areas under six key thematic areas that became apparent during the data sorting phase. The thematic areas were: common identity and community; old and new South Africa – transitions and transformations; Pride, de/politicisation and purpose; the rainbow myth; the gay liberation and the liberation struggle; whiteness, race and party politics. These content areas formed the basis of the questions asked during the interviews and went on to form the basis of the chapter structure for this thesis.

In addition to seeking out common themes and threads, I looked for frequency of names mentioned in the content. Frequently mentioned names were identified as potential research subjects due to their participation or relationship to Joburg Pride. These key players were identified as either having been an editor of *Exit*; an organiser of Joburg Pride or a Pride in

Joburg after the 2012 clash; one of the activists or an activist aligned with the One in Nine Campaign responsible for the protest action of 2012; or persons of significance such as Archbishop Desmond Tutu who is known as having coined the term “Rainbow Nation”.

1.3.2. Stage two: Interviews

Stage two consisted of requesting interviews with those identified as key players in the Pride articles that *Exit* had covered from 1988 to 2014. Interviews were selected as a method because of their ability to situate individuals’ experiences within the historical, social and political context of a given moment, such as that of Joburg Pride.⁷⁷ The aim of employing this method was to extract a rich data set through historical storytelling and narrative that would address the research questions of this study. Field notes were kept throughout the interview process as a reflective tool for the researcher and to elicit insights as the research continued.⁷⁸ It was challenging finding interview subjects that were willing to be interviewed with only seven participants out of the eighteen approached agreeing to be interviewed. From my engagement with the archival and interview material, it appears that some individuals may have either treated Joburg Pride as a social event, thus having no political ties or desire to share their experience and knowledge of Joburg Pride, or that key participants were exhausted after their time with Joburg Pride that they did not wish to revisit their involvement. Two participants, Gerry Davidson, one of *Exit’s* editors and Simon Nkoli, a key member in the fight for recognition of lesbian and gay rights, had passed away. Several attempts were made to contact Bev Ditsie, Edwin Cameron, Tim Trengrove-Jones,⁷⁹ Desmond Tutu, Yusoof Abdullah and Kwezilomso Mbandazayo, Paul Stobbs, Gary Bath and Carrie Shelver to secure interviews. They did not respond to requests for interviews, and it must be noted here that their participation and version of events around Joburg Pride would have contributed greatly to this study.

⁷⁷ T. Epstein Jayaratne and A.J. Stewart, “Quantitative and Qualitative Methods in the Social Sciences; Current Feminist Issues and Practical Strategies,” in M.M. Fonow and J.A. Cook (Eds.), *Beyond Methodology: Feminist Scholarship as Lived Research*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991, pp. 85-100.

⁷⁸ R.V. Kozinets, *Netnography: doing ethnographic research online*. Sage publications: Los Angeles. London, New Delhi. Singapore., Washington DC, 2010.

⁷⁹ Tim Trengrove-Jones was a significant contributor to *Exit* and features largely in the data set gathered from the *Exit* articles. It must be noted that there are numerous variations on the writing of Trengrove-Jones’ surname, which include: Trengrove Jones; Trengrove Jones; Trengrove-Jones; and Trengrove-Jones. Elsewhere, they publish using their full name, Timothy Trengrove-Jones, for the purposes of this study, and taking the lead from the *Exit* articles, their name is written as Tim Trengrove-Jones.

The final list of participants were: Gavin Hayward, Sharon Cooper, Tanya Harford, Sekoetlane Phamodi, Ishtar Lakhani, Henk Botha, and Zak Mbhele. Gavin Hayward is the current editor of *Exit*. Sharon Cooper was a member of the Pride Organising Committee in the late 1990s. Tanya Harford was the chairperson of the Joburg Pride Organising Committee at the time of the 2012 clash. Sekoetlane Phamodi was a member of the Johannesburg People’s Pride Working Group. Ishtar Lakhani was an organising member for the One in Nine Campaign protest action. Henk Botha was the editor of *Link/Skakel* and a member of the Gay Association of South Africa (GASA), and Zak Mbhele had been a member on the Joburg Pride Organising Committee prior to the 2012 moment. Phamodi, Lakhani, and Mbhele are active in LGBTIAQ and social justice advocacy and politics in South Africa. All interview subjects consented to being recorded. They agreed to the interview material being used for the purposes of this research, as well as to having their names used and not having their identities anonymised as it would be easy to identify them given their roles within the “community”. The ethical implications of this are discussed below under the ethical considerations for this study. Interviews were then either conducted via Skype (Tanya Harford and Sharon Cooper) or in person. I travelled to Johannesburg where necessary, or interviewed participants in Cape Town where they were either living or visiting. Interview questions were informed by the study’s research aims and questions, as well as the thematic categories identified during the content analysis of the *Exit* newspaper articles.

The interview process borrowed from oral history’s methodological emphasis on situating the experiences and memories of the individual within social, historical and cultural contexts.⁸⁰ This approach permits the integration of personal accounts with historical processes because the “individual’s story is narrated through memory.”⁸¹ Thus in their remembering and the meaning that they construct through this recollection something more is produced. Their individual telling comes to be interwoven “with collective memory, political culture, social power, and so forth,” and reveals a nuanced relationship between the individual and the social context in which they are situated.⁸² This process adds richness to the material gathered, as well as provides an added layer as participants remember and reconstruct the

⁸⁰ J. Bornat, “Oral history and qualitative research,” in *Timescapes Methods Guides Series*. Guide No: 12, 2012.

⁸¹ S.N. Hesse-Biber, “Oral History: A collaborative Method of (Auto) Biography Interview,” in S.N. Hesse-Biber and P. Leavy (Eds), *The Practice of Qualitative Research*. Sage Publications, 2005, p. 156.

⁸² *Ibid.* p. 189.

events and their involvement. Relying only on archival material would not have provided this kind of richness or depth to the history of Joburg Pride. The tellings of the participants were “read as texts” and “their disclosures [were] understood as part of a larger process of reiteration, where identities are constantly reconstructed around very limited sets of meanings.”⁸³ Interviews were transcribed and then read to identify thematic areas for analysis. The thematic areas corresponded with the thematic areas identified during the data sorting of the archival research stage. The content identified was grouped with the content identified during stage one of data collection and analysed using Fairclough’s three-dimensional model, which is discussed in the following section.⁸⁴

1.3.3. Data interpretation methods

Textual analysis methods were employed for interpreting the research data.⁸⁵ A thematic analysis was applied to the data collected from the articles and interviews in order to establish patterns in the content and to develop an understanding of the core themes or issues that exist around Joburg Pride and broader South African society.⁸⁶ The themes were established by identifying and describing the ideas and themes within the text, both explicit and implicit.⁸⁷ A thematic analysis approach was identified as the most useful method for identifying and analysing the complexity of meaning within both the archival and the interview data sets.⁸⁸ The analytical method involved the reading of the text and identifying themes that emerged through this reading of words, terms or phrases. With regards to the content, these included mention, comment, opinion or referral to Joburg Pride in any form and were then further analysed in order to reveal themes that were dominant within this content.

The themes and the content selected were then discursively analysed in order to understand how they were interwoven with the socio-political and historical conditions in which they were produced and consumed.⁸⁹ Fairclough’s three-dimensional model was useful in

⁸³ N.A. Boyd, “Who is the subject? Queer theory meets oral history,” in *Journal of the History of Sexuality*. Vol 17 (2), 2008, p. 180.

⁸⁴ N. Fairclough, *Critical discourse analysis*. London: Longman, 1995.

⁸⁵ M. Jorgensen and L. Phillips, *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. Sage Publications: London, 2002.

⁸⁶ J. Aronson, “A pragmatic view of thematic analysis”. In *The Qualitative Report*. Vol 2, 1994.

⁸⁷ G. Guest, K.M. MacQueen, and E.E. Namey, *Applied Thematic Analysis*, Sage Publications, 2012, p. 10.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.* p. 11.

⁸⁹ J.E. Richardson, *Analysing Newspapers: An Approach from Critical Discourse Analysis*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007, p. 39.

exploring the texts within the discursive and socio-political contexts in which they operated.⁹⁰ The three-dimensional model analyses beyond the text and aims to investigate and reveal the assumptions, beliefs and values of the socio-political and historical context in which the text is produced and interpreted.⁹¹ This model places emphasis on three levels of text: its description, interpretation, and explanation, thus serving to not only understand the text in isolation but as produced and understood through discursive and social processes.⁹² This model is useful for exploring material produced in a country with complex discursive and social practices such as South Africa, practices that could influence the production of material and meaning. Research which reads texts in isolation or outside of the consideration of social influence would provide incomplete or insufficient understandings of the complex nature of the field of study.

It is through these three levels that discourse analysis is able to show the social processes at play during the construction of the texts.⁹³ This allowed for an exploration of the values, beliefs and assumptions at play in the text; the social position and worldview of the author of the text, Pride participants and activists, and made possible a deeper reading of the texts. Fairclough proposes three stages involved in discourse analysis based on three dimensions: description; interpretation; and explanation.⁹⁴ The description stage is concerned with the formal mechanisms of a text, and focuses on language choices such as wording, grammar and text structure – here the text is the object.⁹⁵ The interpretation stage is interested in the relationship between text and the interaction with text and treats the text as constituted through the production and interpretation processes.⁹⁶ At this stage, analysis is focused on interpreting the relationship between the discourse, its production and consumption. Here, discourse is not only considered a text but also a discursive practice, thus attention is not only focused on the formal properties of the text and its structure but also on the act of speech or writing. The final stage of analysis places its emphasis on the relationship between discursive

⁹⁰ N. Fairclough, *Critical discourse analysis: the critical study of language*. London: Longman, 1995; N. Fairclough, *Discourse and social change*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992, p. 73.

⁹¹ Ibid. p. 54.

⁹² McKenna, "A critical investigation into discourses that construct academic literacy at the Durban Institute of Technology," p. 55.

⁹³ Ibid. p. 54

⁹⁴ N. Fairclough, *Language and Power*, London: Longman, 1989, p. 26.

⁹⁵ Ibid. p. 26.

⁹⁶ Ibid. p. 26.

and social processes and makes reference to the socio-political and historical contexts of the text. It is at this stage that analysis becomes concerned with power and ideology in order to provide a deep reading of the text, its production and consumption.⁹⁷ It is this that makes the model most beneficial in exploring what the texts may reveal regarding Joburg Pride and the tensions that existed throughout the research period.

The key themes were analysed in relation to the lens provided by the theoretical framework as well as relevant literature on Pride in other contexts, LGBTIAQ group identity, community, and nationhood (discussed in the following chapter).

1.4. Ethical Considerations

As this research involves human subjects, this study had ethical implications that needed to be taken into account. Throughout the research process I attempted, as far as possible, to reduce or avoid any harm to participants.⁹⁸ I gained informed and recorded consent from the interview participants after explaining the implications of the research. The identities of the participants were unable to be kept anonymous due to the size of the LGBTIAQ “community”, the positions the participants held, and the ease with which they would be identifiable. The seven interview participants were willing to be identified and gave recorded consent to their identities being published. Best practice would usually protect the identities of the participants by anonymising their identities; this would be particularly pertinent to members of the LGBTIAQ “community”, as this is a marginalised group within society.⁹⁹ However, none of the participants were concerned about their safety or being publically identified. The implication of this is that some sensitive material may have been shared that is associated with a particular individual or organisation. It is important to acknowledge the social and political position of the participants and the organisations and to consider their views and positions within a broader context, particularly how their views and positions have been informed by this context. All research material has been stored securely employing cloud storage and extends to the storage of personal information, correspondence and recordings.

⁹⁷ Fairclough, *Language and Power*, p. 26.

⁹⁸ C. Bless, C. Higson-Smith and A. Kagee, *Fundamentals of Social Research Methods: An African Perspective*, Fourth Edition. Juta: Cape Town, 2006, p. 140.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.* pp. 142-4

1.5. Who is the “I”? Reflexivity and the “I”

In contextualising the study, it is necessary to state my position considering the nature of the study, as well as its historical and socio-political groundings. In particular, it is important that this is done to enable the reader to understand specific choices that have been made at all stages the research. This is because, as Judge has said, one’s position “is entangled in numerous symbolic and material violences,”¹⁰⁰ and this research holds a position that is embroiled in the historical and current structures of race and class dominance.¹⁰¹ In particular, the concern is with regards to the violence enacted towards people of colour by white people through institutionalised racism and, thus, how a white researcher is positioned within this context.¹⁰² White South Africans occupy a particular position of power and privilege and this is one founded in both physical and symbolic violence. In conducting research, I must account for my whiteness and the potential violence it may produce. Drawing on reflexivity, reflection on my own position has been integral to my research journey, and while at times it has felt self-indulgent, it has provided me the space to process complex feelings about an equally complex identity.¹⁰³

As mentioned earlier, I am a queer non-binary white South African who moves through the world in a manner that is complexly informed both by discrimination and privilege. I am a person who through their perceived white skin occupies a position of privilege while attempting to undo the hooks of apartheid; what has been passed down, forced upon and what remains. I “came out”¹⁰⁴ as queer in 2002 at the age of fifteen to my parents and friends, class mates and teachers, none of whom responded in the way I had anticipated. I had not known, until that moment of naming myself, that the world was not a place for an identity like mine. I was met with reactions rooted in fear and heterosexist violence and experienced my first (but not last) encounter with homophobia. The violence made no sense to me. I was still who I was before the words were spoken but in the eyes of those around me, I became

¹⁰⁰ M. Judge, “Violence against lesbians and (IM) possibilities for identity and politics,” Doctoral thesis, University of the Western Cape, Cape Town, 2015, p. 3.

¹⁰¹ Ibid.

¹⁰² Ibid.

¹⁰³ W. Pillow, “Confession, catharsis, or cure? Rethinking the uses of reflexivity as methodological power in qualitative research,” in *Qualitative Studies in Education*. Vol 16 (2), 2003, pp. 175-196.

¹⁰⁴ The idea of “coming out” has been troubled by queer feminist theorists and activists who argue that it serves to further other LGBTIAQ people in asking them to take on the burden of revealing an identity. This can then imply that there is something normal or natural about heterosexuality if it asks that identities outside of it make themselves known.

“other”. I tried to understand how it could be that this one thing could change how I was treated and was allowed to move around in the world. I could only make sense of it by positioning the reactions, even then as a teenager, as stemming from people who had lived and been shaped by an apartheid state. People whose identities had been informed by severe panic around “morality” with regards to race, sexuality and communism, in order to protect and maintain white rule. Over time I pieced together an understanding of whiteness as central to the violence that was enacted towards me.

Whiteness is understood here as a world position or ideology in which all experiences are universalised, and the white experience is constructed and presented as normal.¹⁰⁵ From this position, experiences outside of white experience are often not acknowledged, and when they are, they are positioned as other and deviant, such as the othering and discrimination of people of colour under apartheid. Under apartheid, whiteness and maintaining whiteness was a central feature of the apartheid regime. In this context whiteness facilitated fear of the other and with this explicit prejudice based on race and sexuality and gender identity. This fear is perhaps best captured by the Immorality Act of the apartheid state, an act which, included the prohibition of sexual activity and relations between white people and people of colour, and did much to shape the prejudice that still circulates in South African discourse.¹⁰⁶ I have felt the consequences of the apartheid state and that particular act for most of my life in negotiating my queer identity and in interrogating my white identity and my sense of (non) belonging to a family and a small town community that is troubled by the presence of the “other” in their midst. I am white identified and aim to live a life in which I challenge myself to understand, unlearn and consciously struggle against whiteness. This need to challenge whiteness is as a result of a homophobic and transphobic “community” of upbringing. It was through this experience that I came to trouble prejudice based on difference, finding it impossible to only situate my understanding in prejudice and hate based on gender and sexuality. This is because, in making sense of the manner through which apartheid regulated race and matters of morality, I realised that it was the need of whiteness to regulate the “other” that led to the violence I was experiencing as a queer non-binary body in the world.

¹⁰⁵ S. Smit, “Challenging desire: performing whiteness in post-apartheid South Africa,” Doctoral thesis, Rhodes University, Grahamstown, 2014, p. 26.

¹⁰⁶ *The Immorality Act*, Act 5 of 1927; Act 21 of 1950.

Negotiating this space of other, of queer, has left me feeling that my identity is an in-between, a grey area, that I occupy something of a Borderlands. Anzaldua brought me much comfort as a teenager negotiating high school and an early twenty something adult navigating early adulthood and undergraduate studies. Their work spoke to my sense of queerness, of being other, and showed me the value in this identity. It spoke to the queerness of my sexual and gender identity but also my whiteness and my attempt to move away from whiteness and its violence. It helped me to see the violence of the world around me, to begin to interrogate (but to never fully know) the true weight of my privilege in a society and a world that measures the worth of people based on race. However, I do know the weight of my worth being measured based on a queer sexuality and a non-binary gender identity. My identity is read as deviant. I am queer and I am a white South African that works to reject the notion that white identities are superior to all that whiteness marks as other. My deviance, my queerness, is detested and rejected by society,¹⁰⁷ and has led me to trouble and to “make strange the familiar.”¹⁰⁸

Anzaldua calls the queer and the other that which mirrors the fear of the heterosexual, the fear of being other, being different, viewed as other and lesser, and not quite human.¹⁰⁹ They explain how many societies and cultures have tried to rid themselves of their queers and deviants; they have been attacked, murdered and pushed out of their communities.¹¹⁰ I have experienced some of this violence in the fifteen plus years since I spoke the words that othered me and I continue to feel like a no-thing or no-being in this world. I am the thing, the being - if I am lucky enough to be given status as person - that does not belong. Anzaldua speaks to being denied the opportunity to go home when they write of living in the Borderlands, writing that if a returning home is refused to the queer then they must find a means to stand alone and lay claim to another space, forging for themselves a new culture.¹¹¹ I stand outside of my “community”, outside of my home, on the border, looking in. I do not live there anymore. I have built a new home, a new culture built “with my own lumber, my

¹⁰⁷ G. Anzaldúa, *Borderlands: the new mestiza = La frontera*, San Francisco: Spinsters/Aunt Lute, 1987, p. 18.

¹⁰⁸ J. Culler, *On deconstruction: Theory and criticism after structuralism*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1982, p. 9.

¹⁰⁹ Anzaldúa, *Borderlands: the new mestiza = La frontera*, p. 18.

¹¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹¹ Ibid. p.22.

own bricks and mortar and my own feminist architecture.”¹¹² The denial of home resonates deeply with my own experience and with my negotiation of the world where I feel that my full self, my complete(ly) complex identity is barred from returning home.¹¹³

There is always something measured and carefully constructed in order to be “safe” in the space outside of the Borderlands where all the other queers and deviants reside. It is in the Borderlands that I have come to build a space of belonging for myself. It is outside of this space that I sense and experience the violence, and it is because of this and my involvement in advocacy work (as a direct consequence of my life experience) that led to an interest in research that is bound to social justice. In some ways, this pursuit of research and interest in social justice has been a way for me to make sense of my identity and my place in the world; it has been my resistance.¹¹⁴ Anzaldúa writes that is not enough to take up a position of opposition to the dominant culture because it will force one to engage with the oppressor on their terms, through violence, and they argue that this is no way to live. Rather Anzaldúa suggests that it may be better and more healing to unhook oneself from the dominant culture, to “write it off altogether as a lost cause” and to rather go about making one’s own home, culture or space of belonging.¹¹⁵ They write that when one chooses to move away from a space of reaction and rather to one of action, the possibilities are endless. The way I choose to disengage is to step outside (as much as is possible) of the dominant culture and to observe it. It was, and still is, through my construction as other that I am pushed to the margins but through an awareness and a sense of refiguring of self, I now choose to lead myself to the periphery. It was here that I turned to writing and the weaving of words to make sense of what was happening to me. Even now, in the writing of this research, much sense of self has been made and so while I may write these words, I do not write them brazenly. They are written, at times, from a space of great fear. There have been very real threats of physical harm and attracting violence to myself in writing this thesis. To counter this fear I must acknowledge the risk and know it and then I must write this work. To name the things and to write queerly is to resist. To write this thesis is to act; to act against the patriarchal white conventions that have and still continue to impose violence on the other.

¹¹² Anzaldúa, “*Borderlands: the new mestiza = La frontera*,” p. 22.

¹¹³ Ibid.

¹¹⁴ Ibid. p. 78.

¹¹⁵ Ibid.

1.5.1. *Writing as resistance*

Writing is another space filled with conventions and policing, such as the hold of theory that creates barriers to academia. Academia is presented as a rational space, in which theory is developed, devoid of knowledge based on emotion or emotive experiences and is seen as elitist, abstract and masculinist.¹¹⁶ Ebert asks that theory be recognised as a space of struggle and power relations and thus calls for a feminist theory that disrupts patriarchal, racist and capitalist oppression but also transforms exploitative relations and endeavours to produce ethical practices and relations.¹¹⁷ In writing I found that I experienced a discomfort in owning the “I,” as a person who is in a state of attempting to re/constitute self in a world where occupying space is fraught with tension in response to queer identities that are visibly “other.”¹¹⁸ It is through the writing that much of self has been crafted or made sense of and it is through the understanding of self as other (in both heterosexual society and within the LGBTIAQ “community”) that my account of Joburg Pride was shaped. This process has undeniably influenced my interpretation of texts. In particular, I feel that this applies to my identity as a white researcher and that I must account for this, and acknowledge that this has an impact on the lens through which I see and interpret the history of others, even if I am myself other. Despite my endeavour to trouble whiteness, I must acknowledge that I have been socially conditioned (and privileged) through white culture and must thus make an added effort to ensure that I do not render invisible the experiences of those who do not identify as white.

Studying whiteness is a complex endeavour as it may come to reposition white identity at the centre. However, if it is framed in such a way as to disrupt and end oppressive social relations and practices, whiteness studies can serve as an effective means of challenging white power and dominance.¹¹⁹ I hope that this can be true of my study and that white power and dominance can be challenged in this research. However, I acknowledge that there is the risk of redirecting resources and attention back onto white identity and whiteness, and that this

¹¹⁶ T.L. Ebert, “Ludic Feminism, the Body, Performance, and Labor: Bringing “Materialism” Back into Feminist Cultural Studies,” in *Cultural Critique*, No. 23, 1993, p. 12.

¹¹⁷ Ibid.

¹¹⁸ R. Ivanic and J. Simpson, “Who’s who in academic writing?” in N. Fairclough (Ed), *Critical language awareness*, Longman: London and New York, 1992, p. 144.

¹¹⁹ J.T. Warren, “Whiteness and cultural theory: Perspectives on research and education,” in *The Urban Review*, Vol. 31 (2), 1999, p. 187.

may come to further enforce its position of power.¹²⁰ I have been acutely aware of this risk and I have, as best as possible, worked towards troubling whiteness. For instance, during the gathering of data I was aware that my white identity would impact on how others read me. This reading of my identity influenced whether research subjects wanted to share their stories and how they shaped their stories, for example in relation to the level of trust they felt towards a white identified historian. One's "race", status of researcher and observer, and perceived identity greatly impact on the degree of trust between the research subject and the researcher and in turn the openness and amount of information the research subject is willing to divulge. For instance, I found that one participant, Tanya Harford, in seeing that I was also white, felt comfortable to speak to me about race and black South Africans in a way that suggested that they believed that I held similar beliefs to them because I am a white person. I also found that many people of colour that I contacted to participate in my study did not respond or pulled out of the research. This may have been because I was a researcher wishing to do work on race and whiteness. I believed that they may not have trusted me because of the history of exploitation of research subjects of colour by white researchers and, as Anzaldúa writes, many people of colour do not wish to have anything to do with white people.¹²¹ This is because of what white people represent in South Africa, as well as the violence of whiteness. Thus, I did not expect people of colour to trust my identity and to risk making themselves vulnerable to someone who comes to represent whiteness. This realisation of the potential impact of my identity on the research led me to develop a number of strategies during the time of my research and writing.

1.5.2. Strategies

There are three key strategies I used to assist with my negotiation and reading of the texts. The first, as discussed above, involved paying attention to my white identity and how this may impact on myself as researcher, my lens and my writing. This self-reflexivity is important in conducting research so that the researcher is able to understand how they may influence the research process.¹²² Being reflexive is about an awareness of one's role in shaping knowledge, and a central component of feminist research is being aware of the power of one's position

¹²⁰ Warren, "Whiteness and cultural theory: Perspectives on research and education," p. 187.

¹²¹ Anzaldúa, "*Borderlands: the new mestiza = La frontera*," pp. 85-86.

¹²² M. Quraishi and R. Philburn, *Researching Racism: a guide book for academics and professional investigators*, Sage publications: London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi and Singapore, 2015, p. 46.

as researcher and taking a different approach to doing research.¹²³ Pillow calls for an interruption of what they term “comfortable reflexivity” and to rather take up “reflexivities of discomfort.”¹²⁴ For instance, one such way that I attempted to take a position of discomfort was to acknowledge my whiteness and the risk of reinforcing and affirming whiteness. Warren raises the issue of being able to both critically interrogate and examine whiteness without recentering its power.¹²⁵ As best as possible I have sought to trouble whiteness in relation to Joburg Pride and to interrogate my own position and privileges afforded to me as a result of the associations and power attributed to white skin. However, I do not deny that whiteness continues to shape my position within the research and limit my ability to question or challenge particular versions of “truth”.

The second strategy was to allow the texts to speak or to present the stories as they are and to guide the writing this way. This was primarily about the flow of writing and making it as accessible to the reader as possible. This is because I believe that knowledge should be accessible and available to all who may be interested and willing to engage with the material. As best as possible I have written in such a way that rejects the notion that academic writing should be impersonal and objective – and thus, often, inaccessible - because one cannot truly remove oneself from the writing process.¹²⁶ My experiences and my theoretical lens have come to inform the writing of this research and I have tried my best to acknowledge this where it occurs and to write in such a way that the material is relatable and accessible to a wide range of readers. I wish for this work to be read by those both outside of and inside of academia in order to extend the knowledge produced here into spaces where engagement is not solely regulated by academia.

The third, and last, key strategy was the positioning of the study as an anti-racist queer feminist text. In positioning this study as a queer text and informed by a queer theoretical lens, I aim to continue the work of queer theory of disrupting assumptions about what is absolute and taken for granted through the naturalisation of dominant positions in society.¹²⁷

¹²³ Pillow, “Confession, catharsis, or cure? Rethinking the uses of reflexivity as methodological power in qualitative research,” p. 178.

¹²⁴ Ibid. p. 193.

¹²⁵ Warren, “Whiteness and cultural theory: Perspectives on research and education,” p. 199.

¹²⁶ Ivanic and Simpson, “Who’s who in academic writing?” p. 144.

¹²⁷ C. Beasley, “Queering Gender/Queer Feminism: Butler, Whittle”, in C. Beasley, *Gender and sexuality: critical theories, critical thinkers*, Sage publications: Los Angeles, London, New Delhi and Singapore, 2005, p. 108.

This position affords the study the power of interrogating the South African LGBTIAQ “community” and understanding the manner in which Joburg Pride has been organised, understood and experienced as a key moment in the LGBTIAQ “community’s” history. I expand on the queer theoretical lens in chapter two.

1.6. A Note on Language and Terminology

With regards to the language that emerged during the thematic analysis, it is important to note a few word and language choices that I have made throughout this study. Language choices shape the meanings that are generated by the text.¹²⁸ Further, writing history means acknowledging that the texts referred to and relied upon are, in and of, themselves historical, and this entails acknowledging the incorporeity of the texts and the socio-political and historical lens through which they are read.¹²⁹ For example, the racial categories invented during apartheid – these are used now but are still tied to the meanings they were given in the apartheid context. Due to the political nature of this writing and the recognition that writing is a discursive act, word and language choices made throughout the study need to be contextualised. The following section will present a brief discussion on terminology employed in this study.

March and parade: March and parade are two very particular words used to convey two different Pride experiences. A Pride march is understood as a political event with a political focus and speaks to early Pride days such as the first Pride march of 1990. A Pride parade is also a political event in that it is a political moment where a number of LGBTIAQ individuals collect in the streets. However, it has a strong commercial focus and its primary political agenda is usually one of visibility and does very little to address any other issues pertinent to the LGBTIAQ “community”. In this thesis, the use of the terms will depend on when and where they are employed in the texts analysed, for instance Joburg Pride became a parade as the shift from the political to the commercial occurred, this can be most clearly seen in the coverage of Pride by *Exit*.

¹²⁸ Ivanic and Simpson, “Who’s who in academic writing?” p. 144.

¹²⁹ C. Steedman, “Culture, Cultural Studies and the Historians,” in. S. During (Ed), *The Cultural Studies Reader*, Second Edition, Routledge: London and New York, 1999, p. 56.

The use of the letters in LGBTIAQ: Wherever possible the letters LGBTIAQ – lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex, asexual and queer are used in order to be as inclusive of the LGBTIAQ community as possible. There are times when only a few letters will be employed such as LGBTI, LGBT, LGB or simply “lesbian and gay” or “gay”. When this occurs it is as a result of reproducing accurately the language provided by *Exit* articles, interview subjects or other sources that have been cited and analysed. It appears that “gay” or “lesbian and gay” are often used as catch-all terms for the “community”. This speaks to a broader issue of assimilation and homonormativity as other identities such as bisexual, transgender, intersex, asexual and queer are excluded (either intentionally or unintentionally).

It is important to note the historical trajectory of the use of the letters L, G, B, T, I, A and Q, with L and G being the first two to be employed and are often still the only letters that are given prominence when the LGBTIAQ “community” is discussed. Historically not all individuals were included in discussions pertaining to the “community” and the thesis aims to explore these moments of exclusion. This does not mean that the thesis is exclusionary of members of the LGBTIAQ “community” but rather that the thesis is interested in particular moments in time (which may be exclusionary moments). As Hall states, identities must be made sense of within their specific socio-historical contexts and discursive formations because they are constituted through discourse.¹³⁰ The reading of particular moments will reveal political dynamics of the “community” and who or which identities were being excluded and for what reasons. For example, at the time of the Civil Union Bill only lesbian and gay rights were being discussed and the rest of the “community” was excluded from this conversation.

“Community”: Community is written within quotation marks to show that the term is contested. This is because it cannot be said that there is a singular LGBTIAQ “community” and it is thus problematic to make the assumption that the “community” is united in a common struggle or cause and that all members are equally invested in the creation of a particular kind of community. This is especially important to note when one considers that the push for equal rights for lesbian and gay South Africans were not inclusive of all members of the LGBTIAQ community, and that lesbian and gay individuals occupy a particular space of privilege in the

¹³⁰ S. Hall, “Who needs ‘identity?’” in P. Du Gay, J. Evans, and P. Redman, *Identity: A reader*, Sage Publications: London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi and Singapore, 2002, p. 17.

“community” that is not available to bisexual, transgender, intersex, asexual or queer South Africans.

Queer: It is important to note that this study used queer as it was intended and not what it has become synonymous with.¹³¹ Queer has become synonymous with LGBT, but LGBT spaces are not automatically queer because with rights being won, sexual identity politics have increasingly become about extending the centre and not necessarily about challenging or transgressing it.¹³² Queer theory is employed for its ability to deconstruct, interrogate and capsize that which is read as “normal” or “natural,” and because it recognises that there are a variety of ways of expressing one’s identity which do not fall within the boundaries of heteronormative prescriptions.¹³³ Therefore, when queer is used in the writing it is used in the political sense of disrupting, troubling and queering meaning around that which is normalised or naturalised. In seeking to interrogate what is read as normal or stable further works to generate new and critical questions that come to generate new possibilities and ways of being.¹³⁴

They: Wherever possible the pronoun “they” (in the singular) is employed. “They” is “used to refer to a person of unspecified gender.”¹³⁵ This is an explicitly political choice because as a non-binary individual I believe it is necessary to trouble gendered pronouns. In using “they” as a gender neutral pronoun, I aim to challenge myself and other academics to employ the pronoun instead of relying (blindly) on a binaried gender system. I recognise that this choice may cause some discomfort and assigning or imposing an identity onto another comes with its own issues, complexities and production of power. However, I seek to use “they” as gender neutral and to make it more comfortable for identities like my own to read research in which their identities are acknowledged. In line with the queer, feminist paradigm in which this

¹³¹ C. Beasley, *Queer Theory: Jagose, Seidman*, in C. Beasley (Ed), *Gender and sexuality: critical theories, critical thinkers*, Sage publications: Los Angeles, London, New Delhi and Singapore, 2005, p. 164.

¹³²N. Oswin, “Critical geographies and the uses of sexuality: deconstructing queer space,” in *Progress in Human Geography*. Vol 32 (1), 2008, p. 92.

¹³³R. Payne and C. Davies, “Introduction to the special section: Citizenship and queer critique,” in *Sexualities*. Vol 15 (3), 2012.

¹³⁴ Oswin, “Critical geographies and the uses of sexuality: deconstructing queer space,” p. 100.

¹³⁵ English Oxford Living Dictionary. <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/they>

project is situated, I use “they” to reveal (and trouble) the hegemonic binary, which defines us as either “he” or “she”.

The above terms: march, parade, LBTAQ, “community”, queer and “they” have been discussed to contextualise the language employed in the study, as well as to provide the reader with the reasoning behind the choices made. Because of the discursive nature and the implications for power and readings of the thesis as a historical text, this contextualisation of terms is necessary. Lastly, writing is an act of weaving a story and attempting to describe and name an event or a moment. It is an act of construction and interpretation and cannot be read as the “truth” of a particular event or moment. For these reasons, it is important that I am aware of the position from which I read, interpret and produce texts from, and that I acknowledge this before embarking on the production of content and knowledge.

In the following chapter I outline the theoretical framework, including its key components of poststructuralism, anti-racist queer feminism, queer theory, critical theory, critical race theory, and whiteness studies that inform the study.

CHAPTER TWO: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. Introduction

This is a poststructuralist critical anti-racist queer feminist study grounded in queer theory, critical theory and critical race theory. The study employs these theoretical perspectives in order to interrogate Joburg Pride specifically and the LGBTIAQ “community” more broadly, within the post-apartheid context of South Africa. Further, the research draws on cultural studies where necessary, as well as theories of identity, performance, race, whiteness, citizenship and nationhood. These bodies of theory are particularly useful for the analysis of power, including issues of marginalised identities, intersectionality, race, gender and sexual identities. Thus, this multifaceted theoretical framework allows for an analysis of identities in relation to Joburg Pride’s history and the rupture that occurred in 2012. This framework also makes it possible to interrogate the relationships between the tensions that became visible within the LGBTIAQ “community” and broader tensions in post-apartheid South Africa. This chapter presents the theoretical perspectives that make up the framework of the study, namely poststructuralism, anti-racist queer feminism, queer theory, critical theory and critical race theory, intersectionality and whiteness studies. This theoretical framework informed the processes of data collection, data analysis and the writing up of the study.

2.2. Poststructuralism

Poststructuralism is a theoretical and philosophical movement¹ that takes its point of departure from structuralism while rejecting some of its core principles.² For instance, structuralism perceives truth as existing within a text and employs structural linguistics to show this. In contrast post-structuralism does not rely on structural linguistics but rather focuses on how meaning is produced through a reading of or an interaction with a text. Therefore, within a poststructuralist paradigm, reading is regarded as an active consumption of the text, in which signs are open to interpretation, unstable and assigned meaning through reading. Thus poststructuralism troubles the notion of a fixed and absolute truth.³

¹ J. Williams, *Understanding Poststructuralism*, Acumen Publishing Limited: Chesham, 2005, p. 1.

² B. Harcourt, “An Answer to the Question: “What Is Poststructuralism?” Paper delivered at the Seminar on Law and Political Theory; Tel Aviv University, 2007, p. 3.

³ M. Sarup, *An Introductory Guide to Post-structuralism and Postmodernism*, University of Georgia Press, 1993, p. 3.

Poststructuralism deconstructs that which appears to be stable in order to show that it is not stable, but rather produced through language and discourse. Poststructuralism disrupts and resists meanings assigned status as truth, through language, by showing how meaning is produced. Poststructural perspectives present language as complex and open to multiple interpretations, and thus meanings and understandings as numerous. In this way poststructuralism aims to bring into view the complexities of reality, through an emphasis on meaning-making, power and knowledge.⁴

In investigating the 2012 Pride clash between organisers and participants, as well as the history of Joburg Pride within the context South Africa's transformation, a poststructuralist perspective makes visible the multiple truths of these events. This focus is useful for analysing the multiple meanings of the clash, as well as for interrogating the ways in which certain meanings come to hold more power than others. A poststructuralist analysis can greatly support social justice projects in that it can be used to challenge dominant positions that are produced through discourse.⁵ This type of analysis is in line with the study's aim to trouble dominant interpretations of Joburg Pride, the LGBTIAQ "community", and the Rainbow Nation.

Intertwined with a concern with meaning, language and truth, poststructuralism is also concerned with how power is distributed in and through the construction of knowledge.⁶ Poststructuralism explicitly seeks to make visible the ways in which certain knowledges come to be assumed to be true.⁷ As Foucault argues, power and knowledge cannot be separated because they are co-constituting.⁸ Relations of power are produced, reproduced and naturalised through language, discourse, meaning-making and knowledge.⁹ Further, naturalisation of discourse occurs through the construction of "myth."¹⁰ This is a process whereby a sign comes to be naturalised or adopted widely, and thus goes un-interrogated.

⁴ Williams, "Understanding Poststructuralism," p. 154.

⁵ Ibid. p. 18.

⁶ Harcourt, "An Answer to the Question: "What Is Poststructuralism?" p. 21.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ M. Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: the birth of the prison*, A.Sheridan(trans.), New York: Vintage Books, 1977, p. 27.

⁹ M. Augoustinos and D. Every, "The Language of "Race" and Prejudice: A Discourse of Denial, Reason, and Liberal-Practical Politics," in *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, Vol 26 (2), 2007, p. 138.

¹⁰R. Barthes, *Mythologies*, New York: Hill and Wang, 1972; S. Smit, "Challenging desire: performing whiteness in post-apartheid South Africa," Doctoral thesis, Rhodes University, Grahamstown, 2014; Harcourt, "An Answer to the Question: "What Is Poststructuralism?"

This naturalisation results in the invisibilisation of the way in which the myth or discourse is constructed. This process is referred to as reification.¹¹ Poststructuralism works to reveal this process of reification to show the construction of meaning, power and knowledge. While discourses are made up of signs what they come to do is more than stand for or signify things. It is this “more” that is central to this research, and it is the task of poststructuralism to endeavour to describe and reveal the “more” of a political project.¹² It is through discourse that we are able to understand the structure of reality and the manner in which we have been conditioned to view it. Of particular relevance to this study is how we have come to think of sexuality, gender, race and class in a naturalised manner.

Foucault’s work on discourse as productive is especially useful for this thesis. Discourse is a way of thinking, speaking, acting and making meaning that comes to present positions and world views as true; granting them the status of being able to be thought, spoken, acted and made while preventing others ways of thinking, speaking, acting and making.¹³ For Foucault, discourse does not only provide a description of reality but also comes to constitute reality. Discourse shapes and reflects the world as we know it and it is not something one can escape, as one is always within the realm of discourse.¹⁴ We come to be produced and reproduced through discourse. Therefore, within a poststructuralist framework, systems of meaning-making are not universal and these systems or structures can be deconstructed to reveal the slippages in meaning and the relations of power at play within them and informing them.¹⁵ This perspective contributes to an exploring meaning making surrounding Joburg Pride, and how some meanings have come to be naturalised and reinforced in such a manner as to be adopted as universal truths; truths that have the power to influence the way that some South Africans have come to be treated as other, and thus discriminated against on the basis of their perceived “otherness”.

Foucault’s focus on power also forms a central component of the theoretical grounding of this research; in particular their work on power, described by Williams as an attempt “to

¹¹ Smit, “Challenging desire: performing whiteness in post-apartheid South Africa”; Harcourt, “An Answer to the Question: “What Is Poststructuralism?”

¹² M. Foucault, *Archaeology of Knowledge*, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2002, p. 85.

¹³ Ibid. p. 16.

¹⁴ Ibid. p. 54.

¹⁵ Williams, “Understanding Poststructuralism,” pp. 105-131.

loosen the grip of power.”¹⁶ Foucault believes power to be embedded in social relations¹⁷ where the application of power is not only repressive, as when marginalised groups are policed by the state, but also productive.¹⁸ Power is understood as producing knowledge which comes to inform how individuals exist in the world. This production of knowledge is also an exercise of power. Power and knowledge are thus understood as relational and intertwined. Power is understood as ubiquitous and continuously at play, be it through distribution, contestation or struggles over power.¹⁹ While power may be found everywhere, power relations in which we are all entangled are not fixed or unitary but rather maintained and constituted through meaning.²⁰ That is not to say that domination does not exist but rather that it is complex. Where there are dominant positions there will be opposition and resistance to power, and these are, like power, also not stable or unitary, but rather exist in a multitude of forms.²¹ Mcleod, writing on Foucault, explains further that there exists no single distinct resistance but rather that there exist continuously fluctuating nodes of resistance.²² Resistance, like power (and as a result of power) operate through discourses, working to contest and counter hegemonic discourses.²³

Our social structures and relations are, therefore, produced and reproduced through language. If we wish to understand the world, the meaning people make of it, and the power relations among groups of people and individuals, then we must turn to language as the site of meaning making. It is through language that meaning is produced, and language is in turn embedded in discourse through the conventions and structures that come to regulate it.²⁴ It is through analysing discourse that we are able to understand the structures, conventions, and power relations at play because discourse is constituted through these.²⁵ As it is through

¹⁶ Williams, “Understanding Poststructuralism,” pp. 110.

¹⁷ M. Van Zyl, “A Sexual Politics of Belonging: Same-Sex Marriage in Post-Apartheid South Africa,” Doctoral thesis, Stellenbosch University, Stellenbosch, 2015, pp. 21-2.

¹⁸ A. Jagose, “Way Out: The Category “Lesbian” and the Fantasy of the Utopic Space,” in *Journal of the History of Sexuality*, Vol. 4, No. 2, Special Issue, Part 1: Lesbian and Gay Histories (Oct., 1993), 1993, p.279.

¹⁹ Foucault, *Discipline and punish: the birth of the prison*.

²⁰ C. Mcleod, “Radical plural feminisms and emancipatory practice in post-apartheid South Africa,” in *Theory & Psychology*. Vol 16 (3), 2006, p. 377.

²¹ Ibid. p. 378.

²² Ibid.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ S. McKenna, “A critical investigation into discourses that construct academic literacy at the Durban Institute of Technology,” Doctoral thesis. Rhodes University, Grahamstown, 2004, p. 16.

²⁵ N. Fairclough, *Discourse and social change*, Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 1992, p. 8.

discourse that the world around us is given meaning, it is also through discourse that it has the potential to be transformed.

It is by becoming dominant that discourse comes to be understood as naturalised.²⁶ This naturalisation results in certain discourses being read as “normal”, without making visible or known the political and ideological implications of this naturalisation.²⁷ This dominant or hegemonic position is made possible through the dominant group’s ability to project their worldview as legitimate and therefore rational and unquestionable.²⁸ This projection, reproduction and maintenance of dominance is constituted through discourse; for example, by constructing less powerful groups and their experiences as unnatural or deviant in order to further naturalise the dominant group’s discourse and maintain its position of power.²⁹

Fairclough explains that the discursive practices of a dominant group may achieve such a degree of naturalisation and normalisation that they are simply considered to have always existed rather than having been positioned as such through active construction and relations of power.³⁰ In light of this, discourse and power cannot be separated as the constitution of discourse is inextricably linked to struggles over power, and power relations are maintained, negotiated and resisted through discourse.³¹ Foucault suggests that something must be silenced in order to produce the dominant discourse, therefore when we consider the presence of discourse, we must also consider what is absent, and how it is that one discourse has come to dominate while another has not.³² We must further consider the processes by which this domination occurs, and how the domination of one discourse allows for certain meanings, while disallowing others. For example, whiteness, heterosexuality, and patriarchy all occupy hegemonic positions in South Africa and are viewed, treated and protected as natural. Their positions, while seen as “natural”, are still met with resistance from alternative positions that have their own ideological interests and investments such as anti-racism, queer and feminist movements.³³ For instance, the disruption of Joburg Pride can be read as a

²⁶ McKenna, “A critical investigation into discourses that construct academic literacy at the Durban Institute of Technology,” p. 17.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Fairclough, *Discourse and social change*, p. 9.

³¹ Ibid.

³² Foucault, *Archaeology of Knowledge*, p. 28.

³³ Fairclough, *Discourse and social change*, p. 9.

contestation of the dominance of the depolitical, which is related to race and racism, and commercialisation and economic exclusion, by anti-racist queer feminists.

Further, poststructuralism gives attention to moments of “slippage”³⁴ in systems of meaning, and seeks out these gaps, slippages and related ambiguities in order to discover the meaning that resides there.³⁵ Foucault discusses how discourse is “a slender surface of contact”³⁶ that is contested and struggled over. It is through analysing discourses that one comes to see the undoing of the hold of words and signs and through this how language, discourse and power are maintained through rules informing the use of discourse.³⁷

This ability to trouble what is taken for granted is what makes poststructuralism an ideal paradigm for this study. In particular, it is the way that it supports an anti-racist queer feminist position that wishes to trouble the hegemonic position of whiteness, heterosexuality, patriarchy, and the assimilated gay and lesbian identities which come to adopt these power positions. In desiring recognition, oppressed identities may come to adopt a politics of othering and exclusion, mimicking the structures that oppress them. Informally, there is considered to be a “gaytriarchy”³⁸ present in the LGBTIAQ “community”, whereby gay men come to perpetuate patriarchy in relation to other identities. Thus, power is attained through imposing a dominance over LGBTIAQ identities that are deemed to be other, or as a threat to the privileges gained through assimilation, as well as by adopting discursive practices which serve to provide a position of power and privilege. This position also serves whiteness and its maintenance of power. The enactment of power may be done without consideration for the oppressive nature of patriarchy by those who now come to adopt and use it for their benefit. Dominance is therefore ever present, even among those who are marginalised by white gay men, who while oppressed by patriarchal heterosexuality, in turn use male dominance to position themselves as powerful within the LGBTIAQ “community”.

In order to further a poststructural analysis of meaning, power and knowledge, and in particular to trouble the assumed universality, stability and naturalisation of meaning that comes to shape hegemonic positions in relation to race, sexuality, class and gender. Anti-

³⁴ Harcourt, “An Answer to the Question: “What Is Poststructuralism?” p. 1.

³⁵ Ibid. p. 17.

³⁶ Foucault, *Archaeology of Knowledge*, p. 54.

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ A term formed out of the combination of the words ‘gay’ and ‘patriarchy’.

racist queer feminism, queer theory, critical theory and critical race theory, and whiteness studies have been integrated into the poststructural theoretical framework. These theoretical perspectives are discussed below.

2.3. Anti-racist Queer Feminism

As discussed in chapter one, this is an anti-racist queer feminist study. It is anti-racist because it aims to interrogate the racism which appears to be a core undercurrent of the clash that occurred at Joburg Pride in 2012. The study could also perhaps be defined as postcolonial or decolonial, in that it draws attention to the effects of colonialism and subsequently racism, but positioning it as anti-racist is an attempt to acknowledge a particular position of advocacy that informed the research process. This study explicitly and unapologetically takes the stance of opposing racism and the manner in which racism dehumanises those positioned as other by the dominant group.³⁹ Anti-racist theoretical grounding is influenced by the work of Audre Lorde, bell hooks, Paulo Freire, Gloria Anzaldua, and Gurpreet Singh Johal. Their work also speaks to a particular feminism that informs this research; a feminism that questions how it is possible for some feminist works to discuss gender and associated violences removed from discussions on race, class and sexuality. Anti-racist feminism and its simultaneous analysis of gender, race, and class developed concepts such as “triple jeopardy”⁴⁰ as a means of theorising the systems of oppression related to them, namely racism, sexism, and capitalism, and how these intersect.⁴¹ Later sexuality was included in order to extend the analysis to heterosexism, a position which holds that heterosexuality and heterosexual relationships are normal and naturalised and thus dominant.⁴² Heterosexism constructs relationships and desires outside of heterosexuality as “other”. These forms of oppression such as racism, sexism and heterosexism form an intrinsic part of the structures of society and shape social relations whether we are aware of their constituting potential or not.⁴³ The strength of anti-

³⁹ R. Helman, “I know what it is to be strangled, penetrated!,” 8 December 2016, <https://www.iol.co.za/capetimes/news/i-know-what-it-is-to-be-strangled-penetrated-2096023>, n.p.

⁴⁰ D.D. Aguilar, “Tracing the roots of intersectionality,” *MRZine*, 12 April 2012, mrzine.monthlyreview.org/2012/aguilar120412.html, n.p.

⁴¹ D. Camfield, “Theoretical Foundations of an Anti-Racist Queer Feminist Historical Materialism,” in *Critical Sociology*. Vol. 42(2), 2016, p. 295.

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ C.T. Mohanty, *Feminism without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003, p. 3.

racist queer feminism lies in integrating these forms of oppression, and the social relations informing them, in an analysis of conditions that perpetuate oppressive systems.

While the lens of the research is informed by antiracist thinking, deemed necessary given the socio-political context of post-apartheid South Africa, this perspective does not allow for troubling certain assumptions as queer theory seeks to do. Queer feminism is incorporated into the theoretical lens of the study because of the manner in which it integrates queer theory and feminism, and for its concurrent employment of queer and feminist concepts to gender, sex, and sexuality.⁴⁴ However, queer theory is not limited to gender, sex and sexuality. Rather, it can be extended to all stable and naturalised identities, seeking to trouble their “taken for grantedness.” Queer feminism troubles hegemonic positions, such as heterosexism and whiteness (which is a central concept in this thesis), and thus it is necessary to pair an anti-racist position with queer feminism, in order to construct a theoretical grounding of anti-racist queer feminism for this study. The anti-racist queer feminist position employed by this thesis is theoretically rooted in queer theory, critical theory, critical race theory, and whiteness studies, which are discussed below.

Anti-racist queer feminism focuses on how reality is constructed by race, class, gender, and sexuality, and thus aims to understand how these social constructions have come to be made “normal” or natural. Further, this position recognises that multiple oppressions may be concurrently active, at the level of the individual, institutional and social. Thus, anti-racist queer feminism provides the space to uncover, explore and make visible aspects of social reality that are often concealed or outside of the task of many theories.⁴⁵

An anti-racist queer feminism troubles the hegemonic position of whiteness, heteropatriarchy, neoliberalism, and other forms of oppression based on race, class, gender and sexual identity. Thus a complementary body of work to anti-racist queer feminism is that of intersectionality, which takes the stance that systems of exploitation and forms of oppression interact and are caught up in each other, as is suggested by the word “intersection”.

⁴⁴ M. Marinucci, *Feminism is queer: the intimate connection between queer and feminist theory*, Zed Books: London and New York, 2010, p. 105.

⁴⁵ Camfield, “Theoretical Foundations of an Anti-Racist Queer Feminist Historical Materialism,” pp. 295-6.

Intersectionality recognises that race, gender, class and other social relations do not operate independently but are interdependent of each other.⁴⁶ Intersectionality works to explore and show how racism, sexism, classism, homophobia and other forms of discrimination are produced through the interaction of social constructions of identity.⁴⁷ Crenshaw developed the notion of intersecting roads to show and explicate how discrimination based on gender and race exacerbate each other.⁴⁸ They argued that focusing on one social relation, such as race or gender, would not account for how, for instance, marginalised black women are vulnerable to discrimination on the basis of both their race and gender, and often also their class and sexuality.⁴⁹ Thus the concept of intersecting roads serves to show how experiences of racism may intersect with patriarchy or misogyny, as well as other form of discrimination and oppression.⁵⁰ Crenshaw's work on intersectionality made it possible to investigate the ways in which multiple oppressions work together to co-constitute social relations.⁵¹ Intersectionality, thus, places emphasis on how power and oppression or discrimination need to be considered from a lens of multiple analysis.⁵²

Intersectionality brings to queer theory the ability to highlight the multitude of injustices and discriminations that individuals can experience as a consequence of their race, gender, class and sexual identities, while interrogating the naturalisation and stability of the dominant relations from which these stem.⁵³ What is particularly useful is that intersectionality places an emphasis on lived experiences in relation to intersecting discriminations and oppressions and, therefore, offers an opportunity to generate deeper and more critical knowledge.⁵⁴

Collins advanced the concept of intersectionality by arguing that forms of oppression not only intersect but are also interwoven, and that individuals come to be constituted as a result of

⁴⁶ M. Quraishi and R. Philburn, *Researching Racism: a guide book for academics and professional investigators*, Sage publications: London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi and Singapore, 2015, p. 24.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ K. Crenshaw, "Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics," in *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, Vol 140, 1989, pp. 138-167.

⁴⁹ R.K. Dhamoon, "Considerations on Mainstreaming Intersectionality," in *Political Research Quarterly*. Vol 64 (1), 2011, p. 231

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² Van Zyl, "A Sexual Politics of Belonging: Same-Sex Marriage in Post-Apartheid South Africa," p. 26.

⁵³ S. Singh, "Overcoming heteronormative hegemony: queer resistance to neoliberalism in Chile," Master's thesis, National University of Singapore, Singapore, 2015, p. 38.

⁵⁴ Singh, "Overcoming heteronormative hegemony: queer resistance to neoliberalism in Chile," pp. 37-8.

the “different axes of oppression” and power relations.⁵⁵ This approach of interlocking oppressions emphasises the relationship of the various forms of oppression to each other.⁵⁶ Collins asks how race, gender and class operate as interlocking and correlating system that constitute relations of domination and power.⁵⁷ The conceptualisation of interlocking oppressions serves to move research away from hierarchical representations of oppression and instead to a position which adopts the stance that race, class, gender and sexuality are simultaneous positions, despite the saliency or visibility of one of these forms of oppression.⁵⁸ They suggest that the focus should be on reconceiving oppression through exploring how race, class and gender connect, interact and may or may not be dependent upon one another.⁵⁹ Oppression is constituted through both intersecting and interlocking processes and thus they are complementary.⁶⁰ It is in studying the intersecting and interlocking systems of oppression that we are able to critically analyse power and the manner by which oppressions and social relations come to be produced and reproduced. There can be no simple means of showing the complex relationship and interdependence of these systems. Rather, it must be acknowledged that one may concurrently be positioned within multiple social relations; and may simultaneously be privileged by race, gender, class and sexuality, while also being disadvantaged by them depending on the manner in which your identities intersect, interweave and interlock.⁶¹ Individuals may choose to foreground or take ownership of various components or aspects of their identity, depending on the context they find themselves in.⁶²

For the purposes of this research, given the complexity of the South African identity, an understanding of intersectionality⁶³ is used alongside an understanding of collective

⁵⁵ M. Cruells and G. Coll-Planas, “Challenging equality policies: The emerging LGBT perspective,” in *European Journal of Women’s Studies*. Vol 20 (2), 2013, p. 125.

⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁷ P.H. Collins, “Toward a New Vision: Race, Class and Gender as Categories of Analysis and Connection,” in *Race, Sex & Class*, Vol. 1 (1), 1993, p. 34.

⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁵⁹ Ibid.

⁶⁰ Dhamoon, “Considerations on Mainstreaming Intersectionality,” p. 231.

⁶¹ L. Weber, “A conceptual framework for understanding race, class, gender, and sexuality,” in *Psychology of Women Quarterly*. Vol 22, 1998, p. 25.

⁶² Van Zyl, “A Sexual Politics of Belonging: Same-Sex Marriage in Post-Apartheid South Africa,” p. 155.

⁶³ Crenshaw, “Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics,” pp. 139-167.

constraints.⁶⁴ Given that multiple forms of social constructions are at play in any given moment or situation, the “structures of collective constraints” concept holds that one may simultaneously occupy a marginalised and a dominant position.⁶⁵ For example, one may be marginalised on the basis of gender while holding a position of privilege on the basis of race, such as the case with white women or white transgender people.

If we look to a marginalised group such as LGBTIAQ people we may find that some members, particularly white, middle-class gay men, have greater access to social and economic privileges. Thus while individuals may be marginalised by being an LGBTIAQ person and experience discrimination related to their sexual orientation or gender identity, they may still occupy a space (or several spaces) of privilege, such as being a white, middle-class and male member of this group. This is easily forgotten in South Africa where an emphasis is primarily placed on the oppressed identity of “gay” while the privilege of “white” is often ignored, or rather deployed strategically as and when needed. Thus a white gay man may experience discrimination on the basis of their sexuality but still occupy and acquire privileges based on their race and gender because of the dominant position that white identity and masculinity hold in society. Van Zyl reminds us that in analysing different forms of oppression, we must not forget to consider how dominant positions are co-constituted.⁶⁶

The concept of intersectionality is useful to this thesis in that it facilitates an understanding of the ways in which the apartheid government’s regulation of race constituted other forms of discrimination and oppression. An intersectional approach is necessary for this research given that structures of apartheid sought to regulate people on the basis of race but also class, gender, and sexuality. Ratele writes extensively on sexual morality and race. In particular they show how whiteness came to be constituted and secured through discourses on sexual (im)morality and sexuality under the apartheid government’s rule. In speaking to the Immorality Act, Ratele discusses how an immoral act or deed is typically associated with sexuality and sexual activity, and that South Africans have a peculiar idea of immorality.⁶⁷ Constructions of immorality are not only informed by notions around “normal” sexuality but

⁶⁴S. Groenmeyer, “Intersectionality in Apartheid and Post-apartheid South Africa: Unpacking the Narratives of Two Working Women,” in *Gender, Technology and Development*. Vol 15 (2), 2011, pp. 249-274.

⁶⁵ Ibid. p. 271.

⁶⁶ Van Zyl, “A Sexual Politics of Belonging: Same-Sex Marriage in Post-Apartheid South Africa,” p. 28.

⁶⁷ K. Ratele, “Sexuality as constitutive of whiteness in South Africa,” in *NORA – Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research*, Vol 17 (3), 2009, p. 290.

also draw on race relations. The consequence of this is that South Africans beliefs regarding sexuality are predominantly determined by race.⁶⁸ Apartheid and its legacy continue to influence, shape and regulate the sexual development of South Africans.⁶⁹ Thus, Ratele suggests that we should account for racist sexualisation as not only something of the past but something present in post-apartheid South Africa.⁷⁰

2.4. Queer Theory

Queer theory⁷¹ is a radical and anti-essentialist poststructuralist critical theory that draws on feminism, and gay and lesbian studies, and their examination of gender and the social construction of sexuality and identities.⁷² Queer theory shows how identities and people are rooted in social relations and how discourse, socio-historical and cultural influences produce gender and sexual identities.⁷³ Queer, both as identity and theory, has largely been associated with gender and sexuality. However, queer theory is increasingly being employed to identities beyond the categories of gender and sex.⁷⁴ This theory adopts a social constructionist lens which seeks to reveal how dominant positions are not natural but rather instated through discourse and power.⁷⁵

Queer theory holds that individuals experience their lives along multiple axes of identity, including race and class. Queer theory therefore enables a troubling and deconstructing of taken for granted or naturalised positions, for example of race in South Africa (and generally). Herein we see the complimentary nature of queer theory, intersectionality and feminist theory. This study finds queer theory useful because it extends its focus to include identities that are non-normative and takes on the task of interrogating and disrupting identities that are considered fixed, as well as the conventions circulating in society of what is natural, true

⁶⁸ Ibid. pp. 290-4.

⁶⁹ Ibid. p. 294.

⁷⁰ Ibid. p. 295.

⁷¹ The term, 'queer theory' was first coined by Teresa De Lauretis in 1991 (C. Beasley, *Queer Theory: Jagose, Seidman*, in C. Beasley (Ed), *Gender and sexuality: critical theories, critical thinkers*, Sage publications: Los Angeles, London, New Delhi and Singapore, 2005, p. 164.).

⁷² S.M. Kates, "Making the Ad Perfectly Queer: Marketing 'normality' to the gay men's community?" in *Gender and Multicultural Issues*, Vol 28 (1), 1999, p. 26.

⁷³ Ibid.

⁷⁴ A. Jagose, *Queer theory: an introduction*, New York: New York University Press, 1996, p. 99.

⁷⁵ I. Green, "Queer Theory and Sociology: Locating the Subject and the Self in Sexuality Studies," in *Sociological Theory*, Vol 25 (1), 2007, pp. 28-9

or stable.⁷⁶ It thus furthers the poststructuralist project of interrogating that which presents itself as stable or fixed to show how it is constructed through language and discourse. Queer theory and poststructuralism thus work to disrupt and resist meaning that is perceived or presented as absolute. One area in particular in which queer theory focuses on disrupting natural and stable identities and meaning is heterosexuality and the norms that reinforce it. Queer theory challenges heterosexuality's dominant and hegemonic position, and explores forms of resistance to it.⁷⁷ Therefore, this body of work holds that there are a variety of ways of expressing one's identity which do not fall within the boundaries of heteronormative prescriptions. It is necessary to rely on such a position in attempting to do a complex exploration of race, class, gender, sexuality, community and national identity because it permits the unpacking of experiences that are rooted in and pivot on these lines. Further this body of theory is complimentary to feminism and intersectionality through its emphasis on exploring identity along multiple lines.

With regards to identity, Jagose writes that "queer marks a suspension of identity as something fixed, coherent and natural."⁷⁸ However queer can also signify a different kind of identity, and may refer to individuals who may share a distinctiveness which is not an identity but rather a resistance to normativities regarding sexuality and gender.⁷⁹ Queer is thus both an identity and a viewpoint "that opposes the normal," and seeks to disrupt normativities.⁸⁰ It asks and allows for the imagining of different ways of being through the disruption of normalised and seemingly stable identities. In some ways queer is a continuation of lesbian and gay movements and theory but also a relinquishment of this way of thinking, being and doing. Queer theory's troubling of normativities may extend to the LGBTIAQ "community" and include in its analysis lesbian and gay people who have come to be recognised as legitimate citizens and thus have uncritically adopted "normative" positions in society.⁸¹

⁷⁶ C. Beasley, *Queering Gender/Queer Feminism: Butler, Whittle*, in C. Beasley (Ed), *Gender and sexuality: critical theories, critical thinkers*. Sage publications: Los Angeles, London, New Delhi and Singapore, 2005, p. 108.

⁷⁷ Kates, "Making the Ad Perfectly Queer: Marketing 'normality' to the gay men's community?" p. 26.

⁷⁸ A. Jagose, *Queer theory: an introduction*, New York: New York University Press, 1996, p. 98.

⁷⁹ Jagose, *Queer theory: an introduction*, p. 98.

⁸⁰ Kates, "Making the Ad Perfectly Queer: Marketing 'normality' to the gay men's community?" p. 27.

⁸¹ Jagose, *Queer theory: an introduction*, p. 98.

Anzaldua is a useful theorist to refer to when considering the negotiation of identity. In particular I refer here to their work on “The Borderlands.”⁸² While they developed this theory in relation to the U.S. and Mexico Borderlands, they explain that their thinking is applicable to most contexts where borders may be present. They explain that the Borderlands is a space or a way of being that facilitated by cultures or people of different races and lived experiences meeting or sharing the same space.⁸³ They describe the Borderlands as a “vague and undetermined place” that is constantly shifting.⁸⁴ The forbidden and the prohibited occupy the Borderlands; they are the ones who transgress, defy and trouble the confines of what is considered normal.⁸⁵ Anzaldua explains that these occupants of the Borderlands are considered by the dominant culture, often white and heteropatriarchal, to be “transgressors, aliens.”⁸⁶

The Borderlands is a “place of contradictions,” and not a space of comfort.⁸⁷ Thus we could hold that the Borderlands exist in South Africa, a country in which two or more cultures meet, a country of multiple races, with extensive disparities regarding wealth, and where the effects of apartheid are still felt despite a drive to become (or perform) as a fully-fledged and whole “Rainbow Nation”. The Borderlands are also found within the LGBTIAQ “community”, a “community” in which multiple cultures and races also meet, and wealth disparities exist and rub up against each other. However, within the LGBTIAQ “community” there is the added negotiation of forming a “community” or sense of belonging among its members who experience different forms of discrimination based on the ways in which their sexual orientation and/or gender identity intersects with other identity categories. The Borderlands of the LGBTIAQ “community” is thus an uncomfortable space to occupy. Further, in the moment of the clash, primarily white bodies of Joburg Pride organising committee met the primarily black bodies of the One in Nine Campaign activists. Central to this study, is the need to understand what occurred in this meeting of bodies that made the violence possible.

⁸² G.Anzaldúa, *Borderlands: the new mestiza = La frontera*. San Francisco: Spinsters/Aunt Lute, 1987.

⁸³ Ibid. p. i.

⁸⁴ Ibid. p. 3.

⁸⁵ Ibid. p.3.

⁸⁶ Ibid. p. 3.

⁸⁷ Ibid. p. i.

Further, the study is concerned with how the clash led to the collapsing of Joburg Pride but also the development of other Pride events such as Johannesburg People's Pride.

Using queer theory and its resistance to normalising or naturalising identity is useful to the study in that it allows an analysis of Joburg Pride that seek to disrupt any taken for granted identity, be it heterosexual, lesbian, gay, or the national identity. It is this which is necessary for exploring whether Joburg Pride and the disruptive moment in 2012 (including the violence) was symptomatic of broader social dynamics happening in post-apartheid South African. It is necessary to rely on queer theory, alongside an anti-racist feminist position, to enable a multifaceted approach to Joburg Pride. This multifaceted approach is necessary due to the complexity of a "South African identity;" which is further informed by critical theory and critical race theory.

2.5. Critical Theory and Critical Race Theory

Critical theory holds that society is structured by a complex set of relations and rules which are partially hidden or obscured and thus it seeks to reveal and interrogate these.⁸⁸ Therefore this body of theory is useful for the research aim of exploring the history of Joburg Pride and the complex structure of social relations, some hidden and unobservable, that resulted in the 2012 Joburg Pride clash. Critical theory emphasises the complexity of social relations, arguing that it is problematic to take a simple approach in analysing social relations. This is applicable to the LGBTIAQ "community", as well as South Africa more broadly, given the numerous identities intersecting and resulting in a multitude of complex lived experiences. Critical theory offers valuable tools for this undertaking, allowing for an examination of the complexity of social relations.⁸⁹

Critical theory is in itself complex as the theory made up of a collection of theories that cannot be thought of as independent bodies of work. Rather, Tyson asks that we think of critical theories as "mixed bouquets," each bringing different influences and serving different purposes when applied or moved to other bouquets.⁹⁰ Critical theory assumes that reality is

⁸⁸ P. Strydom, *Contemporary Critical Theory and Methodology*, Routledge: London and New York, 2011, p. 10.

⁸⁹ L. Tyson, *Critical Theory Today: A User-Friendly Guide*, Garland Publishing Inc: New York and London, 1999, p. 2-3.

⁹⁰ Tyson, *Critical Theory Today: A User-Friendly Guide*, p. 6.

constituted through thought, production of knowledge and the employment of knowledge.⁹¹ This body of theory is concerned with matters of justice and crisis that have political, ethical and moral significance and whose exploration could result in solutions to social problems or social transformation.⁹² In this way critical theory supports the work of poststructuralism in supporting social justice projects through interrogating how dominant positions have been produced and result in the subjection of marginalised groups.

Critical theory's understanding of the world as complex and constructed, as well as its concern with issues of political significance, brings a valuable lens to the 2012 Joburg Pride moment, and the moments that may have led up to it, in a complex community such as the LGBTIAQ community, as well as South Africa more broadly. Given the nature of the 2012 clash, which appeared to be related to racial tensions, as indicated by the presence of racial slurs, the theoretical framework of the study incorporates critical race theory to unpack the particular complexities and power dynamics that are produced by notion of "race" in South Africa. The framework draws on strategies, premises and assumptions gained from critical theory directly related to race and racism (critical race theory). While critical theory allows us to understand the complex moment of the clash, critical race theory makes it possible to trouble the lived experiences of white people as the normative standard against which all other races and related experiences are measured.⁹³ Critical race theory emerged from a contestation by legal scholars that a lack of attention was paid to race and racism in the law and courts.⁹⁴ These scholars aimed to include race, racism and racial oppressions in the law, courts and society.⁹⁵ Other disciplines have since come to adopt critical race theory, and it has developed into an interdisciplinary approach to the study of race and racism.⁹⁶

The lens provided by critical race theory is necessary given that it is problematic to discuss South Africa without engaging with issues of race and racism. Critical race theory challenges assumptions about race and problematises naturalised racial constructions. Thus, this theory

⁹¹ Strydom, *Contemporary Critical Theory and Methodology*, p. 12.

⁹² Ibid.

⁹³ R.B. Closson, "Critical Race Theory and Adult Education," in *Adult Education Quarterly*, Vol 60 (3), 2010, p. 264.

⁹⁴ S.V. Iverson, "Camouflaging Power and Privilege: A Critical Race Analysis of University Diversity Policies," in *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 43 (5), 2007, p. 588.

⁹⁵ M. Lynn, "Toward a Critical Race Pedagogy: A Research Note," in *Urban Education*, Vol. 33 (5), 1999, p. 609.

⁹⁶ Ibid.

seeks to interrogate and uncover racism's persistence in the face of substantial efforts to address and eliminate it.⁹⁷ In relation to the 2012 Joburg Pride clash, race is at play both implicitly and explicitly. The presence of white bodies and black bodies clashing reveals a moment of power contestation, one that hinges on the lines of race. Thus, critical race theory is productive for making sense of this contestation. Critical race theory makes it possible to explore the language and discourse that emerged in the moment of the clash between, the predominantly, white bodies of the organising committee and members of the parade and the black bodies of the activists staging a die-in. The language that arose in this moment, the slurs that were used, were rooted in apartheid borne racist discourse, and for this reason critical race theory is useful for "uncover[ing] the deep patterns of racial exclusion."⁹⁸ The study, through the employment of critical race theory, thus seeks to trouble the hegemony of whiteness and white experience. Furthermore, the study seeks to understand race in a complex and critical manner, where race, gender, sexuality, and class are all taken into account, and these dynamics of identity are situated within the broader social context in which they occur.⁹⁹ This adds a further layer of analysis to this study in that race and class are often described as interwoven in South Africa given that economic exclusion under apartheid, which persists in contemporary South Africa, was perpetuated on the basis of race.

In addition to critical race theory, whiteness studies are employed because of the pervasiveness of whiteness, white normativity, and white privilege in South Africa, as well as because of my own position as a white researcher (discussed in chapter one). Given that under apartheid people were separated on the basis of race, in order to protect white supremacy, the consequences of which are still felt today, it is integral that the theoretical lens includes whiteness studies. Whiteness studies makes it possible to interrogate the persistence of whiteness; that is the establishment of white people's experiences and values as the standard by which others are measured.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁷ Iverson, "Camouflaging Power and Privilege: A Critical Race Analysis of University Diversity Policies," p. 588; Closson, "Critical Race Theory and Adult Education," p. 277.

⁹⁸ L. Parker and M. Lynn, "What's Race Got to Do With It? Critical Race Theory's Conflicts With and Connections to Qualitative Research Methodology and Epistemology," in *Qualitative Inquiry*, Vol 8 (7), 2008, p. 12.

⁹⁹ Lynn, "Toward a Critical Race Pedagogy: A Research Note," p. 610.

¹⁰⁰ Van Zyl, "A Sexual Politics of Belonging: Same-Sex Marriage in Post-Apartheid South Africa," p. xxiii.

2.6. Whiteness Studies

Whiteness studies seeks to trouble the hegemony and dominance of whiteness and the manner in which it excludes the experiences of those whom white subjects deem “other”. In particular, it aims to trouble the dominant discourse of whiteness that associates being white with being “normal”, being human. Whiteness studies also interrogates how whiteness has come to be the standard against which people of colour are measured.¹⁰¹ Whiteness can be thought of as an ideology but Steyn suggests that it is better conceived of as a position supported and produced through ideology, which has socio-political, historical, economic and psychological implications.¹⁰² It is a position that those of European descent have acquired as a result of European colonialism and the political and economic advantages of this system.¹⁰³

Whiteness came to hold a position of dominance primarily through the construction of race as a “marker of entitlement” to a position of superiority.¹⁰⁴ Steyn explains that skin colour, and other phenotypes, were employed as a means of naturalising this position through biology.¹⁰⁵ The biological was a means or a strategy to seemingly validate hierarchies of race.¹⁰⁶ However, as Steyn argues, race was not rooted in the biological but rather constituted by socio-political and economic relations of power.¹⁰⁷ For instance, in South Africa, the apartheid government used race as a means of categorising people and thereby created false boundaries between races in order to protect whiteness.¹⁰⁸ Apartheid was rooted in colonialism and racial ideology that worked to ensure the dominance of a white minority and the oppression of the majority of South Africans of colour.¹⁰⁹

Apartheid, through segregation and a series of laws informed by racial ideology, actively worked to establish full white supremacy. The apartheid government of the Nationalist Party enacted a series of racially discriminatory laws such as the Population Registration Act (1950),

¹⁰¹ N. Falkof, *The end of whiteness: Satanism and family murder in late apartheid South Africa*, Jacana, South Africa, 2016, p. 35.

¹⁰² M. Steyn, “*White talk: White South Africans and the strategic management of diasporic whiteness*,” Doctoral thesis, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, 2003, p. 111.

¹⁰³ M. Steyn, “White Talk,” in A.J. Lopez (Ed), *Postcolonial Whiteness: A Critical Reader on Race and Empire*, Albany NY: State University of New York Press, 2005, p. 121.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid.

¹⁰⁸ Falkof, *The end of whiteness: Satanism and family murder in late apartheid South Africa*, p. 70.

¹⁰⁹ M.P. More, “Locating Frantz Fanon in Post-Apartheid South Africa,” in *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, 2014, pp. 3-4.

the Group Areas Act (1950), the Immorality Act (1927; 1957), and the Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Act (1949).¹¹⁰ These acts classified people according to race, regulated where people could live based on their race, who they could have sex with, and who they could marry, respectively. These laws served to protect and preserve the white race, as well as to legally position it as superior.

The process by which whiteness comes to take on an untroubled or uncontested position and is treated as “normal”, “natural” and “right” is referred to as white normativity.¹¹¹ White normativity also supports or enforces dominant positions and normativities such as heterosexual and class norms.¹¹² An example of this in apartheid South Africa was the way in which white superiority not only regulated race relation but also sexuality and notions around morality, as exemplified by the Immorality Acts of 1927 and 1957. White normativity can be seen as particularly problematic and complex in a racially diverse environment such as post-1994 South Africa, where people of colour, who make up the majority of the population, have gained some social and political power but whiteness still holds a dominant position and regulates how people may act and speak.¹¹³ This is an example of the power of whiteness to assert itself as “normal” and superior to any other identity.

Linked to the normalisation of whiteness, white privilege, which is a direct result of white normativity, works in ways that are far more elusive than white supremacy.¹¹⁴ White supremacy is explicit while white privilege operates through more subtle means and is often reproduced unconsciously through social relations and practices.¹¹⁵ This privilege comes to be constituted as normal and natural through systems, processes, actions and representations without the structures governing this norm being visible or apparent.¹¹⁶ This dynamic operates in South Africa where whiteness and its privileges has come to be aspired to – not necessarily the identity itself (to be a white person) - but rather that which comes with being a white person, such as wealth, privilege, and access to opportunities. These

¹¹⁰ More, “Locating Frantz Fanon in Post-Apartheid South Africa,” p. 4.

¹¹¹ J. Ward, “White normativity: The cultural dimensions of whiteness in a racially diverse LGBTI organization,” in *Sociological Perspectives*. Vol 51 (3), 2008, pp. 563-4.

¹¹² Ibid.

¹¹³ Ibid. p. 564.

¹¹⁴ Smit, “Challenging desire: performing whiteness in post-apartheid South Africa,” p. 24.

¹¹⁵ Smit, “Challenging desire: performing whiteness in post-apartheid South Africa,” p. 24.

¹¹⁶ Ibid.

privileges, which are much more difficult for people labelled as “other” to obtain, come to represent markers of success and status. This is an example of how whiteness privileges and benefits white people in ways that are both material and symbolic. Many white people regard the privileges and benefits associated with their whiteness as a natural state of affairs. They, thus, come to believe that they have gained these privileges through hard work and not because of social structuring and power relations. This presumption that these privileges and benefits are normal and natural, and earned through hard work, conceals racial power relations.¹¹⁷ Falkof, citing Dyer (1997), explains that whiteness goes largely unchallenged because it is constructed as normal and the standard against which all others must be measured;¹¹⁸ so much so that “to be white is to be just a person; to be anything else is to be a black, brown or yellow person.”¹¹⁹ Whiteness or white identity has come a dominant, normative and naturalised position that allows it to remain under examined.¹²⁰

In South Africa, under apartheid (and post-apartheid), whiteness operated as a race without race. To be South African meant or implied that one was a white South African and thus only white people were considered citizens of South Africa.¹²¹ Whiteness in apartheid South Africa was “a passport to privilege” and came with economic and social privileges and benefits.¹²² However, these benefits were attached to violence and the policing of bodies on the basis of morality and fear. In the broader global community whiteness operates through subtleties and normativity, and in doing so is seen to be invisible, particularly in contexts in which white people make up the majority. However, in South Africa where white people are in the minority,¹²³ it is particularly problematic for whiteness to operate as the standard or norm.¹²⁴ Falkof contests Dyer’s argument that whiteness is invisible and rather argues that whiteness cannot be invisible for those who are not white.¹²⁵ Rather, for those outside of whiteness, whiteness is hypervisible. In South Africa it is difficult to argue that whiteness is invisible

¹¹⁷ G.S. Johal, “Order in K.O.S. on Race, Rage and Method,” in G.S. Dei and G.S. Johal (Eds), *Critical Issues in Anti-racist Research Methodologies*, Peter Lang: New York, 2005, p. 275.

¹¹⁸ Falkof, *The end of whiteness: Satanism and family murder in late apartheid South Africa*, p. 165.

¹¹⁹ Ibid.

¹²⁰ L. Young, “‘Race’, identity and cultural criticism,” in K. Bhavnani, *Oxford Readings in Feminism: Feminism & ‘Race’*, Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2001, p. 175.

¹²¹ Falkof, *The end of whiteness: Satanism and family murder in late apartheid South Africa*, p. 35.

¹²² Falkof, *The end of whiteness: Satanism and family murder in late apartheid South Africa*, p. 190.

¹²³ Statistics South Africa, “Mid-year population estimates,” 31 July 2017, <http://www.statssa.gov.za/publications/P0302/P03022017.pdf>, p. 2.

¹²⁴ Falkof, *The end of whiteness: Satanism and family murder in late apartheid South Africa*, p. 166.

¹²⁵ Ibid. p. 165.

because the apartheid government “explicitly marked bodies as white.”¹²⁶ White South Africans may not have experienced whiteness as invisible but rather, due to the naturalisation of this position and its associated privileges and benefits, were not required to interrogate it.¹²⁷ However this has begun to shift through student movements such as #RhodesMustFall and #FeesMustFall. These movements, through their criticism of continued presence of colonial statues, such as the statue of Cecil John Rhodes, and the high cost of tuition at tertiary institutions have critiqued, among many things, the position that white people and white privilege continue to hold in South Africa. White South Africans in post-apartheid South Africa may no longer hold exclusive political power as they did under apartheid but they continue to hold economic, social and cultural power, despite the shift in political power and governance in the country.¹²⁸ In this way whiteness “seem[s] to possess almost magical powers,”¹²⁹ in its ability to maintain, construct and determine privileges and benefits.¹³⁰ Much of this is because of the manner in which, globally, whiteness maintains economic, cultural and political power. Thus white South Africans cannot be said to hold a position of marginalisation, unlike South Africans of colour who were (and continue to be) actively policed, discriminated against, and harmed. Rather, white South Africans occupy positions of privilege which make them able to ignore the lived experiences and realities of South Africans of colour.¹³¹ Therefore, in the context of South Africa it is especially necessary to make strange whiteness and to trouble the dominant position it continues to hold in a country where white people constitute a minority. One way of deconstructing the dominance of whiteness is through showing that the power and roots of its dominance are in fact constructed and not natural or simply “the way things are”. The task of whiteness studies is to make visible an identity that is presented as invisible and natural, and thereby to contest the position of dominance that whiteness holds.¹³²

¹²⁶ A. Vaid-Menon, “Rainbows are just refracted white light: Settler homonationalism in neo-apartheid South Africa,” Honours Thesis, Stanford University, Stanford, 2013, p. 31.

¹²⁷ Steyn, “White Talk,” p. 122.

¹²⁸ Steyn, “White Talk,” p. 122; K. Ratele and L. Laubscher, “Making white lives: Neglected meanings of whiteness from apartheid South Africa,” in *Psychology in Society*, Vol. 40, 2010, p. 84.

¹²⁹ Ratele and Laubscher, “Making white lives: Neglected meanings of whiteness from apartheid South Africa,” p. 84.

¹³⁰ Ibid.

¹³¹ Steyn, “White talk: White South Africans and the strategic management of diasporic whiteness,” p.90.

¹³² Smit, “Challenging desire: performing whiteness in post-apartheid South Africa,” p. 13.

In interrogating whiteness and white identity, whiteness studies allows one to show the constructed nature of the position.¹³³ White identities are shown to be normative while identities deemed as other in relation to “white” are marked as peculiar or deviant.¹³⁴ One way that whiteness, white normativity and white privilege can be addressed is by revealing how whiteness is not a dominant, fixed or absolute position but is instead reliant on “a performance of white power”¹³⁵ Whiteness in South Africa was, and continues to be, actively policed, produced and maintained.¹³⁶ As highlighted above, during apartheid, and in the post-apartheid context, whiteness had to be enacted and enforced in such a way that it came to be seen as natural that white identity and whiteness were positioned as superior. We could argue that this position had to be performed in order to be maintained and here we can draw on Butler’s work on performance.¹³⁷ This work on performativity has made a key contribution to queer and gender studies, primarily by presenting identity as performed and thus destabilising naturalised or taken for granted positions such as hegemonic masculinity. While Butler’s work specifically refers to the repeated performance of gender and sexuality, or the way gender and sexuality are constituted through repeated performance, this theoretical perspective is also useful in considering other identity performances through discourses, such as race.¹³⁸ Race, Warren suggests, is a continuous execution of identity and that the very formation of categories of race is a performative feat which is constituted through enactment.¹³⁹ An example of whiteness as performance can be seen in apartheid South Africa in the way in which whiteness had to be enforced and maintained through continuous enactment and regulation in law.¹⁴⁰ In this way whiteness constructs and reconstructs itself through daily enactments and practices.¹⁴¹ Whiteness under apartheid, therefore, had to be enforced and asserted in order for it to be naturalised.¹⁴²

¹³³ Ibid.

¹³⁴ Ibid.

¹³⁵ A.J. Lopez, *Postcolonial whiteness: a critical reader on race and empire*, Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005, p. 13.

¹³⁶ A. Carolin, “Apartheid’s Immorality Act and the fiction of heteronormative whiteness,” in *Tydskrif vir letterkunde*. Vol 54 (1), 2016, p. 111.

¹³⁷ J. Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, London: Routledge, 1990.

¹³⁸ Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, pp. 24-5.

¹³⁹ J.T. Warren, “Whiteness and cultural theory: Perspectives on research and education,” in *Urban Review*, Vol 31 (2), 1999, p. 195.

¹⁴⁰ Falkof, *The end of whiteness: Satanism and family murder in late apartheid South Africa*, p. 167.

¹⁴¹ Warren, “Whiteness and cultural theory: Perspectives on research and education,” p. 187.

¹⁴² Falkof, *The end of whiteness: Satanism and family murder in late apartheid South Africa*, p. 166.

Steyn's doctoral thesis on *white talk* is a key text which shows the enactment or performance of whiteness through discourse in South Africa.¹⁴³ Their work shows how whiteness upheld its position even after South Africans of colour came into political power. Steyn explains that *white talk* works to perpetuate the current social and economic position, privileges and benefits that white people hold.¹⁴⁴ Thus we can consider *white talk* in the South African context to be the discursive articulation between the ideology of whiteness and its reproduction and maintenance.¹⁴⁵ Steyn suggests that white people conflate measures applied to address inequality in South Africa, and thus extend equality to all, with white victimhood and claim to be themselves discriminated against.¹⁴⁶ Steyn and Foster suggest that through this discursive strategy white people thus play into broader global white discourse, and through this, garner sympathy from some members of the global community.¹⁴⁷ Steyn shows how *white talk* maintains global ties in order to help preserve the position of power that white identity holds. Therefore, despite white South Africans' perceptions that their identity is under threat, whiteness maintains and holds onto power through the validation it receives from the power that the Global North and West hold. Whiteness in South Africa relies upon this to grant it credibility and justify its continued position of power.¹⁴⁸ In light of this, we cannot simply have whiteness "go away by simply showing how it deconstructs itself"¹⁴⁹ but we can aim to show how the privileges and benefits held by white people have been acquired through the oppression of and dominance over people of colour.¹⁵⁰ For example, we can aim to show how white South Africans achieved white privilege at the expense of South Africans of colour and how this continues to be maintained despite shifts in political power within the country.

Critical race theory and whiteness studies have been critiqued for drawing attention to whiteness, and in doing so, re-centering the power of whiteness. While this may be the case in certain contexts, these fields make it possible to trouble the position whiteness holds in the

¹⁴³ Steyn, "White talk: White South Africans and the strategic management of diasporic whiteness," p. 90.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid. p. 111.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid.

¹⁴⁶ M. Steyn and D. Foster, "Repertoires for talking white: Resistant whiteness in post-apartheid South Africa," in *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Vol. 31(1), 2007, p. 46.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid.

¹⁴⁸ Steyn, "White talk: White South Africans and the strategic management of diasporic whiteness," p. 277; Lopez, *Postcolonial whiteness: a critical reader on race and empire*, p. 13.

¹⁴⁹ Lopez, *Postcolonial whiteness: a critical reader on race and empire*, p. 13.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid.

world, to render its dominance visible, and to imagine other possibilities. Whiteness studies strives to ascribe a strangeness to white identity and, in doing so, to trouble its position as the norm or standard against which other identities are measured and marked.¹⁵¹ This study adopts this aspect of whiteness studies, and seeks to demonstrate the strangeness of whiteness and its hegemonic position within the context of South Africa and more specifically in the 2012 Joburg Pride clash, as well as throughout the history of Joburg Pride.

2.7. Conclusion

The above theoretical framework provides the necessary conceptual tools for exploring the 2012 Joburg Pride clash, as well as situating this moment within the history of Joburg Pride and the post-apartheid South African context. The particular combination of anti-racist queer feminism, intersectionality, queer theory, critical theory, critical race theory, and whiteness studies allows the research to explore the tensions that arose out of the 2012 event in relation to current conversations circulating in broader South African discourse around what it means to be a South African citizen. These include the reactions from the Joburg Pride parade organisers, marshals, and participants to the activists from the One in Nine Campaign; reactions that revealed fault lines or hairline fractures that may or may not have always been present.

In summary, poststructuralism sets out to reveal the complexity and constructedness of reality and thus is concerned with meaning, power and knowledge.¹⁵² This paradigm holds that meanings are not universal, absolute or fixed, and thus actively seeks to disrupt and trouble meanings, assigned through language, as true and absolute.¹⁵³ Poststructuralism is useful to this study in unpacking power relations at play during the Joburg Pride rupture, as well as the meanings assigned to this moment after it had occurred.

Anti-racist queer feminism is integrated into the theoretical framework in light of the way in which it troubles racism, which appears to be one of the core undercurrents to the clash that occurred at Joburg Pride in 2012. This perspective is also productive in its recognition of the concurrent ways in which social relations and oppressions intersect.¹⁵⁴ Linked to this,

¹⁵¹ Smit, "Challenging desire: performing whiteness in post-apartheid South Africa," p. 13.

¹⁵² Williams, "Understanding Poststructuralism," p. 154.

¹⁵³ Harcourt, "An Answer to the Question: "What Is Poststructuralism?" p. 17.

¹⁵⁴ Camfield, "Theoretical Foundations of an Anti-Racist Queer Feminist Historical Materialism," pp. 296-7.

intersectionality is included in the theoretical framework because of the way in which intertwined social constructions of race, class, gender, and sexuality are deeply ingrained in social relations.¹⁵⁵ Particularly in light of the way that South African bodies were, and continue to be, regulated along the lines of race, gender and sexuality intersectionality allows for the interrogation of the co-constitution of hegemonies.¹⁵⁶

Queer theory, already present in anti-racist queer feminism, allows the study to extend its focus to include identities that are non-normative and concerns itself with the disruption and interrogation of fixed identities and positions.¹⁵⁷ This theoretical position also allows for the interrogation of the conventions circulating in society of what is natural, true or stable. Using queer theory to understand the way that identity is constructed, maintained, enforced and regulated makes it possible to resist the naturalisation and normalisation of identity.¹⁵⁸ This resistance to normalising or naturalising identity is useful to the study in that it allows an analysis of Joburg Pride that seeks to disrupt any taken for granted identity, be it heterosexual, lesbian, gay, or the concept of a national identity. Queer theory and the notion of “queer” has largely been associated with gender and sexuality, it has also been applied to race, class and other identities.

Critical theory brings to this study a view of society as complex and constituted through obscured and partially visible rules and relations.¹⁵⁹ Further, this thesis draws on critical race theory, and whiteness studies, to understand the particular complexities that result from the nature and experience of race in South Africa. These perspectives are also productive for examining the moment at Joburg Pride where a violent altercation emerged between white bodies and black bodies, commercialisation and advocacy, party and politics. This clash came to reveal systems and processes of racial exclusion and, thus, there is a need to draw on critical race theory which works to unpack such patterns, as well as to trouble the hegemony of whiteness and white experience.¹⁶⁰ Linked to this is the integration of whiteness studies,

¹⁵⁵ Weber, “A conceptual framework for understanding race, class, gender, and sexuality,” p. 20.

¹⁵⁶ Van Zyl, “A Sexual Politics of Belonging: Same-Sex Marriage in Post-Apartheid South Africa,” p. 28.

¹⁵⁷ Beasley, “Queering Gender/Queer Feminism: Butler, Whittle,” p. 108.

¹⁵⁸ J. Alexander and M. Gibson, “Queer Composition(s): Queer Theory in the writing classroom,” in *JAC*, Vol 24(1), p. 3.

¹⁵⁹ Strydom, *Contemporary Critical Theory and Methodology*, p. 10.

¹⁶⁰ Parker and Lynn, “What's Race Got to Do With It? Critical Race Theory's Conflicts With and Connections to Qualitative Research Methodology and Epistemology,” p. 12.

which too seeks to trouble the dominance of whiteness, and further trouble the manner in which whiteness has come to hold this position, particularly in South Africa where white South Africans are in the minority, yet continue to hold a position of power and privilege.

In the following chapters I apply the theoretical lens to the data gathered through the analysis of *Exit* articles and interviews with key stakeholders involved in Joburg Pride and *Exit*. The chapters are divided into the following key themes: the depoliticisation of Africa's first Pride march (chapter three); "community" as assimilation (chapter four); the exclusivity of whiteness (chapter five); and the myth of the Rainbow Nation (chapter six).

CHAPTER THREE: THE DEPOLITICISATION OF AFRICA'S FIRST PRIDE MARCH

3.1. Introduction

Pride parades are public festivals of socio-political and cultural significance and are a hypervisible appropriation of public space by the LGBTIAQ "community".¹ The political aspect of Pride events that focuses on issues relating to sexual and gender identity, and other intersecting identities, has resulted in LGBTIAQ individuals gaining a sense of affirmation and belonging and this political emphasis has extended democratic and human rights in South Africa to include rights based on sexual identity.² In the past decade an increasing number of studies have raised concerns over the widespread commercialisation of social movements and events, such as Pride.³ For instance, in their research on Toronto Pride, Kates and Belk found that members of the LGBTIAQ "community" felt that Pride had become too commercialised and had lost its historical and political meaning, thereby undermining Pride's original purpose of making visible and politicising LGBTIAQ identities.⁴ In this way the commercialisation of Pride weakened the political movement's integrity. This concern has been raised with regards to almost all major Pride events globally.⁵ Enguix writes that these concerns are also found in almost all LGBTIAQ spaces and expressions.⁶

¹ S.M. Kates and R.W. Belk, "The meanings of Lesbian and Gay Pride Day: Resistance through consumption and resistance to consumption," in *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, Vol 30 (4), 2001, p. 393; F. Stella, "Queer Space, Pride, and Shame in Moscow," in *Slavic Review*, Vol. 72 (3), 2013, p. 462.

² M. Gevisser and G. Reid, "Pride or protest?: Drag queens, comrades, and the Lesbian and Gay Pride March," in M. Gevisser and E. Cameron (Eds), *Defiant Desire: gay and lesbian lives in South Africa*. Ravan Press: Braamfontein, 1994, p. 283.

³ A. Ghaziani, "Post-Gay Collective Identity Construction," in *Social Problems*. Vol. 58 (1), 2011, pp. 99-125; Kates and Belk, "The meanings of Lesbian and Gay Pride Day: Resistance through consumption and resistance to consumption"; D.C Barret and L.M. Pollack, "Whose Gay Community? Social Class, Sexual Self- Expression, and Gay Community Involvement," in *Sociological Quarterly* 46(3), 2005, pp. 437-56; A. Chasin, *Selling Out: The Gay and Lesbian Movement Goes to Market*. New York: Palgrave, 2000; B. D. Adam, J. W. Duyvendak, and A. Krouwel (Eds), *The Global Emergence of Gay and Lesbian Politics*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1999; C. A. Rimmerman, *The Lesbian and Gay Movements: Assimilation or Liberation?* Boulder, CO: West-view Press, 2008; S. Zeller, "Backward March: Why are Gays Protesting a Gay Rights March?" *The New Republic*, April 17, 2000, p. 24.

⁴ Kates and Belk, "The meanings of Lesbian and Gay Pride Day: Resistance through consumption and resistance to consumption," p. 419

⁵ B. Enguix, "Identities, Sexualities and Commemorations: Pride Parades, Public Space and Sexual Dissidence," in *Anthropological Notebooks*, Vol 15 (2), 2009, pp. 15-33; Kates and Belk, "The meanings of Lesbian and Gay Pride Day: Resistance through consumption and resistance to consumption"; J. Binnie and B. Skeggs, "Cosmopolitan knowledge and the production and consumption of sexualized space: Manchester's gay village," in *The Sociological Review*, Vol 52 (1), 2004, pp. 39-61.

⁶ Enguix, "Identities, Sexualities and Commemorations: Pride Parades, Public Space and Sexual Dissidence," p. 30.

It appears that South Africa is no exception. Joburg Pride, the first Pride event in Africa, which at its conception was deeply political and ground-breaking, has not managed to escape commercialisation. This is clearly highlighted by the One in Nine Campaign's activists' efforts to re-politicise Joburg Pride in 2012 by drawing attention to the violence experienced by black lesbians and gender non-conforming people in South Africa. This disruption can be read as an attempt to re-politicise Pride in light of the event's increasing commercialisation.⁷ To condemn the violence experienced by certain members of the LGBTIAQ "community", the protesters called for "one minute of silence for black queer victims of violence."⁸ This call and its related protest action was met with hostility and violence from Joburg Pride's predominantly white participants and organisers. It is this meeting or clashing of experiences - an example of the Borderlands - that drew my attention to Joburg Pride. Specifically my attention was drawn by a need to understand why this particular moment resulted in a violent reaction. This chapter takes the moment of disruption as its central focus in order to explore processes of depoliticisation and commercialisation within Joburg Pride. This chapter also explores the violent manner through which some LGBTIAQ identities are excluded from Pride, arguing that this exclusion is rooted in apartheid-borne racism and discrimination.⁹ The chapter proposes that the clash at Joburg Pride can be read as more than a tussle over space and rather as a struggle over who has a right to take up the space of Joburg Pride and for what purposes. This struggle can be seen to be linked to broader struggles for legitimacy and citizenship within the "new" South Africa.

What follows in this chapter is an exploration of moments that reveal the process by which Joburg Pride came to be "depoliticised" as the One in Nine Campaign suggests. The analysis also attempts to highlight potential moments in which a political mandate could have been

⁷ M. Hengeveld and T.J. Tallie, "This is my route!" Race, Entitlement and Gay Pride in South Africa," In *Africa's a country*, 15 October 2012, <http://africasacountry.com/2012/10/this-is-my-route-race-entitlement-and-gay-pride-in-south-africa/>, n.p.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ One in Nine Campaign, 8 October 2012, copy of the leaflet distributed at Joburg Pride 2012, www.facebook.com/groups/10123398375/, n.p.

reignited, as well as explore the reasons why this mandate was not reignited at these various points.

3.2. Making Visible the Depoliticisation of Joburg Pride

As discussed in chapter one, on 6 October 2012, approximately twenty feminist activists from the One in Nine Campaign staged a protest in the form of a “die-in”¹⁰ and halted the annual Joburg Pride parade. The activists demanded a minute of silence from the parade and lay down in the middle of the road with life-sized dolls that represented members of the LGBTIAQ “community” who had been raped and murdered by virtue of their sexual orientation or gender identity and expression. The activists and the dolls were dressed in purple t-shirts with political messages on them. For instance the back of their shirts read “solidarity with women who speak out.”¹¹ Other members held banners which read “Dying for Justice” and “No Cause for Celebration.”¹² An activist on a loudhailer was shouting out political slogans such as “Down with the killing of black lesbians!” and “Down with homophobia!”¹³ The Joburg Pride organising committee described this moment as one in which protestors “formed a human blockade across the Pride route,” and that the banner that they were holding, “NO CAUSE FOR CELEBRATION” was unclear and therefore they thought the protest was being staged by a homophobic group.¹⁴ The protesters meanwhile distributed leaflets explaining their presence and calling for a minute of silence for the dead and then listing the names of 25 LGBTIAQ people who had died as a result of hate crimes.¹⁵

Ishtar Lakhani, one of the One in Nine Campaign protestors, explained that “the idea was to disrupt Pride” because it “had morphed into this thing that was nothing like the reason why Pride started.”¹⁶ Thus, the campaign’s aim was to draw attention to how Pride had “ceased to be a space for charting new futures,” and sought to highlight how the depoliticisation of

¹⁰ J. Taylor, *Playing It Queer: Popular Music, Identity and Queer World-Making*. Peter Lang: Bern, 2012.

¹¹ One in Nine Campaign, 4 April 2013, “Now is the time to reclaim our pride: One in Nine Statement on the dissolution of Joburg Gay Pride Festival Company,” at https://www.facebook.com/events/377097409070969/?acontext=%7B%22ref%22%3A%224%22%2C%22feed_story_type%22%3A%22308%22%2C%22action_history%22%3A%22null%22%7D.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Joburg Gay Pride Festival Company, 8 October 2012, “Joburg Pride Response to One in Nine protest,” <https://www.facebook.com/joburgpride/posts/126936200787842>.

¹⁵ One in Nine Campaign, copy of the leaflet distributed at Joburg Pride 2012.

¹⁶ I. Lakhani, interview with the researcher, Cape Town, 9 February 2016.

Joburg Pride had allowed the discrimination and violence of racial apartheid to be extended into “a new, economic apartheid.”¹⁷ The Campaign, like Enguix, hold that capitalist consumerism and commercialisation has come to characterise Pride events and other LGBTIAQ spaces in South Africa.¹⁸ Lakhani continued to explain that Pride had turned into a “gay white male extravaganza” that overshadowed and concealed the fact that gay white male experiences were not reflective of the entire LGBTIAQ “community”, or the majority of South Africans.¹⁹

Their disruption made clear that the Campaign felt there were links between Joburg Pride’s depoliticisation and the increased commercialisation of the event. In response to this action, Joburg Pride parade organisers and marshals threatened to drive over the One in Nine Campaign activists, who were predominantly black lesbians and gender non-conforming people, with their vehicles while telling the activists they “had no right to be at the parade.”²⁰ Vaid-Menon describes the moment as Joburg Pride organisers telling protestors to “go back to the townships,” and that “Pride is not political.”²¹

Members of the organising committee dragged One in Nine Campaign members out of the road, handling them roughly as can be seen in the footage that circulated after the moment.²² Following this, the Pride organising committee, One in Nine Campaign members and Pride participants became involved in a physically violent clash.²³ The clash between Joburg Pride organisers and parade participants with activists from the One in Nine Campaign highlighted tensions around racism, discrimination and exclusion that have surrounded Joburg Pride event since its conception in 1990.²⁴ While the organisers may argue that “Pride is not political” and instead wish to focus on the commercial aspect of the event, the response to the activists is quite clearly a political one. Something about the halting of a parade for explicitly political reasons evoked a violent reaction from Pride organisers and participants.

¹⁷One in Nine Campaign, copy of the leaflet distributed at Joburg Pride 2012.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ I. Lakhani, interview with the researcher, Cape Town, 9 February 2016.

²⁰ A. Valenza, “One in Nine Campaign,” in *ILGA*, 9 October 2012, <http://ilga.org/one-in-nine-campaign/>, np.

²¹ A. Vaid-Menon, “Rainbows are just refracted white light: Settler homonationalism in neo-apartheid South Africa,” Honours Thesis, Stanford University, Stanford, 2013, p. 7.

²² *Gay Pride March interrupted by activists*, 7 October 2012, at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LYjp-xbdFS0>.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ E. Craven, “Racial identity and racism in the gay and lesbian ‘community’ in post-apartheid South Africa,” Master’s thesis, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, 2011; S. De Waal and A. Manion, *Pride: Protest and Celebration*. Fanele: Johannesburg, 2006.

The concerns of the members of the very LGBTIAQ “community” that Joburg Pride allegedly caters for, represented by the One in Nine Campaign protestors, were not integrated into the day’s events but instead were excluded and physically removed out of the path of the parade. This attempt to clear the path for the parade is very telling and reflects broader issues of recognition, inclusion and citizenship within the post-apartheid context.

The violence that occurred at Joburg Pride 2012, in the form of “infighting,”²⁵ reveals “competing ideologies,” between Pride organisers, marshals and participants, and One in Nine Campaign activists. Infighting is rooted in divergent ideology and identity formation. For example, Joburg Pride organisers and participants wished to emphasise and align themselves with the commercial aspects of the event, while One in Nine activists called attention to the loss of the political aspect of Pride.²⁶ In catering only for a singular group identity that is not representative of the whole group, alternative lived experiences and realities are repressed. The One in Nine Campaign troubled the unifying capacity of Joburg Pride; bringing into question who Joburg Pride is for. In doing so the Campaign destabilised and threatened the identity of Joburg Pride, which incited a hostile (and violent) response from organisers and participants.

The eruption in 2012 could simply have passed as another event in Pride history. However, the escalation to physical violence called for a more urgent engagement with the underlying causes of the clash, as well as the implications of its occurrence for Pride, the LGBTIQA “community”, and the South African context more broadly. What emerged from this violent incident were several moments in 2013 where the LGBTIAQ “community” actively attempted to interrogate what it meant to hold a Pride event that represented all members of the South African LGBTIAQ “community”. Following the 2012 clash, social media emerged as an important site through which people could relive and explore what had happened. Both the Joburg Pride organising committee and the One in Nine Campaign made statements via their Facebook pages. One such announcement by the Joburg Pride organising committee on 3 April 2013, resulted in a series of events offline that began to change the face of Joburg Pride.

²⁵ A. Ghaziani and G.A. Fine, “Infighting and Ideology: How Conflict Informs the Local Culture of the Chicago DykeMarch,” in *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society*. Vol. 20 (1), 2008, p. 51.

²⁶ *Ibid.* p. 53.

Firstly, the organising committee announced their dissolution.²⁷ This announcement was then covered by other media sources.²⁸ Following this, LGBTIAQ organisations, members and individuals held events in Johannesburg to discuss a way forward. Events included a meeting on 7 April 2013 at a restaurant in Melville, and another in the Johannesburg CBD at the House of Movements entitled “Reclaim our Pride” on 13 April 2013.²⁹ The Reclaim our Pride meeting organised by the Forum for the Empowerment of Women and the One in Nine Campaign was called in order to “imagin[e] ways forward for reclaiming our pride,” to discuss strategic ways of addressing the depoliticisation and commercialisation of Joburg Pride.³⁰ Follow up meetings saw the emergence of new groups such as Johannesburg People’s Pride, who would go on to organise the Joburg Pride events in 2013.

“Someone decided that the time for polite criticism was over, and action needed” was how the One in Nine Campaign disruption was described in *Exit*.³¹ Gavin Hayward, the editor of *Exit*, said that the publication had regularly over the years, “criticised the depoliticisation of Pride,” including the lack of political messaging such as signage and speakers to address the crowd and to give Pride a political purpose.³² While speeches alone are not enough, they do enable a particular tone to an event and are a means of reminding participants of the context of the Pride event. Tim Trengove-Jones, a regular contributor to *Exit*, wrote that they had “argued too many times...that it is a ‘crying shame’ that Pride has become so depoliticised.”³³ They explain that it was through the protest action that the One in Nine Campaign had “redeemed the event from absolute triviality.”³⁴ Trengove-Jones further explains that the protest action can be “seen as stemming from considerable anger at the (non) direction Pride

²⁷ Joburg Pride Festival Company, 3 April 2013, “Joburg Gay Pride Festival Company board votes to stop production of annual Joburg Pride event,” <https://www.facebook.com/joburgpride/posts/615596805134764>.

²⁸ L. DeBarros, 3 April 2013, “Breaking: Shock as Joburg Pride Shuts Down,” in *Mambaonline*, www.mambaonline.com/article.asp?artid=8011; M. Nathan, 3 April 2013, “Johannesburg Pride Cancelled as Board Dissolves,” in *O-blog-dee-o-blog-da*. <https://oblogdeeblogda.me/2013/04/03/johannesburg-gay-pride-cancelled-as-board-dissolves/>.

²⁹ Staff writer, “Joburg Pride crisis: Future still uncertain,” in *Mambaonline*, 23 April 2013, at <http://www.mambaonline.com/2013/04/23/joburg-pride-crisis-future-still-uncertain/>.

³⁰ One in Nine Campaign, “Now is the time to reclaim our pride: One in Nine Statement on the dissolution of Joburg Gay Pride Festival Company.”

³¹ G. Hayward, “Joburg Pride 2012: In the news for the wrong reasons,” in *Exit* November 2012, p. 1.

³² *Ibid.*

³³ T. Trengove-Jones, “Pride 2012: Fight those heinous pissers back,” in *Exit*, November 2012, p. 4.

³⁴ *Ibid.*

has taken,”³⁵ and that it was through this 2012 moment that the “fault lines” of the LGBTIAQ “community” came to be exposed.³⁶

Tanya Harford, the chairperson of the Joburg Pride organising committee, in particular was criticised for the lack of political focus. For example, one critic stated “one cannot depoliticise an inherently political event.”³⁷ Similarly, Trengove-Jones wrote that the organising committee had “[stood] in the way of those who wish to emphasise its political nature,” and that this was at the root of the 2012 Pride disruption.³⁸ As made clear by these examples, although the disruption to 2012 Joburg Pride and the subsequent dissolution of the organising committee was heralded by some as “shocking”, a closer examination of the history of Joburg Pride from 1990 to 2013 shows that the event had become increasingly depoliticised and commercialised and, therefore, that this disruption was in some ways inevitable.

3.3. The Movement Away from the Political

Joburg Pride was a central component of the early drive for legal recognition of the LGBTIAQ “community”, including the Equality Clause.³⁹ For some members of the “community”, such as Hayward, they believe that “once that was achieved [the political element] just fell away.”⁴⁰ The 1990 march was an explicitly political gathering with members marching to demand equal rights and to be recognised as full citizens.⁴¹ It employed the visibility that Pride granted the LGBTIAQ “community” to challenge homophobia which actively works to render LGBTIAQ experiences invisible. Pride created a space for LGBTIAQ citizens in South African society and thereby became a tool for challenging homophobia and its consequences for LGBTIAQ

³⁵ Trengove-Jones, “Pride 2012: Fight those heinous pissers back,” p. 4.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ The Equality Clause forms part of the South African Constitution and affords protection to all South Africans, and states that “the state may not unfairly discriminate directly or indirectly against anyone on one or more grounds, including race, gender, sex, pregnancy, marital status, ethnic or social origin, colour, sexual orientation, age, disability, religion, conscience, belief, culture, language and birth” (Constitution of the Republic of South Africa 1996).

⁴⁰ G. Hayward, interview with the researcher, Johannesburg, 24 March 2016.

⁴¹ S. De Waal and A. Manion, *Pride: Protest and Celebration*, Fanele: Johannesburg, 2006, p.7; E. Cameron, “Foreword,” in S. De Waal and A. Manion (Eds), *Pride: Protest and Celebration*, Fanele: Johannesburg, 2006, pp. 4-6.

citizens, such as shame, guilt and a sense of exclusion.⁴² The first march was “simultaneously angry and carnivalesque,⁴³ and it, and the early marches that followed, invoked the tradition of South Africa’s human rights and political protest marches, such as the 1956 Women’s March to Pretoria and the defiance campaign marches in the 1980s. Alongside the emphasis on the political these early marches also adopted the festive and carnivalesque format and style of the Pride marches of the Global North, such as New York and San Francisco’s Pride marches.⁴⁴

The first Joburg Pride was “organised by a group of activists called the Gays and Lesbians of the Witwatersrand (GLOW).”⁴⁵ GLOW was founded by Simon Nkoli, an anti-apartheid activist. Nkoli started GLOW as a response to the apolitical and white dominated LGBT spaces and organisations, such as the Gay Association of South Africa (GASA). GASA was the first national lesbian and gay organisation in South Africa, established in April 1982.⁴⁶ It had a membership of approximately 1000 members. Nkoli was a member of GASA, having joined in 1983, but frustrated with the lack of support for black gay men and lesbians, they formed an interest group within GASA for black LGBTIAQ members. This interest group felt excluded from the dominant white gay male culture within GASA and, not surprisingly, was explicitly discriminated against by GASA’s conservative and predominantly white racist members.⁴⁷ GASA positioned itself as “apolitical” and in doing so implicitly aligned itself with the apartheid regime, at a time when to take such a position was highly criticised. It was because of its “apolitical” stance that GASA was rejected by the international LGBTIAQ community.⁴⁸ For

⁴² De Waal and Manion, *Pride: Protest and Celebration*, p.9; J.J. Ratcliff, A.K. Miller and A.M. Krolikowski, “Why pride displays elicit support from majority group members: The meditational role of perceived deservingness,” in *Group Process Intergroup Relations*, Vol 16, No 4, 2013, p. 472.

⁴³ Gevisser and Reid, “Pride or protest?: Drag queens, comrades, and the Lesbian and Gay Pride March,” p. 278.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ D. Van Vuuren and G.H. Khan, 16 October 2014, “Grappling with Gauteng’s Pride Problem,” in Mambaonline. <http://www.mambaonline.com/2014/10/16/grappling-gautengs-pride-problems/>.

⁴⁶ M. Gevisser, “A different fight for freedom: a history of South African lesbian and gay organisation – the 1950s to the 1990s,” in M. Gevisser and E. Cameron (Eds), *Defiant Desire: gay and lesbian lives in South Africa*. Ravan Press: Braamfontein, 1994, p. 48.

⁴⁷ M. Van Zyl, “A Sexual Politics of Belonging: Same-Sex Marriage in Post-Apartheid South Africa,” Doctoral thesis, Stellenbosch University, Stellenbosch. pp. 10-1; Gevisser, “A different fight for freedom: a history of South African lesbian and gay organisation – the 1950s to the 1990s,” p. 52.

⁴⁸ Gevisser, “A different fight for freedom: a history of South African lesbian and gay organisation – the 1950s to the 1990s,” p. 51.

those within GASA, an apolitical stance meant not taking a position on broader political matters in South Africa, and following a conforming, non-confrontational and moderate stance.⁴⁹ For instance, in GASA's mission statement, they stated that the organisation "aimed to provide a 'non-militant non-political answer to gay needs'."⁵⁰ Here they appear to mean this in relation to the anti-apartheid struggle and more radical LGBTIAQ activism and organisations. In contrast, GLOW focused on rights for lesbian and gay people, and on the broader liberation struggle.⁵¹

An example of the political nature of the "community" is that, in 1994, there was a "widely-held perception within it that the annual pride march is a 'black affair'."⁵² This was despite the fact that the majority of Pride participants at this time, up to 75 percent, were white. This reference to Pride as a black affair suggests that it was driven by political interests, given that the anti-apartheid struggle was spear-headed by predominantly black activists. In South Africa, at the time, the anti-apartheid struggle was the most prominent reference to "political" activity.⁵³ The avoidance of the political then speaks largely to the "deeply-entrenched conservatism" of the white LGBTIAQ "community" at this time.⁵⁴ Simply put then, one could not assume that being gay or lesbian would result in members of GASA, and the LGBTIAQ "community" more broadly, being liberal or progressive. Instead, there were conservative, or more explicitly, racist white members within GASA despite the fact that these LGBTIAQ people, like people of colour, were discriminated against under the apartheid regime.

The Pride march was conceptualised as a means of ensuring that the LGBTIAQ "community's" demand for equality became a social issue, thereby operating as "a protest against

⁴⁹ Gevisser, "A different fight for freedom: a history of South African lesbian and gay organisation – the 1950s to the 1990s," p. 51.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ M. Judge, "Violence against lesbians and (IM) possibilities for identity and politics," Doctoral thesis, University of the Western Cape, Cape Town, 2015, p. 52.

⁵² Gevisser, "A different fight for freedom: a history of South African lesbian and gay organisation – the 1950s to the 1990s," p. 82.

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ Ibid.

inequality.”⁵⁵ The theme of the first Pride was Unity in the Community which sought to bring attention to “intersecting forms of discrimination” and draw the LGBTIAQ “community” together.⁵⁶ To contextualise the significance and daring of the first Pride march, it is important to note that given the precarious socio-political context at the time participants wore paper bags to mask their identity so that they could not be identified. This became the most iconic and frequently referenced aspect of the first Pride of 1990; the “bizarre spectacle of people marching incognito for openness and pride.”⁵⁷ This served to highlight the fear that many had regarding being visible in public at a time when equal rights had not yet been granted.⁵⁸

Considering this beginning to Joburg Pride, a key criticism that has emerged in the years following 1990, is that Pride has increasingly moved from the political to the commercial. In 2002 Pride was described as having “no discernible purpose at all,” due to the fact that it had moved away from the political to take on the form of a carnival or festival.⁵⁹ Some South Africans hold that simply having a Pride event is already a political act in that LGBTIAQ individuals take up public space during this event “to demonstrate its existence, and its right to exist.”⁶⁰ As Gavin Hayward writes in *Exit*, “when you put 10000 gay people in a park, by its sheer existence – it is political.”⁶¹ In their interview Mbhele, too, holds that the visibility of the “community” was a political act in that it worked to challenge and counter “the attempt by heterosexist mainstream culture in many ways to make LGBT people invisible.”⁶² Although this insertion into (heterosexual) space can be considered political, as it serves to make the “community” more visible, this visibility may not always be sufficient to challenge dominant structures of power and oppression. It is almost as if “visibility” has come to be read as a political act, an excuse of sorts for the absence of political messaging despite the continued presence of violence against certain LGBTIAQ people. In choosing to avoid taking a political

⁵⁵ Gevisser and Reid, “Pride or protest?: Drag queens, comrades, and the Lesbian and Gay Pride March,” p. 281.

⁵⁶ Van Vuuren and Khan, “Grappling with Gauteng’s Pride Problem,” n.p.

⁵⁷ Gevisser and Reid, “Pride or protest?: Drag queens, comrades, and the Lesbian and Gay Pride March,” p. 280.

⁵⁸ Gevisser and Reid, “Pride or protest?: Drag queens, comrades, and the Lesbian and Gay Pride March,” p. 280.

⁵⁹ T. Trengove-Jones, “What purpose did Pride 2002 serve?” in *Exit*, November 2002, p. 4.

⁶⁰ T. Trengove-Jones, “Pride and the Party Animal,” in *Exit*, November 2000, p. 13.

⁶¹ G. Hayward, “Pride parade unfazed,” in *Exit*, October 2004, p. 1.

⁶² Zak Mbhele, Interview with the researcher, Cape Town, 18 November 2016.

stance, Pride thus “defects from any and all political responsibility” and becomes an apolitical space.⁶³

There are moments throughout the analysis period where attention is called to the need to interrogate the politics (or lack thereof) of Joburg Pride. It is argued that in not doing so the “community” (or organisers) ignore the social realities of many LGBTIAQ people and feign that “nothing is wrong.”⁶⁴ This can be understood within the context of a vastly unequal South Africa, where if Pride “does not show an awareness of these political and economic realities” then it is a misuse of energy, space and political potential.⁶⁵ Sharon Cooper, who was a member of the Joburg Pride organising committee in the 1990s, suggests that the absence of political messaging and political agenda is due to the loss of leadership in the movement. Cooper argues that when individuals like Zackie Achmat, Edward Cameron, Kevin Botha and Phumi Mtetwa, the “political think tank minds,” left for other movements this resulted in an absence of political direction and vision.⁶⁶ In their absence Pride transformed and was no longer representative of its early (political) days. This absence of political leadership, such as seen at the time of the writing of the South African Constitution and the Equality Clause in particular, could very well be one of the reasons for Joburg Pride’s move away from the political.

Joburg Pride has the potential to be a space for driving valuable political change for the LGBTIAQ “community”, such as legislation around hate crimes. In order for Pride to fulfil this role it is necessary for it to engage with the social forces and inequalities operating in South Africa.⁶⁷ In not engaging with these issues, and in not acknowledging the lived experiences of many LGBTIAQ South Africans, Pride then becomes a “gross misinterpretation” of the “community”.⁶⁸ It is necessary to consider that the move away from the political is itself a political choice, one which then shows clearly alignment with the apolitical stance that was held by GASA and its members in the 1980s. Promoting the commercial over the experiences

⁶³ T. Trengove-Jones, “Make a point of pride,” in *Exit*, October 2010, p. 13.

⁶⁴ Evert Knoessen, “Has Pride become meaningless?” in *Exit*, December 2003/January 2004, p. 5.

⁶⁵ Trengove-Jones, “Make a point of pride,” p. 13.

⁶⁶ S. Cooper, interview with researcher, Pietermaritzburg (Skype), 3 February 2016.

⁶⁷ T. Trengove-Jones, “Pride 2003: Benighted we fall,” in *Exit*, November 2003, p. 4.

⁶⁸ Tomas, “You need Pride, ??” in *Exit*, October 2009, p. 2.

of the vast majority of the “community” is a political choice that promotes a capitalist hegemony. This is particularly problematic when we consider that much of the economic wealth in South Africa remains in white hands, and therefore the commercialisation of Pride further excludes the experiences of people of colour. This “not political” stance promotes a compliant citizenry by disguising certain political interests and power dynamics as “apolitical”.

Within the “new” South African context, the acquisition of legal rights and protections afforded to lesbian and gay South Africans through the Constitution, has been read by some as the resolution of all social or political concerns, and given that we all are now equal “it’s all fine.”⁶⁹ However, homophobic violence, such as corrective rape, that many LGBTIAQ South Africans face, continues to occur “despite [these] legal gains.”⁷⁰ This violence clearly indicates that all is not “fine” and that very real threats to LGBTIAQ people continue to exist. The trend in hate crimes against members of the LGBTIAQ “community”, such as corrective rape and murder, represents an opportunity to articulate a political direction. However, this opportunity has not been seized by Pride organisers. As leaders of the LGBTIAQ “community” in Johannesburg the Joburg Pride organising committee have the responsibility to direct the political focus of the “community”. In not acknowledging the violence that many LGBTIAQ South Africans continue to face, Joburg Pride organisers come to “obscure the lived terror of less privileged members” of the “community”.⁷¹ This obscuring of the lived terror is done through the increasing commercialisation of the event. This process serves to direct the focus away from a cause-based approach and rather to a commercial approach; profits over politics. This commercial emphasis can be seen to be intertwined with a neoliberal agenda, which is a very long way from the political mandate of Joburg Pride 1990.

3.4. For the Sponsor: Changing the Name

A pivotal moment in the depoliticisation of Pride is the removal of “gay” from the name Gay Pride and replacing it with “Joburg”. Trengove-Jones describes this as “an altogether tamer name” that serves to “take the gayness out of Pride,” which is a clear sign of the disregard for

⁶⁹ G. Hayward, interview with the researcher, Johannesburg, 24 March 2016.

⁷⁰ R. Thoreson, “Somewhere over the Rainbow Nation: Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Activism in South Africa,” in *Journal of Southern African Studies*, Vol. 34, No. 3, 2008, pp. 679-697. Accessed 10 November 2016. p. 695.

⁷¹ Hengeveld and Tallie, “This is my route!” *Race, Entitlement and Gay Pride in South Africa*, n.p.

the political significance that Pride holds.⁷² This trend towards removing the “gayness” or the political continued with the various changes of leadership over the years. In 2007, the then organisers of Pride, ran and organised the event under a new structure and registered Pride as a section 21 not-for-profit organisation called the Joburg Pride Gay Festival Company. They described themselves as individuals with experience and skills relevant to the running and organisation of Pride, and “not linked to troubled events.”⁷³ This is perhaps an attempt by the organisers to distance themselves from “troubling” or political Pride events.

The change in name from being an event explicitly for the LGBTIAQ “community” to being an event that seemed to target all of Joburg led to the organising committee being accused of devaluing the LGBTIAQ and political aspect of the event in order to make Pride less threatening to heterosexual society.⁷⁴ Tanya Harford, the former chairperson of the Joburg Pride organising committee, explained that they changed the name because they “had got to the point where we didn’t have to define it as Gay Pride,” continuing to explain that “Pride was Pride.”⁷⁵ This notion of Pride as being simply recognised as Pride speaks to the global commodification of Pride events such that the “community” that it initially served comes to be erased from the naming of the event. Harford continued to explain that doing this, removing the “gayness”, helped to make Pride more attractive to sponsors and gaining airtime on radio to advertise the event.⁷⁶ The need to make Joburg Pride less “gay” in order to gain sponsors is telling, and makes Harford’s position clear; “[Pride] needed to be run like a business.”⁷⁷

Harford described how under their leadership “everything [was done] by the book. Correctly registered. Ran proper board meetings with minutes.”⁷⁸ They describe the organising committee as “running it correctly” while funding the event themselves they had to make their “money off the bar.”⁷⁹ Harford tells how, in 2012 they “took a million rand at the bar.”⁸⁰

⁷² T. Trengove-Jones, “Is Joburg’s Pride mainly in vain?” p. 10.

⁷³ E. Craven, “Racial identity and racism in the gay and lesbian ‘community’ in post-apartheid South Africa,” Master’s thesis, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, 2011; S. De Waal and A. Manion, *Pride: Protest and Celebration*. Fanele: Johannesburg, 2006, p. 43.

⁷⁴ Craven, “Racial identity and racism in the gay and lesbian ‘community’ in post-apartheid South Africa,” p. 43.

⁷⁵ T. Harford, interview with the researcher, Johannesburg (Skype), 25 January 2016

⁷⁶ Ibid.

⁷⁷ Ibid.

⁷⁸ Ibid.

⁷⁹ Ibid.

⁸⁰ Ibid.

They said that the committee “understood that there was an activist part to Pride,” and that they attempted to accommodate this by providing an area at Zoo Lake for it in the way of stalls but that ultimately the committee’s “driving force was to make money to cover the costs.”⁸¹ This “activist part”, the need to advocate for recognition and protection of the LGBTIAQ “community”, upon which Pride was founded, is displaced here by the desire for sponsorship. Activism is spoken of as an aspect rather than a fundamental undercurrent of Joburg Pride. This is telling of the politics informing Harford and their committee’s leadership and approach to Joburg Pride. It demonstrates that Pride under their leadership “follow[ed] the money.”⁸²

Similarly to Harford, Zak Mbhele, former co-chairperson of the Joburg Pride organising committee, suggested that “the gayness” was “implied” in the name, in that “Pride means a gay orientated or LGBT oriented event.”⁸³ Mbhele explained that in changing the name to emphasise Joburg over Gay they wanted to “engender this notion that Pride wasn’t necessarily exclusively for LGBT people.”⁸⁴ This comment seems to disregard the fact that Pride was formed for the purpose of creating space for LGBTIAQ people to be visible and to gain a sense of belonging but also to take up physical space in a society that discriminates against them and actively seeks to render them invisible. Mbhele continued to explain that Joburg Pride was then to be “an open community event” that was “centred round certain values and ideas around embracing diversity,” what Mbhele then described as “a ‘rainbowism’ of sorts.”⁸⁵ They continue to explain that “not having the name gay or LGBT in the brand name is a nod in that direction,”⁸⁶ in choosing this “nod in that direction” Joburg Pride came to play into a politics of “sameness” instead of “difference.”⁸⁷

This endeavour to appeal to heterosexual Joburg and not Joburg’s LGBTIAQ “community” served to further depoliticise Pride because a Pride driven by a politics of sameness does not

⁸¹ Ibid.

⁸² Nath, “Gay Pride is political.” n.p.

⁸³ Z. Mbhele, interview with the researcher, Cape Town, 18 November 2016.

⁸⁴ Ibid.

⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁸⁶ Ibid.

⁸⁷ R.L. Einwohner, J. Reger and D.L. Myers, “Introduction,” in J. Reger, D.L. Myers and R. L. Einwohner (Eds), *Identity Work in Social Movements*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008, p. 5.

necessarily allow for the same kind of political engagement that a politics of difference does.⁸⁸ Sameness sees that which makes LGBTIAQ people “different” is suppressed in order to emphasise similarities to the heterosexual centre. Further, although Pride had previously worked to create a safe space for the expression of LGBTIAQ identity and did not cater to the heterosexual centre, through including the broader Joburg citizenry in the event, the form and purpose of the event shifts. This desire to extend the space to broader, and inevitably heterosexual, Joburg through the name change speaks to the “strong assimilationist streak in gay politics”⁸⁹ that De Waal and Manion, and others, speak of.⁹⁰ It is this desire to assimilate that possibly overrides the need to emphasise difference, to disrupt the status quo, and to call attention to the continued violence that many LGBTIAQ South Africans face.⁹¹ Through this process of assimilation, those who will not or cannot integrate are subjected to violence and/or silencing. Although some degree of sameness may exist among lesbian, gay and bisexual (LGB) people and heterosexual society, transgender, intersex, asexual and queer people continue to face discrimination because their differences are far more prominent than those of LGB people and are not as easily integrated or subsumed into broader society. While it is fair to say that movements may at times shift their focus between emphasising and suppressing LGBTIAQ identities and their differences from broader society, they may need to do so in ways that are more conscious; in ways and forms that serve the specific “community” that Pride was initially formed to cater to.⁹² This may be particularly important in South Africa where the commercialisation of the event cannot come at the expense of the political, given the nature of the lived experiences and realities of many LGBTIAQ South Africans.

Huber’s work cautions that this desire to assimilate is not limited to South Africa. They provide the example of LGBTIAQ communities in Europe where LGBTIAQ people are allowed to take up space if they “assimilate and adhere to the norm,” and so they tailor their expressions in

⁸⁸ Ghaziani, “Post-Gay Collective Identity Construction,” p. 100.

⁸⁹ S. De Waal and A. Manion (Eds), *Pride: Protest and Celebration*. Fanele: Johannesburg, 2006.

⁹⁰ D. Richardson, “Claiming citizenship? Sexuality, citizenship and lesbian/feminist theory”. In *Sexualities*, Vol 3 (2), 2000, p. 263; C. Johnson, “Heteronormative citizenship and the politics of passing”. In *Sexualities*. Vol 5 (3), 2002, pp. 317-336; Bernstein, “Celebration and Suppression: The Strategic Uses of Identity by the Lesbian and Gay Movement,” pp. 535-565.

⁹¹ T.M. Milani, “Are ‘queers’ really ‘queer’? Language, identity and same-sex desire in a South African online ‘community’,” in *Discourse & Society*. Vol 24 (5), 2013, pp. 1-19; Ghaziani, “Post-Gay Collective Identity Construction,” pp.99-125; De Waal and Manion, *Pride: Protest and Celebration*.

⁹² M. Bernstein, “Celebration and Suppression: The Strategic Uses of Identity by the Lesbian and Gay Movement,” in *American Journal of Sociology*. Vol. 103, No. 3, 1997, p. 532.

order to be accepted.⁹³ This is similar to what we see occurring in South Africa. Kay reminds us that people on the margins must make complex choices in the enactment of their identities.⁹⁴ They explain that they may choose to emphasise their difference to the dominant norms in order to gain “collective strength from such defiance.”⁹⁵ This appeared to be what occurred at Joburg Pride in the 1990s before rights were awarded. Marginalised identities may also feel compelled or may consciously choose “to assimilate to the norms and values of the dominant group.”⁹⁶ Through this they may abandon their identities that position them as other or they may choose to enact these identities in such a way that they are more acceptable to the dominant group.⁹⁷ Hence the LGBTIAQ “community” may participate in the commodification and exoticisation of their identities as fun gay subjects. This assimilation may also be as a means of protecting themselves, in seeming to be the same or presenting the self as good gay subjects, they are safer and thus less likely to be harmed. It is important to note that these competing desires to assimilate or challenge are not clear cut. Rather, LGBTIAQ people are likely to find themselves negotiating between these two positions depending on the specific demands of the moment or space they find themselves in.

Burns writes that the “idealized sexual citizen” is presumed to be a Western white male who has significant spending power and their self-realisation of identity is tied to their right and ability to consume or purchase.⁹⁸ Neoliberalism and the expansion of sexual rights has made it possible for the LGBTIAQ “community”, specifically white gay men, to opt into this notion of the sexual citizen and to obtain freedom, recognition and some societal acceptance through their access to commodities.⁹⁹ Citizenship thus comes to be defined through consumption and purchasing power, resulting in the increased commodification of LGBTIAQ identities. Sexual identity then “become[s] both an object of consumption, and [an] object in which nonqueers invest their passions and purchasing power, and an object through which

⁹³ Huber, “(Re-) Covering Queer: Restarting public space and sexual politics,” p. 12.

⁹⁴ R. Kay, “Identity and Marginality,” in *eSharp*. Issue 6 (1), 2005, p. 3.

⁹⁵ Ibid.

⁹⁶ Ibid.

⁹⁷ Ibid.

⁹⁸ K. Burns, “Cosmopolitan sexual citizenship and the project of queer world-making at the Sydney 2002 Gay Games,” in *Sexualities*. Vol 15 (3), 2012, p. 314.

⁹⁹ A. Cruz-Malave and Manalansan, M.F, “Introduction: Dissident sexualities/Alternative globalisms,” in A. Cruz-Malave and Manalansan, M.F (Eds), *Queer Globalisations: Citizenship and The Afterlife of Colonialism*. New York University Press: New York, 2002, p. 6.

queers constitute their identities in our contemporary consumer-oriented globalised world.”¹⁰⁰ This can be seen in the increased emphasis on notions of pink currencies, such as the Pink Rand, Pink Dollar, and Pink Euro, which assumes that lesbian and gay people have more disposable income than heterosexual people.¹⁰¹ Trengove-Jones comments on the Pink Rand in *Exit*, arguing that “any attempt to build the identity of an alternative sexual community on its alleged spending power” as being “as foolhardy as it is myopic.”¹⁰² They continue to argue that to hold the view that “all we need to belong is sufficient money to get us the necessary body and accessories is a deeply exclusionary belief.”¹⁰³ They also refer to it as “deeply insensitive” and “deeply dangerous.”¹⁰⁴ In South Africa with its significant economic inequality, this is a dangerous notion because the wealthy minority come to make decisions and display these decisions as representative of the majority who continue to live in poverty. To align the South African community with Global North or Western depictions of the LGBTIAQ “community” and Pride events serves to ignore the realities that are specific to the South African context. This alignment speaks to the position that the organising committee took in organising Pride, one which focused on selling Pride and making profit off the event. Further, treating Pride as a commercial entity and speaking of the spending power of the LGBTIAQ “community” works to support the argument that sexual citizenship has come to be tied to spending power and the commodification of LGBTIAQ identities. The consequence of this is that LGBTIAQ politics come to be refigured through neoliberalism, allowing the previously ostracised “gay” subject to be able to assimilate or gain acceptance through their purchasing power and this then sees them seeking inclusion through heteronormative institutions such as marriage.¹⁰⁵

Neoliberalism “restructures the power relations in society,” and within the LGBTIAQ “community” it can be argued that neoliberalism has come to draw boundaries based on who

¹⁰⁰ Cruz-Malave and Manalansan, “Introduction: Dissident sexualities/Alternative globalisms,” p. 1; D. Bell and J. Binnie, *The Sexual Citizen: Queer Politics and Beyond*. Polity Press: Cambridge, 2004, p. 1809

¹⁰¹ Staff reporter, “SA’s middle-class pink currency,” in *Mail and Guardian*, 18 June 1999, at <https://mg.co.za/article/1999-06-18-sas-middle-class-pink-currency>, n.p.

¹⁰² T. Trengove-Jones, “Pride and the Party Animal,” *Exit* November 2000, p. 13.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁵ A. Gorman-Murray and C. Nash, “Transformations in LGBT consumer landscapes and leisure spaces in the neoliberal city,” in *Urban Studies*. Vol 54 (3), 2017, p. 789.

can access privileges by virtue of their earning power.¹⁰⁶ An example of this from Joburg Pride is the introduction of entrance fees in 2004 in order to gain access to the post-Pride festivities at Zoo Lake. The charging of a fee left many of LGBTIAQ members disgruntled because “many people believed that Pride was a community event,” and such an event should be accessible to all members of the “community”.¹⁰⁷ A boundary fence was put in place to keep out those who could not afford to access the post-Pride parade space, creating the impression that Pride is “for rich, mostly white people,” while outside the fence are “people of colour who do not have access to that privileged space.”¹⁰⁸ This is concerning when one considers that South Africans are not economically equal and that economic power in the country continues to reflect the pattern of wealth distribution established under apartheid.¹⁰⁹ Similarly to the establishment of different sections at the post-Pride event, apartheid “enforc[ed] boundaries and access to rights and resources based on categories of race and class, gender and sexuality.”¹¹⁰ This is an example of the One in Nine Campaign’s argument that Joburg Pride had come to translate the old racial apartheid into an economic one.¹¹¹ Charging an entrance fee without considering who could not afford to pay the fee is deeply exclusionary and shows the critical need for intersectional considerations in the organising of Pride in a context of a multitude of complex lived experiences.

In becoming increasingly commercialised, by focusing on attracting sponsors who would be happy to associate their brand with the event, and being driven by financial needs over political ones, Pride, and social movements at large, become depoliticised and lose their potential to be transgressive spaces.¹¹² This “desire” to be appealing and to be “safe” for brands and companies, such as Coca-Cola, South African Breweries and Mango Airlines, previous sponsors of Joburg Pride, speaks to assimilationist politics. The consequences of an

¹⁰⁶ M. Huber, “(Re-) Covering Queer: Restarting public space and sexual politics,” in M.J. Belbel and R. Reitsamer, *dig me out: Discourses of Popular Music, Gender and Ethnicity*, Art Centre Arteleku, Spain/Austria, 2009, p. 3.

¹⁰⁷ Craven, “Racial identity and racism in the gay and lesbian ‘community’ in post-apartheid South Africa,” p. 42.

¹⁰⁸ Van Vuuren and Khan, “Grappling with Gauteng’s Pride Problem,” n.p.

¹⁰⁹ D. Nath, 10 October 2012, “Gay Pride is political,” in *Mail and Guardian Thought Leader*, <http://thoughtleader.co.za/dipikanath/2012/10/10/gay-pride/>, n.p.

¹¹⁰ Van Vuuren and Khan, “Grappling with Gauteng’s Pride Problem,” n.p.

¹¹¹ One in Nine Campaign, copy of the leaflet distributed at Joburg Pride 2012.

¹¹² Stella, “Queer Space, Pride, and Shame in Moscow,” pp. 461 – 2; Ghaziani and Fine, “Infighting and Ideology: How Conflict Informs the Local Culture of the Chicago DykeMarch,” pp. 51-67; M. Bernstein, “Celebration and Suppression: The Strategic Uses of Identity by the Lesbian and Gay Movement,” in *American Journal of Sociology*. Vol. 103, No. 3, 1997, pp. 535-565.

assimilationist approach is that those on the margins are ignored and obscured by the formation of a collective and “safe” identity that has no space for the nuanced ways of being that multiple, complex identities bring to the space. This process is not limited to South Africa. Marusic provides an example of the commodification of Pittsburgh Pride in 2017. They discuss how Pride organisers sold the naming rights of Pittsburgh Pride to the EQT Corporation, a petrol and gas company which has a history of funding anti-LGBTIAQ politicians and has been “widely criticised by environmentalists for its fracking activities.”¹¹³ The corporation changed the name from Pittsburgh Pride to EQT Equality March.¹¹⁴ This selling of the naming rights shows a lack of awareness of the way in which neoliberalism impacts on matters of sexual rights and environmental justice.

One particular example of the impact of neoliberalism on Joburg Pride is the way in which the focus on commercialisation prohibits political organising in the face of hate crimes. In comparison to matters such as demanding equal rights, including lobbying around the right to adopt and to get married, hate crimes have not been given the same attention or treated with the same level of seriousness. The commercial and business emphasis established by the organising committee of Joburg Pride can be argued to be one of the reasons for this. It appears that the desire to do everything by the book and to generate a profit in order to secure the Pride event of the following year saw the organising committee incapable of considering hate crimes as a political focus of Pride. The organising committee could afford to exclude or ignore the issue of hate crimes because they hold privileges, including white and middle-class privileges, which protect them from this type of violence, unlike LGBTIAQ working-class people of colour.

3.5. Hate Crimes: A Moment for Re-politicisation

In 2009, in an attempt to return to the political, *Exit* offered Phumi Mtetwa, one of South Africa’s leading LGBTIAQ activists in the fight for equal rights, the opportunity to write and publish a speech. Mtetwa wrote in *Exit* that “lesbian women and feminine gay men are being targeted for rape as a measure to ‘correct’ their sexuality.”¹¹⁵ They called on the organising

¹¹³ K. Marusic, 20 June 2017, “Here’s what happened when a city sold their pride march,” <http://splinternews.com/here-s-what-happened-when-a-city-sold-their-pride-march-1796264248>, n.p.

¹¹⁴ Marusic, “Here’s what happened when a city sold their pride march,” n.p.

¹¹⁵ P. Mtetwa, “The speech you didn’t hear at Joburg Pride,” in *Exit*, November 2009, p. 2.

committee and the LGBTIAQ “community” to not “lose sight of these realities.”¹¹⁶ Mtetwa argued for a challenging of the commercialised nature of Joburg Pride because it comes to “hide the struggles” faced by the majority of LGBTIAQ South Africans.¹¹⁷ Despite this call, Pride organisers failed to integrate or respond to these issues.

While South Africa has one of the most progressive constitutions globally, being one of the first to protect lesbian and gay rights and extending same-sex marriage to lesbian and gay people, these constitutional freedoms are not necessarily reflected in the lived realities of the majority of citizens.¹¹⁸ The increased visibility of LGBTIAQ people creates the false sense that homophobia no longer exists or has been drastically reduced. However, as discussed in chapter one, homophobic violence is a daily occurrence for many LGBTIAQ South Africans with 14.9 percent of black lesbian women acknowledging having been raped.¹¹⁹ It must be noted that there is no way of knowing what the actual statistics for hate crimes are because of underreporting and the absence of a separate crime register to record the incidence of homophobia based hate crimes.¹²⁰

After 2000 hate crimes became a major issue affecting the LGBTIAQ “community”. Primary targets were, and still are, lesbian and bisexual women, and transgender men.¹²¹ Phamodi writes of the increase in attacks against “lesbian women in townships” in South Africa and how the nature of these attacks include assault, rape and murder.¹²² Phamodi argues that sexual violence has become a central point of interest in media coverage with the emergence of the term “corrective rape.”¹²³ The term was developed by human rights organisations in the early 2000s to explain and attempt to name this specific form of homophobia related rape

¹¹⁶ Mtetwa, “The speech you didn’t hear at Joburg Pride,” p. 2.

¹¹⁷ Ibid.

¹¹⁸ F. Reygan and A. Lynette, “Heteronormativity, homophobia and ‘culture’ arguments in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa,” in *Sexualities*, Vol 17 (5/6), 2014, pp 707 – 723. Accessed 12 May 2017. p. 719.

¹¹⁹ J. Teal and M. Conover-Williams, “Homophobia without Homophobes: Deconstructing the Public Discourses of 21st Century Queer Sexualities in the United States,” in *Humboldt Journal of Social Relations*, Vol 38, 2016, p. 18; Thoreson, “Somewhere over the Rainbow Nation: Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Activism in South Africa,” p. 695.

¹²⁰ Thoreson, “Somewhere over the Rainbow Nation: Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Activism in South Africa,” p. 695; H. Wells and L. Polders, “Anti-Gay Hate Crimes in South Africa: Prevalence, Reporting Practices, and Experiences of the Police,” in *African Feminisms* Vol 2 (3), 2006, p. 22.

¹²¹ One in Nine Campaign, copy of the leaflet distributed at Joburg Pride 2012.

¹²² Sekoetlaene Jacob Phamodi, “Interrogating the Notion of ‘Corrective Rape’ in Contemporary Public and Media Discourse,” <http://www.ngopulse.org/article/interrogating-notion-%E2%80%99corrective-rape%E2%80%99-contemporary-public-and-media-discourse>, 2011, n.p.

¹²³ Ibid.

and assault. The term has come to be highly contested due to its multiple interpretations which are dependent upon the context in which it is used. The term is widely used in public discourse to describe sexual violence against the LGBTIAQ “community” with the intention of punishing them or attempting to “correct” their perceived sexual deviance.¹²⁴ However, in its attempt to contextualise the action of rapists, the concept comes to further other those who are the targets of this form of violence.¹²⁵ It does this through emphasising the “correcting” action of rapists which stresses the “other” aspect of the victim or survivor’s identity instead of focusing on the “hate” or prejudice and discrimination which informed the behaviour of the rapist.

Hate crimes, Van Zyl argues, are “the ultimate weapon of heteropatriarchy.”¹²⁶ Homophobia and homophobic violence are a means of regulating and policing the queer body through heteromascularity and the fear of violence.¹²⁷ However, violence is not limited to queer bodies because “even women who conform to hegemonic femininities get raped.”¹²⁸ Therefore, the rape of lesbians and gender non-conforming people must be situated within the broader context of rape in South Africa. The reason for this violence is not simply the sexuality or gender identity of the queer individuals targeted but rather “stems from how masculinities and, consequently, femininities are constructed and expressed within a heterosexist and patriarchal gender-order.”¹²⁹ This perspective facilitates an understanding of “corrective rape” as intertwined with heteronormative and heteromascularity values. In light of this, the focus needs to be on addressing not only homophobia but also heteromascularity. In particular there is a need to address the ways in which heteromascularity constructs subjects who feel and believe that they have a right to control the bodies of those they perceive to be other. It is necessary to frame the violence experienced by LGBTIAQ people of colour as situated within interlocking systems of heteromascularity, homophobia, sexism and

¹²⁴ Phamodi, “Interrogating the Notion of ‘Corrective Rape’ in Contemporary Public and Media Discourse,” n.p.

¹²⁵ Ibid.

¹²⁶ Van Zyl, “A Sexual Politics of Belonging: Same-Sex Marriage in Post-Apartheid South Africa,” pp. 259-60.

¹²⁷ Phamodi, “Interrogating the Notion of ‘Corrective Rape’ in Contemporary Public and Media Discourse,” n.p.

¹²⁸ Van Zyl, “A Sexual Politics of Belonging: Same-Sex Marriage in Post-Apartheid South Africa,” pp. 259-60.

¹²⁹ Phamodi, “Interrogating the Notion of ‘Corrective Rape’ in Contemporary Public and Media Discourse,” n.p.

racism, which operate together to control and violate people who are perceived to be non-normative.¹³⁰

As highlighted by the One in Nine Campaign, and evidenced by ongoing hate crimes against the LGBTIAQ “community”, Joburg Pride had very little reason to be apolitical. The reality is that many LGBTIAQ persons, primarily LGBTIAQ people of colour who are more often than not lesbians and transgender persons, face physical and sexual violence, and are often murdered because of persistent homophobia and transphobia. Rights on paper do not necessarily translate into protections, when little has been done to address cultures of homophobia and transphobia. In fact, if there is little public education happening at local, provincial or national levels, then the onus is on a major LGBTIAQ event such as Joburg Pride to drive the politicisation, education, and awareness of LGBTIAQ South Africans. In 2007 there was a minor attempt at Joburg Pride, before the parade, to recognise that hate crimes were effecting the “community”. A moment of silence was observed to “mark the recent brutal murder of two lesbians in Meadowlands, as well as acknowledging all victims of hate-crimes.”¹³¹ This helped to inject a political focus into the event. However this focus was not sufficiently substantial or urgent and the Parade continued on its usual path, and the space was not used to mobilise against hate crimes.¹³² Although Pride has the potential to be a political vehicle and to rally for real change for the majority of LGBTIAQ South Africans, it continuously fails to take up this the role because of the direction leaders and organisers of Joburg Pride continue to take; a direction that positions the political and “the activist part” as a dispensable part of Pride.

Hate crimes and violence against LGBTIAQ bodies ought to be enough to motivate for the bringing of focus and attention from the margins into the centre, the making visible of marginalised identities and the striving to recognise and protect these identities in public and private spaces. In a context where the desire is to belong, to present as “same”, and where the emphasis is on the marketability of Joburg Pride, there is very little awareness of and

¹³⁰ Phamodi, “Interrogating the Notion of ‘Corrective Rape’ in Contemporary Public and Media Discourse,” n.p; S. Selvick, “Positive Bleeding: Violence and Desire in Works by Mlu Zondi, Zanele Muholi, and Makhosazana Xaba, in *Safundi*, Vol 16(4), 2015, pp. 445-6.

¹³¹ Unknown author, “Coming of age: Joburg Pride 2007: A new kind of Pride,” in *Exit*, September 2007, p.28.

¹³² *Ibid.*

space for those who do not conform or assimilate.¹³³ Through their protest, the One in Nine Campaign brought into question Joburg Pride's relevance, which had over the years become increasingly depoliticised and commercial. As a result of this, Pride had come to marginalise people on the basis of race and class.¹³⁴

The predominantly white and middle-class organising committee members of Joburg did not appear to understand or want to engage with the need for the "activist" part, for Pride to have a political focus in order to be able to mobilise the LGBTIQA "community" around important issues. This failure to understand or engage can perhaps be understood in relation to the committee members' experiences of whiteness.¹³⁵ White is, as Dyer writes, to be "normal" to have one's experience read as the default or standard experience.¹³⁶ This is particularly pertinent when one looks at South Africa under apartheid; a nation that was governed by whiteness, that privileged white experience, and actively implemented a system of othering of all bodies outside of the white body.¹³⁷ Apartheid discourse and laws constructed the white body and experience as superior and naturally deserving of this position. This "naturalising" of the white position as dominant (through both implicit and explicit policing), could be a core reason for the depoliticisation of Pride in that the white organisers did not take into consideration experiences outside of whiteness. They, in being white, may view themselves as outside of race, regard their worldview as universal, and thus assume that everyone else in the LGBTIAQ community experiences the world this way. White LGBTIAQ South Africans, while facing discrimination with regards to gender and sexual identity still hold a position of privilege in South Africa. With access to legal protection, wealth and other privileges that come with being white and middle-class in South Africa, it is no surprise that many buy into the discourse of "it's all fine". This is an example of how "rights only benefit social elites and a privileged few."¹³⁸ Violence against members of the LGBTIAQ "community" who do not have access to such privileges persists and thus to organise a Pride

¹³³ M. Huber, "Revisiting places of queer crisis," in *Spheres: Journal for Digital Cultures*. Vol 1 (1), 2014, p. 1, at <http://spheres-journal.org/revisiting-places-of-queer-crisis/>.

¹³⁴ Van Vuuren and Khan, "Grappling with Gauteng's Pride Problem," n.p.

¹³⁵ M. Steyn, "White Talk," in A.J. Lopez (Ed), *Postcolonial Whiteness: A Critical Reader on Race and Empire*, Albany NY: State University of New York Press, 2005, p. 121.

¹³⁶ R. Dyer, *White: Essays on Race and Culture*. Abingdon: Routledge, 1997.

¹³⁷ N. Falkof, *The end of whiteness: Satanism and family murder in late apartheid South Africa*, Jacana, South Africa, 2016; Steyn, "White Talk."

¹³⁸ One in Nine Campaign, copy of the leaflet distributed at Joburg Pride 2012.

event such as Joburg Pride without a political focus, which ignores the lived experiences of the majority of South Africans is deeply problematic.

3.6. Conclusion

Joburg Pride, Africa's first Pride event, and the South African LGBTIAQ "community's" central defiant moment in 1990 had its roots in the political. From the *Exit* articles and interviews presented above it appears there were multiple opportunities to return to these roots, by acknowledging the violence and hate crimes perpetrated against LGBTIAQ bodies. Joburg Pride had the potential to integrate a politicised agenda and take a political stance. However, those in positions of power within the organising committee in their desire to gain sponsors and to make Pride financially viable, disregarded this "activist part". This focus on commercialisation and assimilation leaves very limited space for the political and social change.¹³⁹

It is argued that the endeavour to commercialise Joburg Pride overshadowed the need to engage with hate crimes affecting the LGBTIAQ "community". As Pride was increasingly treated "as a business" up until 2012, "the activist part" was side-lined or not considered by the organisers. Instead, Pride became an entertainment-focused event. In becoming increasingly commercialised, focusing on attracting sponsors and being driven by financial incentives, Pride, and social movements at large, are depoliticised and lose their potential to be transgressive spaces.¹⁴⁰ This "desire" to be appealing and to be presented as "safe" for brands and companies speaks to assimilationist politics, where those on the margins are ignored and obscured by the formation of a collective and "safe" identity which cannot accommodate nuanced ways of being. It appears that this was a primary motivation for the One in Nine Campaign protestors, to disrupt Joburg Pride 2012 in order to make visible its depoliticisation, its commercialisation and the fact that it was no longer serving the LGBTIAQ "community".

¹³⁹ Huber, "Revisiting places of queer crisis," p. 1.

¹⁴⁰ Stella, "Queer Space, Pride, and Shame in Moscow," pp. 461-2; Ghaziani and Fine, "Infighting and Ideology: How Conflict Informs the Local Culture of the Chicago DykeMarch," p. 51; Ghaziani, "Post-Gay Collective Identity Construction," pp. 99-125; Bernstein, "Celebration and Suppression: The Strategic Uses of Identity by the Lesbian and Gay Movement," pp. 535-565.

The significance of the commercialisation of Joburg Pride and the One in Nine Campaign's attempt to disrupt this, needs to be situated within the context of inequality in South African society. The disruption brought sharply into view the hairline fractures that exist not only within Joburg Pride and the LGBTIAQ "community", but also in broader South African society. The violence of commercialisation is extremely political in that it establishes and aggressively maintains distinct hierarchies. The commercialisation of Pride, and the subsequent homogenisation of a diverse "community", comes to obscure the marginalisation and poverty experienced by the majority of South Africans of colour.¹⁴¹ Nath states that "it is not news that capitalism is inherently opposed to diversity and equity, and that a politics based on identity seeks to flatten difference among us and erase those of us who are not gay in the approved way."¹⁴² The One in Nine Campaign protest aimed to make visible the assimilationist politics within the "community", where "the urge to fit into this normalisation is so high, that a minor deviance from the course is a violent threat."¹⁴³ This violence within the "community" raises further questions about issues of community, assimilation, and whether Joburg Pride is in fact for the LGBTIAQ "community". These issues are further explored in chapter four.

¹⁴¹ Nath, "Gay Pride is political." n.p.

¹⁴² Nath, "Gay Pride is political." n.p.

¹⁴³ Huber, "Revisiting places of queer crisis," p. 2.

CHAPTER FOUR: “COMMUNITY” AND ASSIMILATION

4.1. Introduction

The 2012 Joburg Pride clash made visible the divisions within the LGBTIAQ community, as well as the ways in which these divisions mirrored fault lines in broader society. These divisions revealed the way that Pride did not exist as a singular or unified “community”. For example, the organisers of Joburg Pride catered to their particular conception of the “community” by running Pride “like a business,” rather than as a platform for activism. Within the context of divergent conceptions of “community” the sense of belonging that is encapsulated or invoked through the term comes to be meaningless. This chapter aims to explore the way in which “community” has been conceptualised within the context of Joburg Pride, be it as imagined or as a myth, and how different conceptions of “community” serve different political agendas. This chapter also explores how the LGBTIAQ “community” is situated within the broader “community” of South Africa.

In 2006 Trengove-Jones noted that contestations regarding the definition of Pride were ultimately “disputes that reveal the fault lines and hidden structural dynamics in the conceptions of ‘community’.”¹ They continue to explain that the differences among LGBTIAQ people “remain too vast” for the formation of a “community” and that simply because participants or members of the LGBTIAQ community may have “emotional and physical ties to those of the same sex” that this does not automatically result in the formation of a community.² This notion of a disparate collection of people, and whether or not they constitute a community, is of particular interest to this chapter. An analysis of both *Exit* and interview data suggests that the existence of a South African LGBTIAQ “community” is disputed and that the 2012 moment represented an explicit contestation of the notion of Pride as a unified “community”. This chapter interrogates whether Pride can be considered a “community”, be it a temporary or a more durable one. Further, this chapter aims to understand the ties between “community” and assimilation and, in particular, to explore whether the conception of Pride as a community serves an assimilationist agenda of

¹ T. Trengove-Jones, “Talking Pride Once Again”, *Exit*, June 2006, p. 4.

² *Ibid.*

presenting the LGBTIAQ community as the “same” or “not different” to the rest of South Africa.

4.2. Defining Community

“Community” is a central theme that emerged from the content analysis of the *Exit* articles. The term “community” was originally developed to refer to a particular geography or shared physical space and “communities” were thus understood as geographically bound.³ Over time, with the introduction of modernity, whereby travel beyond one’s geographic “community” became possible, the definition of “community” has been extended to a network or organisation of long standing and constant relationships among people who share a foundation of common values.⁴ Members may hold diverse worldviews but their common base of shared values and activities serve to affirm and maintain the relationships established within the group.⁵ Collective or group identity can be a “powerful social mechanism” that shapes the reality that members share; their sense of unity, solidarity and belonging, and the shared values and views that they hold.⁶

In the LGBTIAQ “community”, the concept is more complex. It may be both a geographical and a political “community”, formed around sexual identity politics. Being part of this “community” may provide members with a sense of belonging and collective identity. This sense of belonging and collective identity can be seen to be essential for the affirmation of LGBTIAQ identities who are discriminated against by broader society on the basis of their sexual identity.⁷ In the case of LGBTIAQ individuals, this common struggle for recognition of sexual identity and the manner in which they are treated by hetero- and cisnormative⁸ society provides motivation for “community” development and subsequent political organising. It is

³ F. Cosson, “Voice of the community? Reflections on accessing, working with and representing communities,” in *Oral History*, Vol 38 (2), 2010, p. 96.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ T.L. Cooper, “Building Ethical Community,” in *The American Review of Public Administration*, Vol 41 (1), 2011, p. 5.

⁶ O. David and D. Bar-Tal, “A Sociopsychological Conception of Collective Identity: The Case of National Identity as an Example,” in *Personality and Social Psychology Review*. Vol 13, 2009, p. 373.

⁷ Cosson, “Voice of the community? Reflections on accessing, working with and representing communities,” p. 96.

⁸ Cisnormative is the position that all people experience their lives as cisgender, the term was developed to “better capture the systemic nature of transgender people’s marginalization than transphobia.” (C.H. Logie, L.L. James, W. Tharao, M.R. Loutfy, “‘We don’t exist’: a qualitative study of marginalization experienced by HIV-positive lesbian, bisexual, queer and transgender women in Toronto, Canada,” in *Journal of the International AIDS Society*. Vol 15 (2), 2012, np.)

a sense of belonging garnered from a common struggle that speaks to the notion of collective identity. Shared experiences tie individuals together in a collective identity, for example as in the case of LGBTIAQ people who are discriminated against.⁹ However, in the development of the collective identity some identities may come to be excluded, and consequently when considering the LGBTIAQ “community” it is necessary to consider who is excluded and included in this formation in South Africa.¹⁰ The analysis highlights the way in which LGBTIAQ people share an experience of “othered” sexual identity. However, this shared experience is often emphasised at the cost of interrogating the intersecting violences experienced by certain LGBTIAQ South Africans.¹¹

A politically conceived or politically motivated community can perhaps only ever be fleeting and occur in moments when mobilisation for change or action is required. This is an example of how the purpose of the “community” changes according to the context in which the “community” and its needs are situated. An analysis of the *Exit* articles shows that although many people may identify as lesbian, bisexual, transgender, queer, or any of the identities under the LGBTIAQ umbrella, they may not feel a sense of belonging or affiliation with the LGBTIAQ “community” itself. This may be because their needs, political, emotional or other, may not be addressed by the broader LGBTIAQ “community” and so their sense of belonging is diminished.¹²

In *Exit*, the concept of “community” is discussed as “suggest[ing] cohesion, belonging, a stay against definitional confusion.”¹³ Community is constructed as emphasising shared purpose and unity. This version of “community”, a cohesive “community” that becomes a reprieve or brace against “definitional confusion,” is presented as what is desired by the LGBTIAQ “community”. Below I explore how “community” is referred to and discussed in *Exit* as imagined; deployed strategically; or as a part of assimilationist politics.

⁹ K.M. Bruce, “LGBT Pride as a Cultural Protest Tactic in a Southern City,” in *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, Vol 42 (5), 2013, p. 626; R. Dimitrova, A. Chasiotis, M. Bender, and F.J.R. Van de Vijver, “From a Collection of Identities to Collective Identity: Evidence from Mainstream and Minority Adolescents in Bulgaria,” in *Cross-Cultural Research*, Vol 48 (4), 2014, p. 340.

¹⁰ N. Gal, L. Shifman and Z. Kampf, “‘It gets better’: Internet memes and the construction of collective identity,” in *new media & society*, Vol 18(8), 2016, p. 1699.

¹¹ S. De Waal and A. Manion, *Pride: Protest and Celebration*. Fanele: Johannesburg, 2006, p. 9.

¹² Cosson, “Voice of the community? Reflections on accessing, working with and representing communities,” p. 96.

¹³ T. Trengove-Jones, “Pride and the Party Animal,” in *Exit*, November 2000, p. 13.

4.3. Community: Imagined and Chimerical

The first Joburg Pride in 1990 called for participants to march under the theme of “unity in the community.”¹⁴ Tanya Harford describes the sense of “community” of the early 1990s as “just amazing;” there was a sense of “togetherness of the gays and the gay men and lesbian women,” that they “were all together.”¹⁵ However, they also spoke about how over time this sense of community and togetherness “seem[ed] to have disappeared.”¹⁶ They go on to argue that this was simply “the natural progression of things: I’m gay, so get over it.”¹⁷ This perspective on the dwindling of a sense of “community” is one rooted in privilege. This is because privilege (for example whiteness and middle-classness) protects individuals from certain kinds of violence, for example corrective rape, and therefore they are able to overlook these types of violence. Such a position is problematic as it dismisses the lived realities of the majority of LGBTIAQ South Africans. Further, as we have seen above, when Harford speaks of the community, they speak of it as the gay “community” or the gay and lesbian “community”: “gay men and lesbian women.”¹⁸ They do not make mention of the full range of LGBTIAQ identities. It is concerning that a leader within the “community” may disregard or simply does not consider bisexual, transgender, intersex, asexual or queer identities when they speak of “community”. This is an example characterised by exclusionary and hierarchical power relations.

What emerges from *Exit* content analysed is that “community” is a very loose concept, one that is overused but not critically interrogated. Through this over, or thoughtless use, the meaning or significance of “community” is diluted. Of particular interest is Trengove-Jones’ interrogation of the notion of community in *Exit* and their reference to the community as imagined, “chimerical,”¹⁹ or “a chimerical entity.”²⁰ A chimerical entity is something which is fantastical or exists only in the imagination but still has the potential to be a powerful symbolic force through providing a sense of belonging to its members. It can be deployed to create the

¹⁴ Lesbian and Gay Pride Committee, “Unity in the Community” poster, *Exit* September, October 1990, p. 16.

¹⁵ T. Harford, interview with the researcher, Johannesburg (Skype), 25 January 2016

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ T. Trengove-Jones, “Is Joburg’s Pride mainly in vain?” *Exit* October 2001, p. 10.

²⁰ T. Trengove-Jones, “W(h)ither Pride?” *Exit* November 2001, p. 4.

sense that a cohesive group exists. Here, Trengove-Jones speaks to the idea of the “community” as imagined but also as constructed through a social or collective agreement in order to serve a particular function.

In 2008 Trengove-Jones returns to this idea that the LGBT community in South Africa is a “chimerical community,” arguing that “an annual coagulation of disparate beings does not a community make.”²¹ Their position interrogates the use of “community” as a binding concept, especially among people who are divided along multiple lines, including political ideology. In 2001 they also made a similar argument, writing that in a society as divided as South Africa, “the imagined quality [of the community] crumbles in the face of actual facts.”²² They argue that the differences and divisions in South Africa are explicit and that one would need to be oblivious or ignorant to not be aware of these when attending Joburg Pride or as a citizen living in South Africa.²³ Similarly to Harford, they suggest that obtaining legal rights for the LGBTIAQ “community” in South Africa resulted in the disintegration of a political cause to rally around.²⁴

This chapter explores this notion of the “community” as a common cause to gather and mobilise around. It argues that without this the differences and disparities among members of the “community” are more visible. Trengove-Jones asks readers when they “look around at the motley crew” whether they “experience a horrible sense of loneliness.”²⁵ They explain that this sense of loneliness is as a result of the myth that participants at Joburg Pride have anything in common with each other. Trengove-Jones calls this myth a “fraudulent claim” and argues that it is becoming more obvious with every passing year of Pride.²⁶ The concept of “myth” is important for interrogating of the notion of a “community,” in particular when paired with Anderson’s notion of an “imagined political community.”²⁷ Anderson suggests that nations are imagined because they consist of people who have a sense of belonging or unity with one another, despite the probability that they will never meet. This concept was

²¹ T. Trengove Jones, “Pride: The Politics of the Party,” *Exit* November 2008, p. 12

²² Trengove-Jones, “Is Joburg’s Pride mainly in vain?” p. 10.

²³ *Ibid.*

²⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁷ B. Anderson, *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*, London: Verso, 1983, p. 4.

originally conceived of as in relation to the construction of the nation but can be extended to the notion of the Pride “community” as it is unlikely that all members of the “community” will ever meet but they appear to have a sense of belonging to the collective. This sense of belonging makes possible certain actions. For instance, the idea that a “community” must work together or present a “united front” when facing injustice or fighting for equal rights. An example of this is the very first theme of Joburg Pride, “unity in the community.” However, this notion of “community” does not account for the diverse ways social groups shift over time.

Pride is written of as needing “the participation of the gay public,” and that it can only be experienced by being there.²⁸ Pride is thought and spoken of as a “community” event and in *Exit* an unknown author requests that the party aspect, the politics, the protests, the business and the lifestyle need to be accommodated by the event.²⁹ This is a call for Pride to consider the various needs of the “community”. Another article question whether Pride “is a separate organisation to you and your life” or whether it can be seen as “belonging to the whole community.”³⁰ The author continues to explain that those who organised and volunteered at Joburg Pride in 2001 believed that Pride “belongs to the whole community,” and that anyone could be involved with the planning and organising of the event.³¹ However it appears that this argument is not in fact about building a sense of “community” but rather about avoiding criticism. This is because the author goes on to write that “if [Pride] comes off badly then it is the whole community or the very lack of a sense of community that is at fault.”³² They go on to address those who criticise the event, writing that “you are the community, doll, you are Pride.”³³ Here we see the shifting of “community” ownership in order to shift blame from organisers to those who are part of the “community” but did not participate in organising the event. Therefore, the call to involve the “community” is not really a call to create a different or more inclusive “community”. The notion of the Pride “community” thus remains uninterrogated.

²⁸ Unknown author, “Gay Pride,” *Exit*, June July 1988, p. 2.

²⁹ Unknown author, “Whither Joburg Pride?,” *Exit*, May 2013, p. 1.

³⁰ Unknown author, “Letter,” *Exit*, November 2001, p. 2.

³¹ *Ibid.*

³² *Ibid.*

³³ *Ibid.*

In 2003 Evert Knoessen wrote that Pride was a “community” affair that “belongs to the community.”³⁴ However, unlike the previous author, they use this as a call for the “community” to have a say in how Joburg Pride should be organised and what form it should take. Knoessen claims that those involved in the organising of Pride confuse the “community” with their messaging and representation of Joburg Pride and this serves to detract from Pride’s core message. They argue that the organisers do this explicitly and strategically in order to “drive an ever widening gap between the community and its ownership of PRIDE.”³⁵ Here Joburg Pride is clearly positioned as belonging to the “community” and needing “community” input. There is also a clear dissatisfaction with the way it had been organised up to this point. In order to address this Knoessen proposes that the LGBTIAQ “community” rebuilds Joburg Pride to be inclusive of as many of its members as possible. They propose that Joburg Pride remain under “community” ownership, and that its leadership be publically elected in order to ensure it is representative of the “community”. They also ask that the political emphasis of Joburg Pride is reintroduced in order that “Pride be given back some meaning.”³⁶ Here we see a contrast to the previous approach of involving the “community” with regards to the organising of Joburg Pride. One approach is defensive and reactive and the other critical and proactive.

However, Trengove-Jones challenges the notion of a “community based initiative” and “community” ownership of Pride.³⁷ They write that there can be no such thing as a “community” based initiative because “there is no such thing as a gay community.”³⁸ This, they hold, is the “same reason it is not possible for a ‘community to take ownership’ of the event.”³⁹ They appear to hold that there is no unified “community”, and thus it is not possible for the “community” to organise or own Pride. In considering the LGBTIAQ “community” then it is important to consider whether this notion washes over differences or whether it creates space for the expression of all identities.

³⁴ E. Knoessen, “Has Pride become meaningless?” *Exit* December 2003, January 2004, p. 5.

³⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁶ *Ibid.*

³⁷ T. Trengove-Jones, “Talking Pride Once Again”, *Exit*, June 2006. 2006, p. 4.

³⁸ *Ibid.*

³⁹ *Ibid.*

Joburg Pride has the potential to provide a space for members of the LGBTIAQ “community” to feel supported and affirmed by being around those who are similar to them.⁴⁰ Pride events can create a sense of belonging, solidarity, and “community”.⁴¹ However, I want to explore whether, based on the definition of a “community” as constituted by shared identity and a sense of belonging, Pride can, itself, be considered a “community”. The reason for this is that there appears to be another idea of “community” that seems to exist among the Joburg Pride organising committee, one that, while it may bring together different identities and experiences for a moment in time, does not seem to serve all LGBTIAQ identities or expressions. To explore this idea, this chapter now turns to Fine and Van Den Scott’s notion of “wispy communities.”⁴²

4.4. Wispy Communities

Joburg Pride may be better thought of as a wispy community and considered to be its own “community” that is separate from the South African LGBTIAQ “community”. Its wispieness is due to it being a moment, an event or a gathering, and not a fixed and consistent “community” formation. The concept of wispy communities is adapted from Anderson’s concept of the imagined community and are defined as “worlds of action that are temporary,” limited to a set time and space.⁴³ In their commitment to the event or gathering for the moment of its existence, participants come to create a temporary “community”.⁴⁴

Fine and Van Den Scott divide wispy communities into two categories: events and gatherings. An event is a short-term gathering in which participants “share a space without expecting to develop lasting ties.”⁴⁵ It is not organised in order to develop a sense of “community”, although it can come to be a “memory marker” for participants.⁴⁶ Important to note here is that there is no expectation of developing a sense of “community”. This may not be the case with Joburg Pride where the idea of “community” is often invoked. However, this idea of

⁴⁰ Bruce, “LGBT Pride as a Cultural Protest Tactic in a Southern City,” p. 627

⁴¹ Ibid. p. 626.

⁴² G.A. Fine and L.J. Van Den Scott, “Wispy Communities: Transient gatherings and imagined micro-communities,” in *American Behavioural Scientist*, Vol 55 (10), 2011, p. 1319.

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ Ibid. p. 1320.

⁴⁵ Fine and Van Den Scott, “Wispy Communities: Transient gatherings and imagined micro-communities,” p. 1326.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

“community” may be invoked carelessly or only for the moment of the event, and then disappears from thought until the following year. The second form of wispy community is a gathering. Gatherings occur less frequently and it is the “interpersonal satisfactions” that participants gain from the gathering that “provide the interactional glue that then generates the imagined community.”⁴⁷ Gatherings, Fine and Van Den Scott explain, are more closely aligned with festivals such as music festivals, for example, Woodstock, lasting over a few days. After the gathering the participants leave the space to go back to their lives without any expectations that relationships or bonds developed during the gathering will be maintained outside of that space.⁴⁸

Joburg Pride, being an annual occurrence that lasts the duration of a day, would fall best within the category of “event”. Occurring often on a weekend day, it does not always need “special arrangements” unless participants are travelling to the event. Fine and Van Den Scott argue that the “community” that is formed during events or gathering are both material and imagined.⁴⁹ Events and gathering provide some sense of identity but this sense is not presumed to be permanent or sustainable outside of the event or gathering. Social interaction is a feature of events, through which the community is formed.⁵⁰ What is important to note is that events, such as Pride, are socially constructed, planned and not spontaneous. Rather, they are “social practices where dominant meanings are promoted, negotiated and sometimes strongly resisted.”⁵¹ Events do not occur in isolation, they take place within specific social and political contexts and so these spaces are not neutral. Instead they can be characterised by exclusion and inclusion of those deemed acceptable to attend. Singh writes that rather than being a true reflection and representation of the LGBTIAQ “community”, Pride events are “rare displays of solidarity” in a “community” troubled by divisions based on

⁴⁷ Fine and Van Den Scott, “Wispy Communities: Transient gatherings and imagined micro-communities,” p. 1326.

⁴⁸ Ibid. p. 1327.

⁴⁹ Ibid. pp. 1331-2.

⁵⁰ L. Wilks, “Introduction,” in G. Richards, M.P. De Brito, and L. Wilks, *Exploring the social impacts of events*, Routledge: London and New York, 2013, p. 1.

⁵¹ B. Quinn and L. Wilks, “Festival connections: people, place and social capital,” in G. Richards, M.P. De Brito, and L. Wilks, *Exploring the social impacts of events*, Routledge: London and New York, 2013, p. 17.

race, gender and class.⁵² These displays of solidarity are temporary and tend to dissolve after the Pride event has passed.

As discussed, Joburg Pride can be considered a wispy community given that it is an annual occurrence, limited to a single day of the year. Further, wispy communities are described as “domains of entertainment and sociability,” where participants come to be convinced that those around them are also invested in “fun” such as is seen with the commercial and festive formation of Joburg Pride.⁵³ Thus participants are provided with “a transitory sense” of being part of group.⁵⁴ A wispy community is expected to deliver “a surplus of fun,” that comes to be ingrained in the memories and stories that participants share after the event or gathering.⁵⁵ The worldviews of the participants come to be influenced and shaped by the transitory and wispy community. Alongside fun, the event is also supposed to provide an escape from everyday life. Lakhani speaks to this in an interview when they mention that they understood the need for fun in the LGBTIAQ “community” given that lived experiences are so fraught with trauma and difficulty.⁵⁶ However, they also note that this is not enough of a reason to disregard the political significance of Pride.⁵⁷ Here Lakhani suggests that there is a need for an event that is inclusive of the variety of lived experiences and creates the space to discuss and rally around the violence experienced by members of the LGBTIAQ “community”. Therefore, the political and entertainment aspects do not need to be mutually exclusive; it is possible to have an event that emphasises both the “fun” and the political. Joburg Pride could provide such a space if it actively encouraged all expressions of identity and lived experience.

In considering Joburg Pride as an event, the concept of the wispy community offers an opportunity to reconstruct how “community” is considered. In the context of Joburg Pride, in catering to the participants who gather for the parade, Pride may not fulfil the needs of the majority of South African LGBTIAQ people. Thus, Pride fails to achieve what is desired by LGBTIAQ South Africans, because it is constructed by organisers as an event in which

⁵² S. Singh, “Overcoming heteronormative hegemony: queer resistance to neoliberalism in Chile,” Master’s thesis, National University of Singapore, Singapore, 2015, p. 2.

⁵³ Fine and Van Den Scott, “Wispy Communities: Transient gatherings and imagined micro-communities,” p. 1322.

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ Ibid. p. 1323.

⁵⁶ I. Lakhani, interview with the researcher, Cape Town, 9 February 2016.

⁵⁷ Ibid.

participants establish a temporary sense of cohesiveness and collective belonging. In the moment of the event's existence, the imagined "community" can be considered to be a "tiny public," and participants can feel a sense of unity with each other.⁵⁸ They come to bond through the sharing of their experiences and establish a narrative bond which allows for the development of a "we."⁵⁹

Ghaziani writes that the subsequent sense of belonging, of the group or the "we", is constituted through boundaries which come to mark who is an insider and who is an outsider.⁶⁰ It is this "we" that is of concern to this study, because as Mbhele argues, there is "no such thing as an LGBT community," but rather there exists "a collection of communities."⁶¹ Taking this and Ghaziani's argument that boundaries mark who belongs to a "community", it may be argued that Joburg Pride serves only one "community" of LGBTIAQ experience out of the "collection of communities"; one that caters to white and affluent LGBTIAQ South Africans. This means that this Joburg Pride "community" fails to respond to the needs of South African LGBTIAQ people broadly, particularly in relation to multiple points of oppression, because these experiences lie outside of Pride's conception of "community". If Joburg Pride wishes to serve South African LGBTIAQ people more broadly, then it would need to reconceptualise its concept of "community".

An alternative conception of "community" is offered by Cooper's concept of an "ethical community."⁶² An ethical community "take[s] seriously the relativity of cultures," as well as matters of diversity and lived experiences.⁶³ Cooper explains that ethical community is not about agreeing on matters of social justice for instance but rather it is a community in which members openly discuss and reflect on the areas in their lives that are interdependent.⁶⁴ An ethical community, in the context of South Africa, would dismiss the notion that there exists

⁵⁸ Fine and Van Den Scott, "Wispy Communities: Transient gatherings and imagined micro-communities," p. 1324.

⁵⁹ K. Eder, "A Theory of Collective Identity Making Sense of the Debate on a 'European Identity,'" in *European Journal of Social Theory*, Vol 12 (4), 2009, p. 431.

⁶⁰ A. Ghaziani, "Post-Gay Collective Identity Construction," in *Social Problems*. Vol. 58(1), 2011, p. 101.

⁶¹ Z. Mbhele, interview with the researcher, Cape Town, 18 November 2016.

⁶² Cooper, "Building Ethical Community," p. 10

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ Ibid. p. 11.

a singular or essential gay identity that is easily digestible and marketable.⁶⁵ It would further be inclusive in its consideration of the intersecting identities and aspects of its members' lives and draw attention to overlapping matters of justice, such as issues of poverty, employment, and access to water and land. This notion of an ethical community can be seen to be aligned with the One in Nine Campaign's disruption of Joburg Pride in 2012. Although perhaps not explicitly articulated in this way, the campaign called attention to the wispy nature of the Pride community by highlighting the false or fleeting sense of belonging that the event facilitated for certain LGBTIAQ people.

Linked to the idea of the ethical community, Gevisser and Cameron note that long-lasting acceptance of the LGBTIAQ "community" is only possible if the "community" were fully "acknowledged in all our complexity."⁶⁶ They continue that this would be facilitated by LGBTIAQ "community" itself embracing its diversity and complexity, and until then it cannot hope that broader society would do what it cannot yet do itself.⁶⁷ Ethical community presents an opportunity to embrace diversity and complex intersecting identities and experiences. Therefore, it holds the potential for constituting a new Pride "community". This concept is returned to in chapter seven.

The next sections seeks to explore how community was deployed strategically by Joburg Pride and the broader South African LGBTIAQ community. In particular, this section explores the Bill of Rights, the Equality Clause, and the Civil Union Act, and how these influenced the formation of the Joburg Pride community.

4.5. Community as Strategic

The idea of a "community" was strong in 1990 and during other moments when the "community" was battling for legal recognition. In this section the study investigates the way in which the formation or sense of "community" was strategically employed. For example, how the "community" was employed to present a unified front in order to gain weight or

⁶⁵ M. Gevisser and E. Cameron, *Defiant Desire: gay and lesbian lives in South Africa*. Ravan Press: Braamfontein, 1994, p. 12.

⁶⁶ M. Gevisser and E. Cameron, *Defiant Desire: gay and lesbian lives in South Africa*, Ravan Press: Braamfontein, 1994, pp. 12-3

⁶⁷ Ibid.

political strength to push for recognition, such as the case with the Equality Clause and Civil Union Act. A group may be motivated to take up a political position by a sense of common experiences and shared circumstances, such as was the case with the South African LGBTIAQ “community” in challenging discriminatory laws and lobbying for legal recognition.⁶⁸ Judge writes of how the LGBTIAQ movement came to expand politically when its primary focus was on seeking equality, recognition and legal protections.⁶⁹ In citing Bernstein they speak of identity deployment for the purposes of strategic action, whereby identity is used strategically to bring about social transformation.⁷⁰ The achievement of the Equality Clause in the South African Constitution (Bill of Rights) and the Civil Union Act can be seen as two key moments in South African LGBTIAQ politics. These examples are discussed below.

In 2000 Trengove-Jones asked what “might now constitute so grand a thing as a shared vision”⁷¹ for the LGBTIAQ “community”, asking what identity was being constructed by the Joburg Pride parade, and how this identity may correspond with the priorities of post-apartheid South Africa.⁷² In earlier years, transformation and a sense of “community” was symbolised and embodied in the legislative changes that challenged discrimination against lesbian and gay people. South Africa played a significant role in leading the global challenge to discrimination on the basis of sexual identity.⁷³ The fight for equal rights and in particular the Equality Clause can be seen to have given the LGBTIAQ “community” a united purpose. As discussed above, once legal recognition was achieved for gay and lesbian South Africans, this “common vision” fell away despite the presence of hate crimes, poverty, and discrimination experienced by LGBTIAQ people.⁷⁴ In the *Exit* articles analysed there are multiple references to the fact that members of the LGBTIAQ “community” have “little in common” besides “suffering common discrimination on the bases of sexual orientation.”⁷⁵ It

⁶⁸ G.R. Sanchez and E.D. Vargas, “Taking a Closer Look at Group Identity: The Link between Theory and Measurement of Group Consciousness and Linked Fate,” in *Political Research Quarterly*, Vol 69(1), 2016, p. 160.

⁶⁹ M. Judge, “Violence against lesbians and (IM) possibilities for identity and politics,” Doctoral thesis, University of the Western Cape, Cape Town, 2015, p. 43

⁷⁰ Judge, “Violence against lesbians and (IM) possibilities for identity and politics,” p. 43; M. Bernstein, “Celebration and Suppression: The Strategic Uses of Identity by the Lesbian and Gay Movement,” in *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 103, No. 3, 1997, pp. 535-565.

⁷¹ T. Trengove-Jones, “Pride: The Politics of the Party,” *Exit*, November 2008, p. 12.

⁷² T. Trengove-Jones, “Pride and the Party Animal,” *Exit* November 2000, p. 13.

⁷³ T. Trengove-Jones, “Who needs what Pride?” *Exit*, October 2009, p. 14.

⁷⁴ Lesbian and Gay Pride Committee, “Pride – the committee’s report (abridged),” *Exit* November 1999, p. 5.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

is this “common discrimination” that promotes the formation of a LGBTIAQ community in order to lobby for legal recognition and protection.

An example of where the LGBTIAQ community was united by “common discrimination” was in the push for equal rights and the inclusion of lesbian and gay protection in the Bill of Rights. This is covered in *Exit*. For example, one article describes how the African National Congress (ANC), through political action on the part of LGBTIAQ activists, such as Simon Nkoli, included protections for gay and lesbian people in the Bill of Rights.⁷⁶ In 1990, for the first Pride march, the ANC sent an official letter of support to the organisers of the march.⁷⁷ The work of LGBTIAQ activists had paid off, and “the right not to be discriminated against or subjected to harassment because of sexual orientation” was included in the Bill of Rights which would later inform the South African Constitution of 1996.⁷⁸ It is through the struggle for equal rights, materialised in the Equality Clause and the broader South African Constitution, that lesbian and gay South Africans came to be protected under the law.⁷⁹

In 1992 the theme for Joburg Pride was “marching for our rights,”⁸⁰ and the “community” was called to attend Pride in order to demonstrate their solidarity to “help to convince the constitution making body that we can no longer be excluded and discriminated against.”⁸¹ The article states that the struggle for equal rights for gay and lesbian citizens “cannot be separated from the struggle for freedom for all South Africans.”⁸² Through this, gay and lesbian people are clearly positioned as South African citizens; legitimate citizens wanting and worthy of legal protection. This link to the Bill of Rights and the South African Constitution reappear often in discussions around Pride, with statements being made that suggest that rights on the basis of sexual identity are interwoven with the political struggle for rights for all South Africans.

Another key political moment for the LGBTIAQ community was the Civil Union Act, with South Africa becoming the first country in Africa to legalise same-sex unions in 2006. This is one of the central moments around which Pride mobilised. The extending of the rights to marriage

⁷⁶ Unknown author, “Viva Gay Pride! Viva! Viva!” *Exit*, November 1990, p. 1.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*

⁷⁸ Unknown author, “Marching for our rights,” *Exit*, July August 1992, p. 11.

⁷⁹ T. Trengove-Jones, “Pride 2000: possible or impossible,” *Exit*, October 2001, p. 4.

⁸⁰ Unknown author, “Marching for our rights,” p. 11.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*

⁸² *Ibid.*

through the Civil Union Act served to affirm lesbian and gay identities in South Africa.⁸³ Marriage discourse now de-emphasised and downplayed differences between homosexuals and heterosexuals and instead accentuated similarities between the two. Chasin calls this “emphasis on similarity between gay and straight rights and culture,” particularly where lesbian and gay “culture” comes to resemble “straight” or heterosexual culture, “a kind of assimilation.”⁸⁴ Marriage plays a central role in society and it is inextricably linked to notions of citizenship. Thus it can be assumed that seeking rights to get married is interwoven with the desire among lesbian and gay South Africans to be recognised and assimilated as full citizens.⁸⁵

These examples of uniting as a community in order to achieve a political end speaks to the notion of “communities of practice.”⁸⁶ Communities of practice refers to groups of people who interact with the sole purpose of achieving a goal or a joint enterprise. This interaction involves the formation of a group identity and working towards a common goal, such as the legal recognition of one’s identity and associated rights as occurred with the South African LGBTIAQ “community”.⁸⁷ One means of demonstrating “community” or community of practice is the mass demonstration effect that is achieved through Pride. Pride marches and parades can be considered to be “collective enactments to demonstrate worthiness, unity, numbers, and commitment.”⁸⁸ We see this in Joburg Pride, whereby there was a push for the community to “unite as a singly driven community” in order to “obtain full human rights, such as same-sex marriages with full spousal benefits, [and] the right to adopt children.”⁸⁹ However, it may be challenging to get a “community” to “unite as a singly driven community” if its members have diverse needs. In fact, infighting, competing ideologies or tensions may arise when one tries to wash over differing experiences in order to highlight similar ones, such

⁸³ Judge, “Violence against lesbians and (IM) possibilities for identity and politics,” p. 58.

⁸⁴ A. Chasin, “Interpenetrations: A Cultural Study of the Relationship between the Gay/Lesbian Niche Market and the Gay/Lesbian Political Movement,” in *Cultural Critique*, No. 44, 2000, p. 146.

⁸⁵ V. Kantsa, “The price of marriage: Same-sex sexualities and citizenship in Greece,” in *Sexualities*. Vol 17(7), 2014, p. 829.

⁸⁶ B. Zelizer, “Journalists as Interpretive Communities,” in *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, Vol 10, 1993, p. 223.

⁸⁷ M. Hughes and S. Kentlyn, “Older LGBT people’s care networks and communities of practice: a brief note,” in *International Social Work*, vol. 54(3), 2011, p. 440.

⁸⁸ Bruce, “LGBT Pride as a Cultural Protest Tactic in a Southern City,” p. 610.

⁸⁹ J. De Wet, “Pride 2000,” *Exit*, September 2000, p. 3.

as discrimination on the basis of sexual identity.⁹⁰ This infighting is exemplified by the rupture that occurred at Joburg Pride in 2012.

The Joburg Pride 2012 clash revealed the lack of common vision, whereby some members of the LGBTIAQ “community” felt that all members were equal and had no reason to rally or protest, while others felt that Joburg Pride ought to continue to serve as a political vehicle for social change. Instead of creating space for different expressions of LGBTIAQ identity, and thus allowing Pride to cater to different needs. Joburg Pride instead emphasised one concept of “community”, that of the united, equal, entertainment “community” made up of trouble avoidant “good gays”. Thus, anything outside of this conceptualisation deviated from the organising committee’s chosen representation of the LGBTIAQ “community”. For an identity to be considered legitimate it needs to be acknowledged by the group. In the context of the LGBTIAQ “community”, the group that one is seeking to be acknowledged by may be heterosexual society rather than LGBTIAQ people.⁹¹ This attempt to present an acceptable identity speaks to an assimilationist approach. This is evident when we consider specifically the lesbian and gay “community” and their endeavour to have access to the same rights as heterosexual society such as the right to marry.

4.6. Assimilating: Which Community? Which Homosexuality? ⁹²

This section explores the idea of “community” further, unpacking how identity is defined, who belongs, and who is recognised as a “respectable gay”. This section expands on the discussion on assimilation politics presented in chapter three.

Identity-based movements, such as the LGBTIAQ movement may come to “promote sameness,” and thus ask that differences be assimilated or excluded in order to assimilate.⁹³ This process creates the grounds for inequality. Through a desire to assimilate, identity formation comes to be driven less “by drawing boundaries against the dominant group and more by building bridges toward it.”⁹⁴ What occurs here is that the group identity becomes

⁹⁰A. Ghaziani and G.A. Fine, “Infighting and Ideology: How Conflict Informs the Local Culture of the Chicago DykeMarch,” in *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society*, Vol. 20 (1), 2008, p. 51.

⁹¹ D. Buckingham, “Introducing identity,” in D. Buckingham (Ed.), *Youth, Identity and Digital Media*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 2008, p. 6.

⁹² M. Nel, “Queer Africa. From whence we come,” *Exit* October 1997, p. 14.

⁹³ Chasin, “Interpenetrations: A Cultural Study of the Relationship between the Gay/Lesbian Niche Market and the Gay/Lesbian Political Movement,” p. 166.

⁹⁴ Ghaziani, “Post-Gay Collective Identity Construction,” p. 117.

less reliant on difference and instead seeks out apparent commonalities between groups.⁹⁵ However, if harmful systems of oppression are still in place, an emphasis on sameness becomes complicit in the oppression or discrimination of those who are perceived to be different (even if belonging to the same marginalised groups), in order to gain privileges for only a few of the group's members. This can be seen with the case of the Civil Union Act which instated the right to marry for lesbian and gay South Africans. However, other members of the LGBTIAQ were not extended these rights and their different needs were ignored. This de-emphasis on difference reveals a desire to belong and to be accepted by broader society.⁹⁶ An example of this is the change in Joburg Pride's name, as discussed in chapter three, which can be seen as part of this endeavour to belong and to be accepted.⁹⁷ Pride's change in name thus can be seen as part of a struggle to be included in South African society. By deemphasising the "gay", Pride attempts to construct LGBTIAQ people, or more specifically, lesbian and gay people, as the same as everyone else in broader society and therefore as deserving of equal rights.⁹⁸ It is this desire to assimilate, and the benefits that come with assimilation, that possibly overrides the need to emphasise difference, to disrupt the status quo, and to call attention to the continued violence that many LGBTIAQ South Africans face.⁹⁹

In assimilating, dominant ideologies or positions such as heteronormativity, continue uncontested and LGBTIAQ identities are depoliticised through the process of shaping themselves into more acceptable forms so as to appease the dominant culture. By emphasising certain similarities, assimilation comes to "mute identity" through ignoring or obscuring difference.¹⁰⁰ The assimilationist gay person desires to be read and treated as normal and thereby "embrac[es] only respectable conceptions of gay lifestyle."¹⁰¹ This assimilationist desire is exclusionary as only select bodies are able to assimilate. These are often bodies that occupy some form of dominant position, such as white, male and Western

⁹⁵ Ibid.

⁹⁶ Ghaziani, "Post-Gay Collective Identity Construction," p. 117.

⁹⁷ De Waal and Manion, "*Pride: Protest and Celebration*," p. 9.

⁹⁸ Ibid.

⁹⁹ T.M. Milani, "Are 'queers' really 'queer'? Language, identity and same-sex desire in a South African online 'community'," in *Discourse & Society*. Vol 24 (5), 2013, pp. 1-19; De Waal and Manion, "*Pride: Protest and Celebration*."

¹⁰⁰ Ghaziani, "Post-Gay Collective Identity Construction," p. 100.

¹⁰¹ D. Collins, "'We're there and queer': Homonormative mobility and lived experience among gay expatriates in Manila," in *Gender & Society*. Vol 23 (4), 2009, p. 467.

bodies.¹⁰² These assimilationists then come to regulate and police other members of the LGBTIAQ community. An example of this can be seen in the 1997 controversy around Steven Cohen's banner at Joburg Pride.¹⁰³ Cohen marched with a banner that read "give us your children; what we can't fuck we eat."¹⁰⁴ The banner opened up debates on issues of morality, queerness and normativity, as well as issues of assimilation into broader society. The matter of Cohen's banner precipitated telling conversations around the issue of "community". For example, one writer wrote that Cohen did not "represent the gay community."¹⁰⁵ Here Cohen is positioned as outside of the "acceptable" "community". Blignaut writes that Cohen "intended it to be read as a send-up of the fear of the child-molesting fag," reflecting heterosexual fear around the awarding of rights to the LGBTIAQ community.¹⁰⁶ Blignaut says that "few understood and many were unamused," and one of the organising committee members tried to remove the banner.¹⁰⁷ Similarly, at Joburg Pride in 2012, organising committee members tried to remove activists from the parade.¹⁰⁸ Cohen demanded their right to freedom of expression, included in the new rights that had been cemented in the 1996 South African Constitution. In *Exit* Zackie Achmat wrote that Cohen had "a right to display that banner at the Parade or anywhere he wishes regardless of its content. Every democrat should defend this right."¹⁰⁹ Achmat reminds readers that an attempt to censor Cohen's banner is tied up in the dangerous behaviour of the apartheid government of censoring certain material.¹¹⁰ Cohen's banner draws attention to the issue of respectability politics, whereby you can only claim to be part of the community if you can present yourself as a particular kind of respectable entity. This moment made visible thinking around "the idea of packaging and presenting respectable gayness" in a non-threatening way in order to be allowed to take up public space.¹¹¹ However, this limits the recognition and acceptance of LGBTIAQ people, as it permits only a narrow conception of "gay" or LGBTIAQ identity.¹¹²

¹⁰² Ibid.

¹⁰³ Fernwinkel, "Save the community – eat the artists," *Exit* December January 1997, p. 2.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid.

¹⁰⁵ Fernwinkel, "Save the community – eat the artists," *Exit* December January 1997, p. 2.

¹⁰⁶ C. Blignaut, "A matter of Pride", *Mail and Guardian*, 26 September 1997.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid.

¹⁰⁹ Z. Achmat, "That banner: not particularly funny nor radical!" *Exit* December 1996 January 1997, p. 10.

¹¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹¹ Z. Mbhele, interview with the researcher, Cape Town, 18 November 2016.

¹¹² Ibid.

The decision to assimilate or be set apart is part of what Kay describes as the difficult choices marginalised identities face in defining and performing their identities.¹¹³ They argue that marginalised identities feel obligated to assimilate into the dominant group's norms and thereby come to discard or disguise the aspects of their identity that set them apart.¹¹⁴ Most marginalised identities will shift between the two, selecting when and where they perform a particular aspect of their identity.¹¹⁵ Some members of the marginalised group come to develop what Ghaziani (citing DuBois 1903) refers to as a sense of twoness.¹¹⁶ This sense of twoness is described as a doubleness to life as individuals negotiate the need or desire to assimilate into the dominant culture while attempting to retain their own culture.

If identity needs difference in order to construct itself, for example as "us versus them," Ghaziani asks how identity is constructed when these differences are de-emphasised and instead similarities are asserted.¹¹⁷ Joburg Pride appears to have predominantly discarded its emphasis on difference from heterosexual society in order to emphasise similarity.¹¹⁸ It appears that Joburg Pride organisers rather emphasise the "sameness" and overlook or ignore the "difference" of experience, such as hate crimes. The need to emphasise similarity with the centre results in very real and abhorrent experiences being overlooked. In order to adequately respond to these experiences meaningful political organising within the LGBTIAQ community is required. Mbhele provides the example of the advocacy and lobbying work that was done around marriage equality, and how it came to be presented as "the gay struggle."¹¹⁹ The consequence of this was that "once it was achieved for many people that gay struggle was over."¹²⁰ However, "[i]t wasn't, obviously."¹²¹ In turning their attention towards integrating into the dominant culture and acquiring the right to marry, lesbian and gay identity politics come to be "criticised for producing good gays who don't destabilise existing power formations."¹²² Judge argues that marriage rights have been a key constructing

¹¹³ R. Kay, "Identity and Marginality," in *eSharp*. Issue 6 (1), 2005, p. 3.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁵ Kay, "Identity and Marginality," p. 3.

¹¹⁶ Ghaziani, "Post-Gay Collective Identity Construction," p. 106

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.* p.100.

¹¹⁸ Bernstein, "Celebration and Suppression: The Strategic Uses of Identity by the Lesbian and Gay Movement," p. 532.

¹¹⁹ Z. Mbhele, interview with the researcher, Cape Town, 18 November 2016.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*

¹²¹ *Ibid.*

¹²² Judge, "Violence against lesbians and (IM) possibilities for identity and politics," p. 43.

narrative in the formation of a global gay discourse.¹²³ They note that in depoliticising and privatising the gay subject, these rights come to “disarticulate gay politics from wider political struggles” such as those around race, gender and class.¹²⁴ This comes to reinforce dominant heteronormative positions, which are then applied to the LGBTIAQ “community”, resulting in the production of a depoliticised neoliberal gay subject.¹²⁵ This is what Duggan refers to as “homonormativity;”¹²⁶ an extension of neoliberalism and its effect on sexual identity politics that comes to centre on a normative gay subject who “fits the logics of heteronormativity.”¹²⁷ Homonormativity extends Warner’s 1993 idea of “heteronormativity” which demonstrates the way in which heterosexual experience is positioned as normal.¹²⁸ Homonormativity too produces a normalising effect when applied to gay and lesbian identities. It imposes upon the LGBTIAQ “community” a respectability and does so through dominant neoliberal messaging around what it means to be a good subject. This comes to construct a good:bad dichotomy in the LGBTIAQ “community”, which then only recognises LGBTIAQ identities when they overlap with heteronormativity, serving to maintain a heterosexual and heterosexist centre.¹²⁹

This adoption of the good:bad dichotomy can be seen in the LGBTIAQ “community” where some members of the “community”, entangled in a “politics of respectability,” seek to separate themselves from what they perceive to be “bad gays.”¹³⁰ The securing of rights for privileged LGBTIAQ members are intertwined with the exclusion of LGBTIAQ members on the basis of race and class.¹³¹ This is a politics of respectability, where the “acceptably visible,” do not trouble dominant power structures or positions which come to disadvantage their fellow members of the LGBTIAQ “community”.¹³² An example of this emerged in an interview with

¹²³ Ibid.

¹²⁴ Ibid. p. 44.

¹²⁵ Ibid. p. 43.

¹²⁶ L. Duggan, “The new homonormativity: The sexual politics of neoliberalism,” in R. Castronovo and D. Nelson (Eds), *Materializing Democracy: Toward a Revitalized Cultural Politics*, Durham: Duke University Press, 2002, pp. 175-194.

¹²⁷ Judge, “Violence against lesbians and (IM) possibilities for identity and politics,” p. 43.

¹²⁸ J. Teal and M. Conover-Williams, “Homophobia without Homophobes: Deconstructing the Public Discourses of 21st Century Queer Sexualities in the United States,” in *Humboldt Journal of Social Relations*, Vol 38, 2016, p. 18.

¹²⁹ Teal and Conover-Williams, “Homophobia without Homophobes: Deconstructing the Public Discourses of 21st Century Queer Sexualities in the United States,” p. 18.

¹³⁰ Ibid. p. 16.

¹³¹ Judge, “Violence against lesbians and (IM) possibilities for identity and politics,” p. 56.

¹³² Judge, “Violence against lesbians and (IM) possibilities for identity and politics,” p. 56; D. Richardson, “Desiring sameness? The rise of a neoliberal politics of normalization,” in *Antipode*, Vol 37(3), 2005, pp. 515-537.

Tanya Harford who spoke to the matter of hate crimes. Harford was not sympathetic to the violence experienced by “black lesbians in the township,” and instead engaged in victim-blaming.¹³³ They asked that “to be a black lesbian living in the township, being taunted every day...should you be in the shebeen trying to be one of the guys? Are you not inviting problems?”¹³⁴ They continued, “public displays of affection may not be the best thing for us to be doing. If you are going to do it then you are going to invite some kind of comment from people that might not be favourable. Then you are going to get upset. So then why are you doing it in the first place?”¹³⁵ Here Harford is not only victim-blaming but also suggesting the black queer bodies need to police themselves in order to avoid violence. In this way Harford normalises violent heteromascularity instead of interrogating it. This is an example of how whiteness others people of colour, as well as the sexuality of persons of colour. This resonates with Ratele’s work which demonstrates that sexual morality is constitutive of whiteness.¹³⁶ The implication of this is that black LGBTIAQ people are made responsible for the violence that is enacted towards them, while the systems of power that make this violence possible and acceptable are left unchallenged. This response from someone who was once the chairperson of the largest LGBTIAQ Pride parade in South Africa (and possibly Africa) is deeply problematic. Harford’s comments reveal the politics that underlie the depoliticisation of Joburg Pride. These comments demonstrate the privileges that some white South Africans have gained as a result of the legacy of apartheid which make it possible for them to disregard the harm that happens to those constructed as “other”.

In South Africa many LGBTIAQ South Africans face “homophobic violence and ‘corrective rape,’” in addition to the marginalisation they experience on the basis of race, gender and class.¹³⁷ Homophobia-related violence, Judge suggests, is “a symbolic and material marker of the differentiated experiences of queers,” and reveals how race, gender and class intersect and impact upon black lesbian people, increasing their risk of violence.¹³⁸ In not acknowledging the violence that many LGBTIAQ South Africans continue to face, and in

¹³³ T. Harford, interview with the researcher, Johannesburg (Skype), 25 January 2016.

¹³⁴ Ibid.

¹³⁵ T. Harford, interview with the researcher, Johannesburg (Skype), 25 January 2016.

¹³⁶ K. Ratele, “Sexuality as constitutive of whiteness in South Africa,” in *NORA – Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research*, Vol 17 (3), 2009, p. 160.

¹³⁷ R. Thoreson. “Somewhere over the Rainbow Nation: Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Activism in South Africa,” in *Journal of Southern African Studies*, Vol. 34 (3), 2008, p. 695.

¹³⁸ Judge, “Violence against lesbians and (IM) possibilities for identity and politics,” p. 73.

victim-blaming those who are targets of homophobic hate crimes, Harford and others continue to render invisible the experiences of violence that the majority of LGBTIAQ people in South Africa are vulnerable to.

4.7. Conclusion

This chapter has shown the disparity between the concept of “community” constructed by the Joburg Pride organising committee and presented to sponsors, and a concept of “community” or communities that more fully captures the dynamics at play among LGBTIAQ people in South Africa.

The “community” constructed by the organising committee is one that is palatable and sellable to sponsors, thereby guaranteeing a return on investment. Within this version of “community” there is little or no little space for social justice issues such as hate crimes. Harford’s construction of black and queer bodies as precarious, as seen in their comment on black lesbians in shebeens, is an example of how issues of respectability and assimilation have come to shape the notion of the Pride “community”. The push for “sameness” in order to assimilate into the norms and values of the dominant group, results in the discarding or exclusion of elements of LGBTIAQ identity that are at odds with the dominant culture. The dominant culture is taken as the standard by which LGBTIAQ identities are judged, as is evidenced by Harford’s comment about “black lesbians in the townships.”¹³⁹ This is an example of how a marginalised group may come to mimic the power and oppressive structures that they find themselves dominated by.

The Pride collective comes to exclude a focus on violence and pain experienced by black LGBTIAQ South Africans. There exists an unwillingness or inability to listen and acknowledge the persisting violence that is perpetrated against certain LGBTIAQ people, particularly violence which is enacted along intersecting lines of race, class and gender. Thus, the Pride “community” is not an ethical one, as it does not account for differing experiences but instead enforces the dominant notion of the “respectable gay” within the LGBTIAQ “community”. In order to accommodate a diversity of identities, it is necessary to reconceptualise the LGBTIAQ as an assortment of communities.

¹³⁹ Kay, “Identity and Marginality,” p. 3.

This chapter has argued that Joburg Pride can be considered to be an example of a wispy community; one that is temporary, and emphasises fun. Although this community may create the sense of solidarity, this is temporary and comes to dissolve after the event has passed. Joburg Pride, which comes to form a wispy community, caters to a particular “community”, one that consists of ideal neoliberal citizens; white, wealthy and compliant.

CHAPTER FIVE: THE EXCLUSIVITY OF WHITENESS

5.1. Introduction

The previous chapter argued that Pride can be seen as a wispy community; serving the interests of those LGBTIAQ people who are seeking a day of fun, entertainment, and to celebrate their right to move freely as recognised and constitutionally protected citizens. This wispy community does not accommodate LGBTIAQ people of colour who are marginalised by intersecting and interlocking homophobia, racism and sexism. The wispy nature of the Joburg Pride “community” is intertwined with the depoliticisation and commercialisation of the event, whereby the event is increasingly geared towards making profits. In taking this approach of profits over politics, Pride comes to operate as an exclusionary system informed by race, class and gender power relations that mirror the hierarchy of wider neoliberal society.

Although hailed as a victory for the LGBTIAQ “community”, the awarding of marriage rights in the form of the Civil Union Act, because of its emphasis on same-sex unions, only benefitted gay men and lesbian women. Subsequently, there has been a lack of political energy directed towards lobbying for rights for other groups within the LGBTIAQ “community”, such as transgender and intersex South Africans who specifically need provisions at the level of health and wellbeing. The argument made by this thesis thus far is that the desire for assimilation and recognition on the basis of sameness has led to the exclusion of those members of the LGBTIAQ “community” who are “too different” or “too queer” to assimilate.

While issues of race, diversity and lack of inclusivity have emerged at various points in the history of Pride prior to the 2012 clash, these issues are met with resistance. One example of this, discussed later in this chapter, is the matter of the changing of the parade’s route from Rosebank to Hillbrow in 2001. This incident is an example of what is termed here the “blinkers of whiteness”. This term is employed in the study to refer to the manner in which whiteness and white privileges are so normalised that anything outside of whiteness is obscured. In this way whiteness does not allow those who occupy this uninterrogated privileged position to see or understand the need for a political positioning of Pride. For example, the ability to see that the choice of route for the parade is a political issue is absent under whiteness. Whiteness, prior to the development of critical race theory and whiteness studies, went

mostly unchallenged as a normative and naturalised position. However, despite the development and employment of these critical theories, whiteness continues to permit white people to see themselves as outside of race.¹

As a result of the commercial focus of Joburg Pride, which caters to predominantly white participants, Pride came to emphasise the spectacle as well as fun and entertainment. In doing so Pride plays into the consumption and commodification of the queer by broader neoliberal heterosexist society.² Within this context, the organising committee does not interrogate what it means for participants to be able to afford to attend (even if the event is free, transport costs need to be factored in) and how issues of affordability are tied to the hangover of apartheid economic exclusion. Race and class come to be intertwined as a result of the apartheid system of economic exclusion which targeted South Africans of colour. As a result of this, the majority of those living in poverty in contemporary South Africa are people of colour.³ In not accounting for these consequences of apartheid and assuming that everything is now equal, the organising committee furthers a project of exclusion rooted in neoliberal capitalism. Smit (2014) explains that economic power comes to support and enable white power because in South Africa economic power still largely rests in the hands of white people.⁴ In attempting to account for the intersecting oppressions of racism, homophobia, sexism and class this chapter troubles the structures informing Joburg Pride, using perspectives from critical race theory, whiteness studies and intersectionality.

What follows is a discussion of whiteness within the Joburg Pride “community” and how this whiteness more often than not remains uninterrogated by the white members of the group. Therefore, they continue to make decisions for the LGBTIAQ group from a position of privilege and do not always consider the needs of other members who may have vastly different lived experiences to them. They assume that because the group shares a common identity (being LGBTIAQ) that this is their common experience, facing discrimination on the basis of sexuality

¹ J.T. Warren, “Whiteness and cultural theory: Perspectives on research and education,” in *The Urban Review*, Vol. 31, No. 2, 1999, p. 191

² S.M. Kates and R.W. Belk, “The meanings of Lesbian and Gay Pride Day: Resistance through consumption and resistance to consumption,” in *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*. Vol 30 (4), 2001, pp. 392-429.

³ H. Wells and L. Polders, “Anti-Gay Hate Crimes in South Africa: Prevalence, Reporting Practices, and Experiences of the Police,” in *African Feminisms* Vol 2 (3), 2006, p. 21.

⁴ S. Smit, “Challenging desire: performing whiteness in post-apartheid South Africa,” Doctoral thesis, Rhodes University, Grahamstown, 2014, p. 23.

only. This perspective is supported by the argument that having been afforded constitutional protection, all LGBTIAQ South Africans are now equal within the South African context. However, these constitutional protections do not necessarily translate into lived reality and homophobic or transphobic forms of violence continue to disproportionately affect LGBTIAQ people of colour.⁵

In the analysis of content in *Exit* it emerged that white LGBTIAQ South Africans were not willing to engage with the experiences of persons of colour within their “community”. Where inclusivity or diversity were spoken of it was either with resistance or spoken to symbolically and not enacted. In remaining ignorant to the experiences of all members of the group, other than the white and wealthy, the organising committee and white LGBTIAQ members assume that the struggle for equal rights for the “community” was over with the establishment of a democratic state. Further, in emphasising the commercial as the primary focus of Pride and avoiding politics, the committee is making a distinctly political decision; one that assumes that all members are privileged enough to focus only on the party and commercial aspect and do not need to rally behind a political cause. Here we see how whiteness positions itself as outside of politics in a manner that protects the position of wilful ignorance. Given the country’s demographics and vast and complex inequalities, the committee’s failure to engage with these issues is particularly problematic. Poverty is clearly visible in South Africa and rooted in the systemic oppression of people of colour under apartheid. I will argue that to not acknowledge these inequalities is a result of something more than ignorance; it is as a result of privilege and the desire to defend the position of whiteness in society. The resistance to engage with the political is telling of a fear of the loosening of whiteness’s power and therefore the loss of privileges afforded to those who are white.

5.2. Defining Whiteness

Whiteness assumes that all experiences are universal, and constructs white experience as normal.⁶ In contrast, experiences outside of white experience are not recognised or

⁵ R. Thoreson, “Somewhere over the Rainbow Nation: Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Activism in South Africa,” in *Journal of Southern African Studies*, Vol. 34(3), 2008, pp. 679-697.

⁶ M. Steyn, “*White talk: White South Africans and the strategic management of diasporic whiteness*,” Doctoral thesis, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, 2003; Smit, *Challenging desire: performing whiteness in post-apartheid South Africa*, p. 26; Falkof, *The end of whiteness: Satanism and family murder in late apartheid South Africa*.

acknowledged, and when they are they are often positioned as other and deviant. In order to maintain its position of power, whiteness, Warren suggests, can be considered as an enactment or a performance that comes to construct and continuously reconstruct itself through the “everyday embodiments and practices.”⁷ When challenged, whiteness may resist the threat and continue to perform its power or position. The enactment of whiteness is evident in both the *Exit* articles and the interviews with stakeholders. Tanya Harford’s interview, in particular, is revealing of this.

What is important to note here is that while individuals may espouse particular views, these individual views are constituted by social contexts which privilege these positions. Their views are not isolated but rather occur within, and are representative of, power dynamics operating in broader society. For instance, Closson (2010) describes the “perpetrator perspective” and how this allows whiteness to define racism as an explicit act, thereby permitting white identity and whiteness to escape accountability and responsibility for racism rather than acknowledging its systemic nature.⁸ This allows whiteness to maintain its power, ignore and police others and conveniently other the past. The avoidance of politics is itself a political position that serves to maintain a system of white power. To reinforce its position in South Africa, whiteness relies heavily on discourses of internationalism and globalisation, depending upon this association with global whiteness to protect its local position.⁹ Steyn explains that this can be seen in *white talk* whereby white South Africans are more sympathetic and attentive to events in the West and Global North than those in the local context and the rest of the continent.¹⁰

5.2.1. Bastions of the White Middle Class

In ignoring the lived experiences of people of colour, the majority of white people can be seen to be ensconced in the oblivion that whiteness affords individuals; a wilful ignorance that renders invisible or trivialises the experiences of others. A key example of this can be seen with regards to the response to the One in Nine protest. Had the white organisers and participants been more aware and sensitive to the experiences of queers of colour,

⁷ Warren, “Whiteness and cultural theory: Perspectives on research and education,” p. 187.

⁸ Closson, “Critical Race Theory and Adult Education,” p. 269.

⁹ M. Steyn, “White Talk,” in A.J. Lopez (Ed), *Postcolonial Whiteness: A Critical Reader on Race and Empire*, Albany NY: State University of New York Press, 2005, pp. 128-9

¹⁰ Ibid.

particularly in relation to hate crimes and violence, they may have been able to engage with the protest in less violent and dismissive ways. For example, the organisers could have halted the parade for the minute of silence that was asked for. However being suddenly confronted with the political, which had been previously disregarded or buried, was deeply distressing for those who occupy spaces of comfort and privilege in South African society. This is an example of how whiteness is protected from the realities of its colonised past and neoliberal present. However, as one *Exit* article argues “the old racial divisions are still with us,” as well as their related economic arrangements.¹¹ The article argues that the gay movement can be “seen to be upholding the bastions of white male middle class.”¹² This highlights the way in which whiteness comes to be reinforced through Joburg Pride and other LGBTIAQ spaces.

Another example of how whiteness, wilful ignorance and racism operate within the context of Pride is highlighted in Knoessen’s article in 2003. Knoessen describes how a master of ceremonies (MC) at Pride told the “white queens” that “today is your day to go native.”¹³ In response to this, Knoessen asks, “is it Pride or is it a white racist gathering?”¹⁴ This statement, “today is your day to go native,” reveals the continued prevalence of racist discourse in South Africa, showing how racist language is so normalised that it can be unabashedly used at a public event. Through the statement “to go native” black South Africans are exoticised, othered and positioned as objects of entertainment. The term “native” was also employed in colonial and apartheid discourse to distinguish between “uncivilized” black locals and “civilized” white colonisers.¹⁵ In light of this, Knoessen asks “are we surprised then that black people do not attend [Pride]?”¹⁶ Knoessen goes on to suggest that Pride runs the risk of being “a political disaster,” given that it projects “a collective image of being a group of only middle and upper class white men with a few of their equally middle and upper class lesbian friends.”¹⁷

¹¹ T. Trengove-Jones, “The significance of Pride,” *Exit*, October 2006, p. 4.

¹² Unknown author, “Imagine all the people,” *Exit*, May 1993, p. 8.

¹³ E. Knoessen, “Has Pride become meaningless?” *Exit*, December 2003 January 2004, p. 5.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ J. L. Comaroff, “Reflections on the Colonial State, in South Africa and Elsewhere: Factions, Fragments, Facts and Fictions,” in *Social Identities*, Vol 4(3), 1998, p. 329.

¹⁶ Knoessen, “Has Pride become meaningless?” p. 5.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

The nature of Pride as a predominantly white space is highlighted when the presence of black lesbians on a FEW float in 2004 is described as “a welcome change for a group known for low visibility.”¹⁸ Hayward, the author of the article, comments that there was an increase in numbers at Pride 2004 and congratulated LGBTIAQ people of colour, writing “Bravo! It is good to remind this part of the world that homosexuality is not a white man’s affliction, and that, despite occasional mutterings of racism, we do mix.”¹⁹ The fact that Hayward thought that it was appropriate to write this in a public forum, without critically considering that the space created by Joburg Pride may not be a comfortable space for LGBTIAQ people of colour, is concerning. By labelling LGBTIAQ people of colour as a group “known for low visibility,” they do not question what it is about Pride that results in LGBTIAQ people of colour staying away, for example that the space is not safe or welcoming for identities that are not white. In this way, the statement highlights the violence of whiteness, in particular, how it makes spaces unsafe for anyone outside of this dominant culture.²⁰ The congratulatory sentiment, “Bravo!” places the onus on LGBTIAQ people of colour to integrate themselves into Pride, rather than making the organisers responsible for creating an event where LGBTIAQ people can feel comfortable. In this way, this statement masks the power inequalities operating within the context of Joburg Pride. The reference to “occasional mutterings of racism” also dismissed experiences of racism, including racially motivated violence, which disproportionately affect black South Africans.

An interesting comparison can be made between the description of Pride 2004 presented above and Gevisser’s argument that the 1994 Pride was perceived of as “a black affair”, despite the overwhelming number of white participants.²¹ This reference to the march as “a black affair” may reflect how many white gay and lesbian people found Pride to be too political, given its ties to the anti-apartheid movement.²² For many white members of the LGBTIAQ “community”, “political” and “black” came to be conflated in a manner that “link[ed]

¹⁸ G. Hayward, “Pride parade unfazed,” *Exit* October 2004, p. 1

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ R. Dyer, *White: Essays on Race and Culture*. Abingdon: Routledge, 1997.

²¹ M. Gevisser, “A different fight for freedom: a history of South African lesbian and gay organisation – the 1950s to the 1990s,” in M. Gevisser and E. Cameron (Eds), *Defiant Desire: gay and lesbian lives in South Africa*. Ravan Press: Braamfontein, 1994, p. 82.

²² M. Gevisser and G. Reid, “Pride or protest?: Drag queens, comrades, and the Lesbian and Gay Pride March,” in M. Gevisser and E. Cameron (Eds), *Defiant Desire: gay and lesbian lives in South Africa*. Ravan Press: Braamfontein, 1994, p. 279.

current-day gay activism to black liberationist politics.”²³ Gevisser notes that this is revealing of the deeply-rooted conservatism of the white LGBTIAQ “community” in South Africa.²⁴ The conflating of the political with “black”, can be seen to be an example of how the dominant culture, in this case white culture, will categorise race, class and gender, into binaries, such as white and black, rich and poor, in order to create polarised binary rankings of “good and bad, worthy and unworthy.”²⁵ In South Africa, under apartheid to be white was to be good and worthy, and to be black (or a person of colour) was to be bad and unworthy, and within the context of this chapter, political. Within this system whiteness or white identity is presented as outside of race, as a position that is not questioned as it is the standard against which people of colour are measured.²⁶ This creates a context in which white people might be aware of being white, but whiteness is still predominantly invisible or assumed to be natural.²⁷ This invisibilisation or naturalisation of white privilege makes it possible for blame or responsibility to be shifted away from white bodies and onto bodies of colour, as seen in the examples discussed above.

5.3. Forgetting the Past and Avoiding Politics

The One in Nine protest served to make visible the whiteness of Joburg Pride and called into question the exclusionary nature of the event. This attempt to disrupt whiteness was met with violent resistance. This violent resistance, as well as everyday enactments of wilful ignorance, are performances of whiteness facilitated by an urgent desire to leave the past, and the role of whiteness in it, behind. In making the past visible, whiteness risks having to take responsibility for the violence it inflicted on those constructed as “other” and perhaps even giving up its position of privilege.

And so, in order to protect whiteness, the past is relegated to history and constructed as having no place in the “new South Africa”. In not fully acknowledging the past, half memories

²³ Gevisser, “A different fight for freedom: a history of South African lesbian and gay organisation – the 1950s to the 1990s,” p. 82.

²⁴ Gevisser, “A different fight for freedom: a history of South African lesbian and gay organisation – the 1950s to the 1990s,” p. 82.

²⁵ L. Weber, “A conceptual framework for understanding race, class, gender, and sexuality,” in *Psychology of Women Quarterly*. Vol 22, 1998, p. 18.

²⁶ Dyer, *White: Essays on Race and Culture*; Falkof, *The end of whiteness: Satanism and family murder in late apartheid South Africa*, p. 165.

²⁷ Steyn, “White Talk,” p. 122.

come to be formed; half memories that lead to the forgetting of the most horrific parts of apartheid history. This forgetting may lead to the suppression of this history, which serves to naturalise or normalise the violence.²⁸ Derrida's concept of "hauntology" is useful here in considering how the racialised past of apartheid South Africa comes to be treated in order to re/constitute a South African identity outside of race.²⁹ There is a dominant discourse in South Africa that encourages people to "forget about race," which is fundamental to the deployment of the concept of a post-race South Africa, serving to obscure the country's history of discrimination on the basis of race.³⁰

The construction of a post-race South Africa can be seen in *Exit* in the call to "forget the past,"³¹ because "things have changed and it is no longer necessary for us to fight for our rights,"³² and telling readers that "the rest is history."³³ This call to forget the past and to move on renders invisible the pain of those who suffered under apartheid rule. An acknowledgement of the trauma experienced and the harm done by the past is treated thus as "not only irrelevant but also illegitimate."³⁴ In an attempt to preserve the power and privilege of whiteness, the One in Nine protest at Joburg Pride 2012 is positioned by white organisers and other white members of the LGBTIAQ "community" as a moment of deviance that sought to divide the LGBTIAQ "community". Through this construction, the role of whiteness in perpetuating inequality and injustice is renounced.³⁵

Another example of how the past is ignored or trivialised³⁶ is a statement in *Exit* in 1996 which argued that, "South Africans have transcended a history of dealing with each other through their differences," suggesting that the past is now behind South Africa, and that the country has "moved from a society that was deeply divided by these artificial barriers to one which

²⁸ L. Meskell and C. Scheermeyer, "Heritage as Therapy: Set pieces from the New South Africa," in *Journal of Material Culture*, Vol 13 (2), 2008, p. 156.

²⁹ J. Derrida, M. Bernd and S. Cullenberg, *Specters of Marx: the state of debt, the work of mourning and the new International*. New York: Routledge, 2006.

³⁰ Z. Erasmus, "The Nations, its populations and their recalibration: South African affirmative action in a neoliberal age," in *Cultural Dynamics*. Vol 27 (1), 2015, p. 111.

³¹ M. Nel, "Queer Africa. From whence we come," *Exit*, October 1997, p. 14.

³² G. Rissik, "Do we have Pride?" *Exit* November 2010, p. 14.

³³ Unknown author, "Pride: out there, everywhere," *Exit* October 2001, p. 9.

³⁴ Falkof, *The end of whiteness: Satanism and family murder in late apartheid South Africa*, p. 196

³⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁶ Steyn, "White Talk," p. 129; Meskell and Scheermeyer, "Heritage as Therapy: Set pieces from the New South Africa," p. 154.

exists without such boundaries.”³⁷ The idea that within such a short period of time South Africa had transcended entrenched inequities does not acknowledge the true reality of apartheid South Africa and the consequences this had on the lives of most South Africans. The implication is that because inequity is no longer entrenched legally that the inequities of the past simply vanish. This is an example of how whiteness seeks to absolve itself from the part it played in apartheid South Africa and specifically the violences it perpetrated against people of colour. Thereby, white power and privilege remain unchallenged.

Alongside calls to “forget the past”, whiteness is also performed through the avoidance of politics. This “avoidance of politics” is particularly interesting given the political nature of the struggle for the “new” South Africa. The “avoidance” of politics is intertwined with positions of privilege, for example white privilege which protects white people from certain kinds of violence, which in itself is a political issue. In 2012, after the Joburg Pride clash, Trengove-Jones writes of “the return of the repressed” as a direct response to the depoliticisation of Pride by the organising committee and their decision to sidestep the political by not “giv[ing] the Parade a political focus.”³⁸ The notion of the return of the repressed, a Freudian concept, speaks to what occurs when emotions or experiences, or in this case political issues, are suppressed for too long.³⁹ When the repressed returns it “boils over in ways many will find unpalatable and unseemly.”⁴⁰ Trengove-Jones suggests that this is what occurred at Joburg Pride, that the political was suppressed for too long, and created the environment for a protest such as that executed by the One in Nine Campaign. It was, as Hayward described in an interview, “an incident waiting to happen.”⁴¹

On the matter of the One in Nine protest at Joburg Pride, Trengove-Jones writes that Tanya Harford “was incensed by the hiccup,” and stated that “had the Committee been approached beforehand, they would have provided a platform for 1 in 9 to articulate their position.”⁴² This implies that the organising committee required activists to ask permission to take up space. Lakhani, who took part in organising the One in Nine Campaign protest, explained that they

³⁷ Unknown author, “Pride ’96: be there,” *Exit* September 1996, p. 1.

³⁸ T. Trengove-Jones, “Pride 2012: ‘Fight those heinous pissers back’,” *Exit* November 2012, p. 4.

³⁹ Freud, S, “Further remarks on the neuro-psychoses of defence,” in J. Strachey (Ed.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud*, London: Hogarth Press, Vol. 3, 1896, pp. 159-185.

⁴⁰ Trengove-Jones, “Pride 2012: ‘Fight those heinous pissers back’,” p. 4.

⁴¹ G. Hayward, “Joburg Pride 2012: in the news for the wrong reasons,” *Exit* November 2012, p. 1.

⁴² Trengove-Jones, “Pride 2012: ‘Fight those heinous pissers back’,” p. 4.

had not applied for permission because Pride is meant to be an inclusive and diverse space. They explained that “if this is a legitimate Pride the space is ours for the taking, it’s not about asking permission.”⁴³ Continuing to describe how people had criticised this decision not to seek permission, Lakhani stated that this was “part of the problem” with Joburg Pride; “it’s not about us as a bunch of black queers having to beg and plead and ask.”⁴⁴ Trengove-Jones goes on to write that even if the activists had asked the committee for permission and a platform for their protest, “where would that have got them?”⁴⁵ The notion of asking permission for a protest seems to counter the purpose of the protest, to disrupt the happenings and draw attention to a cause. In *Exit*, Trengove-Jones tells how Harford “insisted that precisely because it was so difficult to reach some kind of political consensus, the Committee had decided to avoid politics.”⁴⁶ Trengove-Jones describes this decision to avoid the political as “cowardly and futile.”⁴⁷ It is cowardly because prior to legal protections, “the political emphasis given to Pride carried far more hazards than it does today,” and futile because “the event, by definition, is political in nature.”⁴⁸ The idea of needing to ask for permission indicates that some members of the “community” are welcome to take up space while others must be granted permission to do so. It focuses in on the matter of race here; it is evident that it is predominantly LGBTIAQ people of colour who are asking predominantly white gay and lesbian people for permission to exist, to be in a space, to protest. This resonates with apartheid’s violent exclusion of people of colour from public spaces.

Within the data, there were also attempts to reconstruct issues of racial difference as not about race. For example, Harford argued that “race in theory shouldn’t have anything to do with it,” that “it could be culture not race. It’s just a colour difference.”⁴⁹ This is an example of how being situated in a position of privilege, or being the “right” colour allows individuals to disregard others’ experiences of race and racism. Closson discusses how in relation to the passing of civil rights legislation in the U.S., white people needed to not view themselves as racists and so racism came to be constructed as “aberrant, intentional behavior, perpetrated

⁴³ I. Lakhani, interview with the researcher, Cape Town, 9 February 2016.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ G. Hayward, “Joburg Pride 2012: in the news for the wrong reasons,” *Exit* November 2012, p. 1.

⁴⁶ Trengove-Jones, “Pride 2012: ‘Fight those heinous pissers back’,” p. 4.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ T. Harford, interview with the researcher, Johannesburg (Skype), 25 January 2016.

by a conscious wrongdoer.”⁵⁰ Critical race theory troubles this by showing how racism is normalised rather than an aberrant occurrence that is outside of societal construction.⁵¹ If whiteness is perceived as normal and presented as such, then in viewing other races as inferior whiteness is inherently racist. Given that whiteness is actively constituted through daily practice in order to maintain its position, racism is endemic rather than isolated incidents of violence. In considering issues of race and power it is also important to acknowledge that by virtue of their position as the chairperson of the Pride organising committee, Harford’s dismissal of issues of race and racism have the potential to influence and shape views and behaviour among Joburg Pride participants, as well as the broader South African LGBTIAQ “community”. Harford is embedded in a discourse of whiteness which positions them as able to determine how race should be read.

Harford goes on to argue that “maybe we are different cultures.”⁵² They provide the example of “the European thing where the Germans don’t like the French” and suggest that this may be a case of “cultural difference” and “yet we are all calling it racism.”⁵³ Harford goes on to ask how South Africans will ever “get over this?”⁵⁴ They are suggesting that in referring to differences as race difference and not a difference of culture that South Africans are prevented from meaningfully tackling these issues and therefore moving past them. This appears to be a discursive tactic to evade or obscure the role of apartheid, and subsequently white people, in constituting these differences. Here Harford tries to shift the focus from racism to cultural differences through “the denial of prejudice,” which Augoustinos and Every (2007) argue is a predominant feature of race discourse.⁵⁵ They explain how people come to position themselves within social contexts opposed to prejudice by locating their potentially prejudiced viewpoint as outside of them and part of general discourse. Thereby presenting their views as rational and justified in order to avoid accusations of prejudice, such as racism.⁵⁶ This is what Harford appears to be doing in their attempt to explain differences

⁵⁰ Closson, “Critical Race Theory and Adult Education,” p. 268.

⁵¹ Closson, “Critical Race Theory and Adult Education,” p. 268.

⁵² T. Harford, interview with the researcher, Johannesburg (Skype), 25 January 2016

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ M. Augoustinos and D. Every, “The Language of “Race” and Prejudice: A Discourse of Denial, Reason, and Liberal-Practical Politics,” in *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*. Vol 26 (2), 2007, p. 123.

⁵⁶ Augoustinos and Every, “The Language of “Race” and Prejudice: A Discourse of Denial, Reason, and Liberal-Practical Politics,” p. 126.

between races as cultural differences and then going on to provide examples of where this has occurred elsewhere, such as their example of the Germans and the French.⁵⁷

In their interview Harford, in reference to the LGBTIAQ “community”, said “We have our rights now. We are not being discriminated against.”⁵⁸ They do not specify who this “we” is and instead, construct a single gay, or LGBTIAQ identity.⁵⁹ This identity is inevitably assumed to be white, gay or lesbian, and middle-class. This discourse, which presumes a singular LGBTIAQ identity, has significant consequences for the kinds of experiences and issues that are then highlighted or treated as worthy of attention or empathy.⁶⁰ Here we are reminded of Harford’s discussion of black lesbians in chapter four and their suggestion that black lesbians police themselves with the statement, “should you be in the shebeen trying to be one of the guys are you not inviting problems?”⁶¹ This is an example of how certain lesbians, lesbians of colour, are regarded as putting themselves in danger.⁶² Judge argues that this perception is rooted in colonial constructions of race.⁶³ Judge draws on Richardson’s (2005) notion of the “acceptably visible” and argues that the acceptable gay is homonormative or assimilationist and leave systems of oppression, such as racism, unchallenged.⁶⁴

The discourse espoused by Harford, as well as other white South African both within and beyond the LGBTIAQ “community”, is rooted in wilful ignorance of how their whiteness is complicit in the violence perpetrated against people of colour. We can see this in how Harford discusses race as only a matter of colour and not as a socially constructed category that makes systemic discrimination possible, as well as the way in which they suggest that LGBTIAQ people of colour are largely responsible for the violence that is enacted upon them. The fact that Harford is able to make such statements about how “a black lesbian living in the township” should behave demonstrates the way in which whiteness dictates what is “normal” and “acceptable” behaviour. This position is steeped in apartheid (and colonial) racial

⁵⁷ T. Harford, interview with the researcher, Johannesburg (Skype), 25 January 2016.

⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁵⁹ M. Gevisser and E. Cameron, *Defiant Desire: gay and lesbian lives in South Africa*. Ravan Press: Braamfontein, 1994, p. 3.

⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁶¹ T. Harford, interview with the researcher, Johannesburg (Skype), 25 January 2016.

⁶² M. Judge, “Violence against lesbians and (IM) possibilities for identity and politics,” Doctoral thesis. University of the Western Cape, Cape Town, 2015, p. 56.

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ Ibid.

discourse, which actively regulated the bodies of people of colour. This is an example of how whiteness assumes a position of normativity and prescribes that all “other” identities must aspire to adopt its standards and values.⁶⁵ In the absence of accountability of the values and actions of whiteness, those constructed as “other” are dismissed, unfairly discriminated against and positioned as lacking.⁶⁶

The dismissal of experiences outside of whiteness is further demonstrated by Harford’s discussion of incidences of violence. For instance, speaking to their perception of the experiences of LGBTIAQ South Africans, they state that “there just don’t seem to be that many burning issues anymore. The violence is probably the worst but, I hate doing it, making it white or whatever but there hadn’t been incidents in our general community, of murder.”⁶⁷ When asked if they were speaking about the white “community” when referring to a general “community”, Harford said “I hate getting into that black/white thing; it’s not a burning issue for us right now.”⁶⁸

Here we see how whiteness operates to obscure the violence that is perpetrated against those constructed as “not white”. The “us” that Harford mentions, which have no burning issues, are quite clearly white LGBTIAQ South Africans. The idea that there are not that many burning issues shows the privilege that their identity affords them. This is significant when considering the rise in hate crimes from 2000 onwards against LGBTIAQ South Africans, particularly poor black queers.⁶⁹ Linked to this, the statement “I hate getting into that black/white thing” reveals Harford’s privilege, which allows them to “side step” a discussion of race. This statement also speaks to the racial dynamics of the interview encounter where Harford talks to me as a fellow white person, assuming that I share their thinking and values. In light of this, they appeared to feel safe to openly discuss their viewpoints in a way that they may not have they been interviewed by a person of colour. Again, this reveals the way in which whiteness, and in this case white racism, is positioned as a naturalised state of being.

⁶⁵ L. Young, “‘Race’, identity and cultural criticism,” in K. Bhavnani, *Oxford Readings in Feminism: Feminism & ‘Race’*, Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2001, p. 175.

⁶⁶ Closson, “Critical Race Theory and Adult Education,” p. 269.

⁶⁷ T. Harford, interview with the researcher, Johannesburg (Skype), 25 January 2016

⁶⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁹ H. Wells and L. Polders, “Anti-Gay Hate Crimes in South Africa: Prevalence, Reporting Practices, and Experiences of the Police,” in *African Feminisms* Vol 2 (3), 2006, pp. 20-28.

This naturalisation of whiteness is co-constituted by a history of colonialism and apartheid, as well as contemporary discourses and practices of neoliberalism.

In elaborating on the burning issues facing “our general community,” Harford describes these as “the Rand and business, getting our children through university, and those sort of things.”⁷⁰ These concerns are an example of how the normativity of whiteness comes to protect and maintain other normative positions that “emphasize the pursuit of prosperity, safety, reproduction, and respectability,” such as classism and heteronormativity.⁷¹ Concerns about the Rand, business and getting children through university speak to Steyn’s discussion of how whiteness and its associated privileges are believed to be under threat.⁷² Harford, in our interview, went on to speak to how “white people are being driven out of this country,” explaining that “they say there are four million whites and two million have got an exit strategy.”⁷³ Harford noted that those with the exit strategy are planning to “leave when things get really bad.”⁷⁴ The idea of an exit strategy for “when things get really bad” is illustrative of the way in which whiteness views itself as victimised.⁷⁵ This victimisation emerges in a context where whiteness comes to view itself as under threat by virtue of the fact that people of colour have been granted equal rights, and therefore increased opportunities to access employment and wealth. The threat is constructed as a type of crisis by white South Africans, who come to describe themselves as “in the ‘the same’ position now as black people were in the past under apartheid.”⁷⁶ However, the notion of whiteness as victimisation does not account for the fact that although white people may have lost their political monopoly, they retain much of their social and economic power.⁷⁷ Their victimhood is constituted in relation to having to share resources that were previously reserved exclusively for white people. Within a context characterised by white fear of losing privileges and benefits, as well as entrenched racist discourses, it is perhaps not surprising that Joburg Pride comes to be

⁷⁰ T. Harford, interview with the researcher, Johannesburg (Skype), 25 January 2016.

⁷¹ J. Ward, “White normativity: The cultural dimensions of whiteness in a racially diverse LGBTI organization,” in *Sociological Perspectives*. Vol 51 (3), 2008, pp. 563-4.

⁷² Steyn, “White Talk,” p. 131

⁷³ T. Harford, interview with the researcher, Johannesburg (Skype), 25 January 2016

⁷⁴ Ibid.

⁷⁵ Steyn, “White Talk,” p. 131

⁷⁶ Ibid.

⁷⁷ Ibid. p. 122.

organised in line with an agenda of whiteness, which seeks to preserve white privilege and invisibilise the experiences of those who exist outside of whiteness.

5.4. Pride is Clearly Uneven, Absurd and Inconsiderate

The whiteness agenda produces an uneven Pride. Pride in being associated with the commercial and fun limits the space available for political engagement. When the political does appear, it is resisted. For instance the change in route and the One in Nine protest are met with resistance as these events challenge the agenda or purpose of Pride pursued by the organising committee. Joburg Pride, in its commercialisation is aligned with whiteness, given that wealth remains disproportionately in the hands of white South Africans. In playing to the sponsors then Pride does not remove itself from the political but rather pushes another political agenda; one which reinforces whiteness by disregarding the experiences of “other” LGBTIAQ people. It is also interesting to note, that much like Burning Man, AfrikaBurn and Woodstock, the political heritage is referred to with a sense of nostalgia while the commercial and assimilationist aspects of these events are bolstered. The event comes to operate as a quick tourist event (a wispy community, as discussed in chapter four), outside of day-to-day happenings and once it is over things return to “normal”.

In 2009, Trengove-Jones writes that Pride is “clearly uneven,” describing the inequities that exist between participants; inequities that are rooted in racism, classism, and sexism.⁷⁸ They continue to write on transformation and racism, questioning whether transformation can be said to have taken place when there is frequent mention of “racial discrimination in our ‘community’.”⁷⁹ While transformation may be visible on paper, it is not the lived reality. Although the LGBTIAQ “community” may speak of transformation, issues of diversity and difference are still constituted by whiteness and racism; either explicitly or unconsciously through a lack of engagement with racism and the various forms it takes. This is a continuation of Trengove-Jones’ discussion in 2004 where they had described Pride as “manifestly discriminatory” and that while it “allegedly wishes to foster non-discrimination” it is “structurally discriminatory” in its introduction of economic exclusion.⁸⁰ This comment is made in relation to the charging of entrance fees for events, which disproportionately

⁷⁸ T. Trengove-Jones, “Who needs what Pride?,” *Exit* October 2009, p. 14

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*

⁸⁰ T. Trengove-Jones, “The sad decline of pride,” *Exit* November 2004, p. 4.

excludes LGBTIAQ people of colour in light of the economic disparities instigated by apartheid. Apartheid discriminated on the basis of both race and class in the way that it prevented people of colour from economic participation, resulting in an overlap of race and class identities.⁸¹ It is thus important to reflect on intersecting identities and employ an intersectional approach when considering race and class in South Africa. Trengove-Jones suggests that introducing an entrance fee “introduced a kind of neo-apartheid” which privileges and benefits “the economically more secure,” and “chiefly white in our society.”⁸² The use of the term neo-apartheid seeks to suggest that despite the ending of apartheid, economic power and wealth have not been fairly redistributed. This suggests that while apartheid, as a legislative system, may be over “it still manifests itself in practice,”⁸³ and continues to generate white economic power through neoliberal policies and politics.⁸⁴ Trengove-Jones describes that within the LGBTIAQ “community” there are “huge disparities in wealth,” and they ask, given this, “what chance of a ‘community’ is there?”⁸⁵ This suggests that the possibility for community or community building is blocked by an inability to reflect on and engage with structural inequalities.

Another example of the unevenness within Joburg Pride can be seen in the formation of and responses to Black Pride in 2001. This alternative Pride event was met with significant resistance, as well as accusations that it was seeking to divide Pride and the LGBTIAQ “community”.

5.4.1. Black Pride

Although there seems to be an effort by Pride organisers and other LGBTIAQ people to avoid or dismiss issues of race and racism (as discussed above), race does receive some explicit mentions in *Exit*. In an article discussing Joburg Pride 2000, Pride is described as “a mostly pearly white event,” and it asks “why were there so few black gays and black lesbians in attendance?”⁸⁶ Fourie goes on to write that “the proportion was certainly not reflective of the demographic reality.”⁸⁷ They question whether “most black gays [are] still in the closet,” or

⁸¹ Trengove-Jones, “The sad decline of pride,” p. 4

⁸² Ibid.

⁸³ A. Vaid-Menon, “Rainbows are just refracted white light: Settler homonationalism in neo-apartheid South Africa,” Honours Thesis, Stanford University, Stanford, 2013, p.16.

⁸⁴ Smit, *Challenging desire: performing whiteness in post-apartheid South Africa*, p. 36.

⁸⁵ T. Trengove Jones, “You need pride: prepare to meet your sponsor,” *Exit* November 2009, p. 13.

⁸⁶ C. Fourie, “Pride 2000 – unforgettable,” *Exit* November 2001, p. 1.

⁸⁷ Fourie, “Pride 2000 – unforgettable,” p. 1

whether their lack of attendance is because “they perceive this as an elitist white event?”⁸⁸ Fourie asks “do the organisers make enough of an effort to include black gays?”⁸⁹ These are significant questions, particularly in light of a broader socio-political process to construct a “new”, integrated South Africa in the post-1994 period. As Ziyad discusses LGBTIAQ people of colour, specifically referred to in this section as black LGBTIAQ people, may avoid Joburg Pride because they view it as a white event which is inherently “anti-Blackness.”⁹⁰ As Anzaldúa has written, many people of colour wish to have very little to do with white people and what they represent.⁹¹ In South Africa, in particular, people of colour may wish to avoid the spaces made unsafe by whiteness and the violence that is associated with it. As has been argued above, the predominantly white organisers of Pride, catering to the dominant culture of whiteness, cultivate an event that is not representative of the LGBTIAQ “community”. Instead the organisers appear to actively cater to the “affluent white, cisgender male fantasy of what a celebration of queer life looks like.”⁹² In light of this it should not be surprising that many LGBTIAQ people of colour choose not to attend Joburg Pride and have come to create alternative Pride events.

The formation of Black Pride events hosted in Newtown Johannesburg at The Horror Café was met with a variety of responses. Some of the LGBTIAQ “community” regard this development as “unfortunate” and feel that “the gay/lesbian scene should not be racially divided,” while “others see it as an inevitable development as many black gays and lesbians have been turned away from certain clubs.”⁹³ This construction of Black Pride as unfortunate and the argument that the LGBTIAQ scene should not be racially divided ignores the way in which Joburg Pride is governed by whiteness and that there is a need for a black LGBTIAQ event that is not predominantly white and male. The necessity of establishing safe spaces which allow for authentic expression of identity, instead of being invited into a space which does not cater to or recognise particular identities has been highlighted by black students within the

⁸⁸ Ibid.

⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁹⁰ H. Ziyad, “When white people enter a space, anti-Blackness always does too,” in *Black youth project*, <http://blackyouthproject.com/white-people-enter-space-anti-blackness-always/>, 6 June 2017, n.p.

⁹¹ G. Anzaldúa, *Borderlands: the new mestiza = La frontera*. San Francisco: Spinsters/Aunt Lute, 1987, pp. 85-6.

⁹² Ziyad, “When white people enter a space, anti-Blackness always does too,” n.p.

⁹³ Unknown author, “After party advantage,” *Exit* October 2001, p. 1.

#RhodesMustFall and #FeesMustFall movement.⁹⁴ Similarly, LGBTIAQ people of colour need spaces that cater specifically to their lived experiences. In South Africa this is particularly urgent given the intersecting forms of violence perpetrated against particular LGBTIAQ people.

Further, in responses to Black Pride, resistance is directed towards the establishment of black LGBTIAQ spaces rather than interrogating what it is about the dominant Pride culture that makes it necessary for alternative events to be created. What this does is refocus attention on “‘others’ as the problem needing explanation and needing to come in line with the center.”⁹⁵ This is because the centre, the dominant culture, has constructed itself as the norm, and so Black Pride is positioned as outside of this norm and therefore is viewed as a threat to the centre and an attempt to destabilise its power. Thus, the dominant culture must police and regulate this occurrence and render it as strange and other.⁹⁶ The formation of an outsider serves to reinforce the centre’s position as normal and naturalised. In this case, Joburg Pride, constitutes itself as natural, while simultaneously othering Black Pride and constructing it as divisive. This construction reinforces Joburg Pride’s position as natural. Through this process the privileged position of whiteness is “normalised, and rendered unremarkable,” allowing whiteness to go uninterrogated.⁹⁷ This is how Black Pride comes to be read and positioned as other or outside of the norm and only receives a brief mention in *Exit*. This brief mention does nothing to unpack the reasons for the formation of the event or to look deeper into the discrimination that occurs within the LGBTIAQ “community”, for example at Joburg Pride.

5.4.2. Diversity

In overlooking the political, including race and class, the LGBTIAQ “community” continues to be constituted by whiteness, where white experiences are normalised and read as the default.⁹⁸ The LGBTIAQ “community” may speak of diversity and difference but as has been

⁹⁴ Rhodes Must Fall, “Bremner Occupation Statement,” 23 March 2015, at <https://www.facebook.com/RhodesMustFall/posts/1558533494422143>.

⁹⁵ Steyn, “White Talk,” p. 120.

⁹⁶ Steyn, “White Talk,” p. 120; Falkof, *The end of whiteness: Satanism and family murder in late apartheid South Africa*, p. 63

⁹⁷ Steyn, “White Talk,” p. 121.

⁹⁸ Dyer, *White: Essays on Race and Culture*.

demonstrated above, “communal” spaces such as Pride do not reflect or embody these politics. Trengove-Jones argues that “the easy gesture towards difference that is contained in the would-be synthesising formulation about ‘gays and lesbians of all shapes and colours and sizes’” is “too simple and too misleading,” and “seeks to remove us from the obligation of thinking.”⁹⁹ While diversity is spoken of, it is what Trengove-Jones calls an “easy gesture” because it does not interrogate what it means to be diverse and inclusive of differences, much like the manner in which “community” is used thoughtlessly.¹⁰⁰ Diversity comes to operate as a popular phrase which is employed carelessly. Mohanty suggests that when diversity is spoken of it should be in an effort to understand race, class, gender and sexuality “not just in terms of static, embodied categories but in terms of histories and experiences that tie us together –that are fundamentally interwoven into our lives.”¹⁰¹ Mohanty is thus calling for an intersectional approach when discussing diversity. However, there seems to be resistance to this within the LGBTIAQ “community”. When Pride’s diversity is criticised, these criticisms are put down to being “inclusiveness issues.”¹⁰² The use of the word “issues” implies trouble or something which disrupts the flow of proceedings. Iverson argues that diversity plans intend to create communities that are inclusive and encouraging of difference, but what often occurs, as a result of the presence of the dominant culture’s discourse “circulating in and through diversity action plans,” is that these plans present the white male experience as standard.¹⁰³

The changing of the Joburg Pride route in 2001, which moved the parade away from suburbia to Hillbrow, an area in the city centre, can be seen as an attempt to diversify Pride. However, this move was met with much resistance from certain members of the LGBTIAQ “community”. For example, Hillbrow was described as “that dirty, barren wasteland no-go area that few people go to by choice.”¹⁰⁴ The article continues that “worldwide the idea behind Pride Parades is to show the population we are here, and proud of our sexual orientation.”¹⁰⁵ The

⁹⁹ T. Trengove-Jones, “Pride and Spring: Under African skies,” *Exit* October 2003, p. 4

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁰¹ C.T. Mohanty, *Feminism without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003, p. 191.

¹⁰² Unknown author, “Pride after party organiser responds,” *Exit* December 1996, p. 7.

¹⁰³ S.V. Iverson, “Camouflaging Power and Privilege: A Critical Race Analysis of University Diversity Policies,” in *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 43, No. 5, 2007, p. 607.

¹⁰⁴ D. Van Heerden, “Not a parade downtown again!” *Exit* August 2001, p. 2.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*

author does not explicitly mention who this population or perceived audience is but they suggest that the residents of Hillbrow do not count as either and are not as worthy of a Pride parade as the residents of Rosebank, an affluent area in Johannesburg. Another article written in 2005 noted “I am still mystified at the reasons why this location was chosen. Were we supposed to reconnect with our African roots?”¹⁰⁶ The author, Mansuy continues, “well, if our roots are dug down under, then we achieved our objectives. Because that’s where we went, down under. And it was not pleasant. It was not fun.”¹⁰⁷ They continue to question the purpose of “send[ing] us to the dumps,” and what this change in route aimed to achieve by having participants parading “down the back routes and the grey areas of Joburg.”¹⁰⁸ They conclude with “I thought that the aim of a Gay Pride was to show people, the world that we were out there, that Gays are not to be afraid of, that we are part of a community called society.”¹⁰⁹ What Mansuy seems to be suggesting is that only a certain kind of visibility, for example the visibility of middle-class gay men in an affluent suburb, counts as visibility. The connections made between “African roots” and “down under”, “the dumps” and “the grey areas” serves to construct Africaness as cheap, dirty and dull. This deems these areas and the people who live here as unworthy of visibility. However, the continued violence directed at LGBTIAQ people of colour demonstrates the need to challenge homophobia beyond the suburbs.

The change in route also raised significant concerns about “safety”. For instance, in 2005 a Pride participant was struck by a bottle during the parade downtown. This was seen to “add to fears people have about an inner city route.”¹¹⁰ Trengove-Jones writes that the person who was struck by the bottle “despite our constitution, our Parade, our parties, need[ed] to remain nameless.”¹¹¹ This incident, which clearly indicates that there is a need to trouble heterosexual and heteronormative spaces all over the city, facilitates a focus on safety, rather than on visibility. This concern for safety seems at odds with responses (or rather lack of responses) to other instances of violence, for example “corrective rape”, experienced by LGBTIAQ people of colour. This is another example of how only certain LGBTIAQ people, those

¹⁰⁶ A. Mansuy, “PRIDE 2005 – Quite a disaster,” *Exit* November 2005, p. 2.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁰ G. Hayward, “Pride at 16 not all sweet,” *Exit* October 2005, p. 1.

¹¹¹ T. Trengove-Jones, “Can we Pride ourselves on PRIDE?” *Exit* November 2005, p. 4.

who are outside of whiteness, are invisibilised and therefore their trauma is not recognised as harm. As Helman (2017) argues colonial constructions of personhood which position black people as non-human make the harm that happens to them ungrievable.¹¹²

Attempts to diversify Pride by moving the parade to a different part of the city were met with resistance. This can be seen as an example of how whiteness, in order to protect itself, resists attempts at diversity and inclusivity. In the case of Joburg Pride this was done by constructing the new route as “other”. In this way, whiteness was able to maintain its position of power and remain uninterrogated.

5.5. Conclusion

Joburg Pride remains uneven in terms of the distribution of power and creating the space for diverse experiences, including the political. This unevenness is constituted by whiteness, which is actively maintained through performances of white talk and discourse which call to forget the past. While the LGBTIAQ “community” may speak of diversity and difference, Pride continues to be shaped by whiteness and racism – either explicitly or unconsciously through a lack of engagement with the lived experiences of all members of the LGBTIAQ “community”. Within this context matters that impact on white individuals tend to be read or received as the only matters that are of significance, and white experiences are assumed to be the experiences of all. Therefore, whiteness is read as the default position and anything outside of whiteness is positioned as “other”, invisible or outside of the collective. This can be seen in discussions of the change in route; the Pride committee’s response to the One in Nine disruption of the parade; and in Harford’s interview where they discuss how race should not have anything to do with it, while simultaneously using their white privilege to police the bodies of LGBTIAQ people of colour.

Pride is seen as “manifestly discriminatory”, not only in terms of whiteness and wilful ignorance but also in terms of structural discrimination and economic exclusion.¹¹³ This is evident in the introduction of an entrance fee, which is argued to be a form of neo-apartheid. In this way Pride comes to privilege those with access to wealth and who can afford to pay for entrance fees, who happen to be predominantly white members of the LGBTIAQ

¹¹² R. Helman, “Why are all rapes not grievable?” in *South African Journal of Psychology*, 2017, pp. 1-4.

¹¹³ Trengove-Jones, “The sad decline of pride,” p. 4.

“community”. The LGBTIAQ “community”, or rather the “community” around Joburg Pride, is seen to be “upholding the bastions of white male middle class.”¹¹⁴ It does so by constructing Pride in such a way that it attracts predominantly white participants and in catering to a white minority it comes to discourage LGBTIAQ people of colour from attending. Further, the negative responses to the establishment of Black Pride illustrate the way in which whiteness resists attempts to disrupt its dominance.

The examples discussed in this chapter show how Pride is constructed in relation to whiteness; the discrimination based on race and class which is inherent to the space, and the need for visibility of members of the “community” who are not white and/or gay men. The following chapter attempts to interrogate the social context that makes these performances of whiteness possible. Chapter six explores how the transition from apartheid to post-apartheid South Africa did not fully address the violence of whiteness, and in fact, in some ways, continued to protect this position of power and the violence it perpetrates. Chapter six takes this chapter’s discussion of whiteness and situates it within the context of constructing the Rainbow Nation.

¹¹⁴ Unknown author, “Imagine all the people,” *Exit*, May 1993, p. 8.

CHAPTER SIX: THE MYTH OF THE RAINBOW NATION

6.1. Introduction

The history of Joburg Pride “rests heavily with the identification of a broader struggle.”¹ Pride was established at a time when the LGBTIAQ “community” was being granted legal protections under the South African Constitution, and integrated into the country’s multicultural project; the Rainbow Nation. However, as discussed in the previous chapter the shift to the “new” South Africa brought with it calls to forget the past because we are now all equal. This is evidence of the post-race discourse which emerged post 1994. This chapter will argue that this post-race discourse is intertwined with the notion of the “Rainbow Nation”.

Despite the establishment of one of the world’s most progressive constitutions, glaring inequalities persist in post-1994 South Africa. These inequalities are divided along intersecting lines of race, class and gender.² In this context post-race discourses are dangerously depoliticising. This chapter wishes to interrogate the notion of the Rainbow Nation in light of very real contrasts in lived experiences in the “new” South Africa. This chapter is particularly interested in the implications of Rainbow Nation rhetoric for the 2012 clash, as well as Joburg Pride and the LGBTIAQ communities more broadly. In being afforded equal rights, lesbian and gay South Africans were recognised as having been discriminated against and worthy of constitutional protection. However in light of intersecting structures of oppression, these constitutional rights do not translate into protection for all LGBTIAQ South Africans. As discussed in chapter five, many white gay and lesbian South Africans fail to recognise the way in which discrimination based on sexuality intersects with gender, race and class and therefore they fail to interrogate how their (white and middle-class) privilege protects them from a variety of violences that are enacted towards LGBTIAQ people of colour, particularly those who are poor.

This failure to interrogate whiteness and its privileges may be constituted by the project of nation building in the form of the Rainbow Nation. This project sought to build a nation that presents all South Africans as united through sharing a common history, rather than

¹ Unknown author, “Pride gifts for children,” *Exit*, July 1997, p. 9.

² C. Mcleod, “Radical plural feminisms and emancipatory practice in post-apartheid South Africa,” in *Theory & Psychology*, Vol 16 (3), 2006, p. 368.

interrogate the inequalities of the past.³ Building a nation focused on non-racialism averted the tough discussions necessary for addressing the violence of apartheid South Africa. The discourse of Rainbow Nation in which all are equal did not allow for a meaningful engagement with the trauma of those positioned as “non-white” under apartheid. This discourse also allowed for white South Africans to maintain their position of privilege without taking responsibility for their participation (actively or passively) in the violences perpetrated by the apartheid system. Within this context the 2012 Joburg Pride clash is perhaps not surprising. Similarly, student-led social movements such as #RhodesMustFall and #FeesMustFall have challenged the idea of the Rainbow Nation by making visible the effects of colonialism and whiteness.⁴

This chapter aims to explore issues of rights and citizenship in relation to LGBTIAQ people in South Africa. It also seeks to interrogate the Rainbow Nation Project and the consequences of this project for multiple and diverse lived experiences in post-1994 South Africa. I introduce the concept of “rainbow-washing” to explore how certain experiences have been ignored or washed over.

An article in *Exit* noted that Joburg Pride had “a history born out of the peaceful revolution,” going on to link the movement to the end of apartheid and the formation of a new nation.⁵ The article attributes this to “the hard work of activists in the late eighties and early nineties” through which the call for equal rights for lesbian and gay South Africans “was successfully linked to the struggle for equality for all the people in South Africa.”⁶ In these extracts the author suggests that the establishment of the Equality Clause and the Constitution has solved the inequalities of the past. This is an example of how with the “new” South Africa everything is constructed as “fine,” because LGBTIAQ people now have their rights protected by the Equality Clause.⁷ While this may be the case for some LGBTIAQ South Africans, as Smit points

³ E. Bornman, “The Rainbow Nation versus the colours of the rainbow: Nation-building versus diversity in post-apartheid South Africa with some notes on the role of the media,” inaugural lecture, University of South Africa, Pretoria, 2014, p. 11.

⁴ C. L. Laureore, “‘Rhodes Must Fall’: Student Activism and the Politics of Memory at the University of Cape Town, South Africa,” Honours Thesis, Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, 2016.

⁵ Unknown author, “Pride: out there, everywhere,” *Exit*, October 2001, p. 9

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ G. Hayward, interview with the researcher, Johannesburg, 24 March 2016.

out, in post-apartheid South Africa, “any grand notion of equality...is problematic.”⁸ This is because white South Africans and South Africans of colour may be represented as equal in terms of the law and legal protections but they are not equal on economic and social grounds because of the advantages that apartheid bestowed upon white people.⁹ Linked to this, constitutional protection did not automatically result in protection of all LGBTIAQ South Africans (and all South Africans). This absence of protection beyond paper can be seen as a key driving factor of the Joburg Pride 2012 moment, which sought to highlight the ongoing violence experienced by LGBTIAQ people of colour. The protest highlighted the way in which, due to the legacy of apartheid and specifically the intersections of race, class, gender and sexuality, many persons of colour could not access the same level of rights and protection as white South Africans. What follows is a discussion of rights and citizenship; the national project; and the consequences of the symbol of the rainbow in order to more fully explore these contradictions.

6.2. Rights and Citizenship

In the early 1990s Pride operated as a space to rally around and lobby for equal rights for LGBTIAQ citizens in the “new” South Africa. Simon Nkoli called for the community to be visible, and to “come out and say: ‘Don’t disregard us. We here and we have a right to be here.’”¹⁰ Similarly, the Archbishop Tutu, urged “the framers of the Constitution 'to include gay and lesbian people in the "Rainbow People" of South Africa',” and advocated for this by emphasising how apartheid had denied LGBTIAQ people “their basic human rights and reduced them to social outcasts and criminals in their land of birth.”¹¹ In *Exit* one article argues that GLOW “demand[ed] that Gay and Lesbian issues be included in the agenda to democratise South Africa,” and had “been negotiating with the ANC to add a clause to its proposed Bill of Rights to protect gay men and lesbians from discrimination.”¹² Another article goes on to explain how GLOW, in order to extend protections to gay and lesbian South Africans, had pushed for these rights to be recognised as inseparable “from the struggle for

⁸ S. Smit, “Challenging desire: performing whiteness in post-apartheid South Africa,” Doctoral thesis, Rhodes University, Grahamstown, 2014, p. 36.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Unknown author, “GLOW turns 2,” *Exit*, May, June 1990, p. 7.

¹¹ R. Thoreson, “Somewhere over the Rainbow Nation: Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Activism in South Africa,” in *Journal of Southern African Studies*, Vol. 34, No. 3, 2008, p. 687.

¹² Unknown author, “Viva Gay Pride! Viva! Viva!” *Exit*, November December 1990, p. 1.

freedom for all South Africans.”¹³ During this time there was the sense that “South Africa would be firmly based on equality for all,” on the basis of a “shared understanding and experience of oppression” among South Africans.¹⁴

The drafting of the Constitution saw that the rights on the basis of sexual identity were included in Chapter Two, Section Nine (known as the Equality Clause). The Equality Clause stated that “[t]he state may not unfairly discriminate directly or indirectly against anyone on one or more grounds.”¹⁵ Included in this was “race, gender, sex, pregnancy, marital status, ethnic or social origin, colour, sexual orientation, age, disability, religion, conscience, belief, culture, language and birth.”¹⁶

This section of the Constitution made South Africa the first country in the world to ban the discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation.¹⁷ Section Nine also explicitly worked to address the laws of the apartheid system which had controlled the mixing of races, such as the Immorality Act. This act, in its focus on “the preservation of the white, heterosexual, reproductive family” sought to protect white heterosexual power and the reproductive family by criminalising sex between different races.¹⁸ This is an example of how apartheid was deeply rooted in patriarchy which established gender and sexuality as central to regulation and control, leading to the policing of bodies.¹⁹ Central to apartheid was the construction of the other, with otherness being founded along lines of race, gender, sexuality, ethnicity and class.”²⁰ Although apartheid did not initially criminalise homosexual sexual practice, homosexuality was made a criminal offence by the 1966 Amendment to the Immorality Act, which was introduced because of a growing gay subculture in urban areas.²¹ In 1988 this was extended to homosexual sexual practice between women.²² Homosexuality under apartheid

¹³ Unknown author, “Marching for our rights,” *Exit*, July/August 1992, p. 11.

¹⁴ T. Trengove-Jones, “Freedom cries: A different hue of pride,” *Exit* October 2007, p. 12.

¹⁵ *The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa 1996*.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷ Thoreson, “Somewhere over the Rainbow Nation: Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Activism in South Africa,” pp. 680-1

¹⁸ *Ibid.* p. 680.

¹⁹ M. Judge, “Violence against lesbians and (IM) possibilities for identity and politics,” Doctoral thesis, University of the Western Cape, Cape Town, 2015, p. 51.

²⁰ *Ibid.* p. 52.

²¹ *Ibid.*

²² *Ibid.*

was initially considered as a white issue because of the manner in which it threatened the white family unit, which in turn threatened the nation-state.²³

Through a reliance on human rights discourse, lesbian and gay South Africans changed the apartheid laws that had criminalised their sexuality.²⁴ Trengove-Jones positions the lesbian and gay “claim to identity” as one that protests “against being marginalised,” and is thus “culturally ‘central’ [to the] post-1994 project of South African liberation politics.”²⁵ They describe the overturning of legislation that had criminalised lesbian and gay South Africans as “a record of sustained processes designed to reverse the discriminatory history that had made us a pariah among nations.”²⁶ The LGBTIAQ “community” systematically changed the apartheid laws that had criminalised their sexuality. Their legal victories included the dismantling of sodomy laws, the extension of legal protections and benefits which included adoption rights, and the right for same-sex couples to marry before the law through the Civil Union Act.²⁷

From the start, lesbian and gay equal rights advocates emphasised identity politics and opted for an essentialist approach which positioned sexuality as a fixed and unchanging identity.²⁸ Sexuality became a matter of orientation and not preference, thus a matter of biology and not choice. In opting for an essentialising approach, activists were able to communicate their discrimination as being on par with that of discrimination on the basis of race. It is this essentialism that facilitated legal success, because it was through this that activists were able to make a link between the discrimination they had faced and apartheid’s race and gender-based discrimination that the new government had undertaken to eliminate.²⁹ In employing this approach activists moved from “an oppositional ‘us versus them’ formation,” to emphasise their similarity, which enabled their inclusion in the “new” South Africa.³⁰ This is

²³ A. Vaid-Menon, “Rainbows are just refracted white light: Settler homonationalism in neo-apartheid South Africa,” Honours Thesis, Stanford University, Stanford, 2013, p. 86.

²⁴ Judge, “Violence against lesbians and (IM) possibilities for identity and politics,” p. 53.

²⁵ T. Trengove-Jones, “Pride 2000: possible or impossible,” *Exit* October 2001, p. 4.

²⁶ T. Trengove-Jones, “Who needs what Pride?” *Exit* October 2009, p.14.

²⁷ Judge, “Violence against lesbians and (IM) possibilities for identity and politics,” p. 53.

²⁸ Thoreson, “Somewhere over the Rainbow Nation: Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Activism in South Africa,” pp. 681.

²⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰ A. Ghaziani, “Post-Gay Collective Identity Construction,” in *Social Problems*. Vol. 58 (1), 2011, p. 99.

what Ghaziani calls “strategic selection”; choosing to emphasise or suppress a group’s difference to the dominant culture.³¹ Strategic selection can serve to gain the dominant culture’s protection. It is important to note that this essentialism only worked in favour of lesbian and gay South Africans, as transgender, intersex and queer South Africans were not fully included under this argument of essentialism.³² The lobbying work done around the Equality Clause centred the focus on lesbian and gay South Africans and mostly excluded transgender, intersex and queer identities from its project.

6.2.1. *Becoming assimilated citizens*

The link between rights and citizenship is evident when Trengove-Jones writes about their own rights, afforded to them “as a gay man” and “as a South African.”³³ They explain how these rights enabled them to participate in “the chorus that asserts that we ‘have (one of) the finest Constitutions in the world’.”³⁴ Trengove-Jones describes how as a gay South African they have now moved from being a criminal to someone who is equal, “accepted, recognised, protected” before the law.³⁵ They go on to describe how legal rights for all South Africans included the protection of lesbian and gay rights and thus it must follow that “a gay identity is underpinned by a South African identity.”³⁶ Here they demonstrate that in being afforded protection under the Constitution, lesbian and gay individuals thus came to be incorporated into the Rainbow Nation. Trengove-Jones suggests that “this is not about ‘gay rights’. It’s about the rights of citizens,”³⁷ and that lesbian and gay South Africans must consider their “status as South African citizens,”³⁸ and what it must “mean to be a gay citizen in SA.”³⁹ Here rights and citizenship are inextricably bound together and the implication is that they cannot be separated, that is, you cannot be a citizen without rights, and you cannot have rights if you are not a citizen.

³¹ Ghaziani, “Post-Gay Collective Identity Construction,” p. 100.

³² Thus, the study does alternate between referring to lesbian and gay South Africans and LGBTIAQ South Africans, when discussing rights and legal protections lesbian and gay South Africans are explicitly mentioned, when discussing the community “LGBTIAQ South Africans” is used.

³³ T. Trengove-Jones, “Who are we now?” *Exit* September 2012, p. 4.

³⁴ *Ibid.*

³⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁶ *Ibid.*

³⁷ T. Trengove-Jones, “Dreams, denial and pride,” *Exit* November 2007, p. 12.

³⁸ T. Trengove-Jones, “Make a point of pride,” *Exit* October 2010, p. 13.

³⁹ *Ibid.*

Citizenship within a democracy provides members with a national identity, allowing them to participate in political life and to enact their rights.⁴⁰ However, citizenship in South Africa is complex because of the layered identities that exists. In particular, there are many challenges for people of colour to achieve legitimate status as citizens, in a context which is “so fundamentally ordered by the white-supremacist-colonial-apartheid-project.”⁴¹ This is an example of how full and equal membership may be unattainable for those disadvantaged by class, race, gender and sexual orientation, even in communities or countries where they are legally citizens. Trengove-Jones glosses over this complexity in their comment and constructs the relationship between citizenship and rights only in terms of the rights afforded to lesbian and gay people.

Citizenship is hierarchically structured around various poles of social identity, for example sexuality, with heterosexuality being the dominant and naturalised position.⁴² Citizenship, therefore, comes to be legitimised through heterosexual institutions such as marriage and the family.⁴³ Within this context any rights-based claim for citizenship status for lesbian and gay people must be shaped to “fit this pre-existing heterosexual frame.”⁴⁴ This explains the focus of lesbian and gay South Africans on securing the right to get married and to adopt children. In struggling for recognition and full citizenship, LGBTIAQ individuals need to present themselves as legitimate citizens who have been erroneously excluded from certain rights.⁴⁵ Given that citizen rights are positioned around sexuality, marriage and family, securing these rights secures recognition as citizens. This is an assimilationist model of citizenship that seeks to provide lesbian and gay people with access to the same rights afforded to heterosexual citizens.⁴⁶

⁴⁰ K. Knight Abowitz and J. Harnish, “Contemporary discourses in citizenship,” in *Review of Educational Research*, Vol 76 (4), p. 653.

⁴¹ S. Phamodi, interview with the researcher, Johannesburg, 21 March 2016.

⁴² A. Roy, “Towards a practice of democratic citizenship,” in *Indian Journal of Gender Studies*, Vol 14 (1), 2007, p.6; D. Bell and J. Binnie, *The Sexual Citizen: Queer Politics and Beyond*. Polity Press: Cambridge, 2000 p. 27.

⁴³ Roy, “Towards a practice of democratic citizenship,” p. 6.

⁴⁴ Bell and Binnie, *The Sexual Citizen: Queer Politics and Beyond*, p. 27.

⁴⁵ D. Richardson, “Claiming citizenship? Sexuality, citizenship and lesbian/feminist theory,” in *Sexualities*, Vol 3 (2), 2000, p. 263.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

These assimilationist endeavours, whereby the lesbian and gay “community” provide normative or prescriptive identities for LGBTIAQ people in order to align with the requirements from heterosexual society, are referred to as homonormativity.⁴⁷ Homonormativity is a means of regulating members of the LGBTIAQ “community”, on the basis of identity, practice and politics in order to move the “community” away from “deviant” and political identities towards “individualist–consumerist practice of inclusion in heteronormative institutions.”⁴⁸ However, homonormativity seeks to grant access to only particular identities which are deemed respectable, such as white, male, middle-class and western identities.⁴⁹ Thus, homonormativity works hand in hand with whiteness in that it regulates or polices on the basis of otherness. In assimilating, white gay and lesbian South Africans reduce their otherness in order to access the privileges afforded to heterosexual and white society. We must ask then who within LGBTIAQ communities is afforded rights under the Constitution?

6.2.2. Whose rights?

As highlighted above, the rights afforded to gay or lesbian people (bisexual, transgender, intersex and queer are often excluded from this) are often contingent upon them discarding or reducing their queerness in order to assimilate into the dominant.⁵⁰ Thus, assimilating only serves to strengthen heteronormative prescriptions of citizenship as it requires compliance with heteronormative values and practices in order to gain access to the privileges granted to heterosexual citizens.⁵¹ In assimilating, therefore, one is required to give up that which makes one different to the centre. Heterosexism is produced by the dominance of heterosexual standards, which serves to maintain and protect heterosexuality as normal and natural.⁵² Heterosexism, therefore, influences and limits the formation of LGBTIAQ people’s sexual and

⁴⁷ L. Duggan, “The new homonormativity: The sexual politics of neoliberalism,” in R. Castronovo and D. Nelson (Eds), *Materializing Democracy: Toward a Revitalized Cultural Politics*, Durham: Duke University Press, 2002, pp. 175-194.

⁴⁸ D. Collins, “‘We’re there and queer’: Homonormative mobility and lived experience among gay expatriates in Manila,” in *Gender & Society*. Vol 23 (4), 2009, p. 466

⁴⁹ Ibid. p. 467.

⁵⁰ A. Narrain, “Rethinking citizenship: A queer journey,” in *Indian Journal of Gender Studies*, Vol 16 (41), 2007, p. 61.

⁵¹ C. Johnson, “Heteronormative citizenship and the politics of passing,” in *Sexualities*, Vol 5 (3), 2002, pp. 317-336.

⁵² A. Gibson and C. Macleod, “(Dis) allowances of lesbians’ sexual identities: Lesbian identity construction in racialised, classed, familial, and institutional space,” in *Feminism & Psychology*, Vol 22 (4), 2012, pp. 462-481.

gender identities by determining and regulating who they are, who they may be, and how they may express themselves.⁵³ In this way heteronormative privileges are generally denied to LGBTIAQ people. However, some lesbian and gay people have come to adopt “a normalising logic of heteronormativity” whereby they conform to the naturalised idea of a normal citizen, except for the matter of their sexual identity.⁵⁴ This failing of identity and citizenship can be overlooked if they are otherwise able to perform as appropriately “normal”. Included in this performance is an attempt to present their relationships as appropriate and worthy. This can be seen to be the reason why marriage holds a central role among lesbian and gay people, as marriage serves to further normalise their identities.⁵⁵ The limited freedom afforded to gay and lesbian people by marriage equality is highlighted by Trengove-Jones’ statement that they “doubt marriage would free us.”⁵⁶

Marriage equality became a central issue around which LGBTIAQ people organised, with Pride adopting the theme of a Wedding March in 2004.⁵⁷ However, as feminists have argued, heteronormative practices, such as marriage, come to privilege heterosexual relationships while positioning those outside of this as having unnatural or deviant identities.⁵⁸ In seeking marriage rights LGBTIAQ people are upholding and sustaining the institutions and values of the dominant heteronormative culture.⁵⁹ Therefore, lesbian and gay people reinforce heteronormativity as the dominant culture.⁶⁰ This is an example of how lesbian and gay South Africans carry “the deadening weight of heterosexual conventions and its normalising, validating ritual of marriage.”⁶¹ Marriage has long been a governing institution that draws “boundaries of social inclusion and exclusion,” leading those outside of this to desire access to it, in order to gain recognition.⁶² Thus, Trengove-Jones asks if one “MUST one be married”

⁵³ Gibson and Macleod, ““(Dis) allowances of lesbians’ sexual identities: Lesbian identity construction in racialised, classed, familial, and institutional space,” pp. 462-481.

⁵⁴ I. Lynch and D.J.F. Maree, “Negotiating heteronormativity: Exploring South African bisexual women’s constructions of marriage and family,” in *Feminism & Psychology*. Vol 23 (4), 2013, p. 460.

⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁶ T. Trengove-Jones, “Are we really proud of pride?” *Exit*, September 2002, p. 6.

⁵⁷ T. Trengove-Jones, “Pride again” *Exit*, September 2004, p. 4

⁵⁸ S. Singh, “Overcoming heteronormative hegemony: queer resistance to neoliberalism in Chile,” Master’s thesis, National University of Singapore, Singapore, 2015, p. 31.

⁵⁹ Ibid. pp. 31-2.

⁶⁰ Ibid. p. 31.

⁶¹ T. Trengove-Jones, “Mincing for marriage?” *Exit*, October 2004, p. 4.

⁶² M. Van Zyl, “A Sexual Politics of Belonging: Same-Sex Marriage in Post-Apartheid South Africa,” Doctoral thesis, Stellenbosch University, Stellenbosch, 2015, p. ii.

to have one's relationship recognised, and to be considered partners?⁶³ Here Trengove-Jones can be seen to be challenging the way in which marriage is positioned as the only legitimate relationship form.

In their assimilation into the heterosexist culture, lesbian and gay people come to participate in the othering of non-normative identities and relationships as heteronormativity comes to dictate what is socially valuable and what are appropriate ways of being.⁶⁴ Therefore, lesbian and gay people may come to other and exclude LGBTIAQ people who are deemed to be illegitimate or bad lesbian and gay citizens. Lesbian and gay identities, in regulating themselves and other members of the LGBTIAQ communities, adopt the norms and values of belonging that are associated with a good heterosexual citizen.⁶⁵ Duggan's work on homonormativity makes it possible to interrogate how gay rights are increasingly complicit with capitalism, white supremacy, imperialism and other systems and structures of discrimination and oppression.⁶⁶ The homosexual family, assimilated into the centre, is then normalised and comes to partake in society and the production of the nation.⁶⁷ Therefore, lesbian and gay groups come to endorse equality founded in neoliberalism, with an emphasis on consumption and domesticity.⁶⁸ This sees "gay political organising becom[ing] increasingly corporatized and commercialised."⁶⁹ Hence, an "idealised sexual citizen" comes to be constituted through neoliberal discourse that emphasises rights, freedom, consumption and cosmopolitanism and white power comes to be produced through neoliberal politics, as the citizen is presumed to be a white, male, middle-class, and western subject.⁷⁰ Within this context, sexual identity politics become about extending the heterosexual norm and not

⁶³ Trengove-Jones, "Pride again," p. 4.

⁶⁴ Lynch and Maree, "Negotiating heteronormativity: Exploring South African bisexual women's constructions of marriage and family," pp. 459-60.

⁶⁵ R. Payne and C. Davies, "Introduction to the special section: Citizenship and queer critique," in *Sexualities*. Vol 15 (3), 2012, p. 254.

⁶⁶ Vaid-Menon, "Rainbows are just refracted white light: Settler homonationalism in neo-apartheid South Africa," p. 14.

⁶⁷ A. Yue, "Queer Asian mobility and homonational modernity: marriage equality, Indian students in Australia and Malaysian transgender refugees in the media," in *Global Media and Communication*, Vol 8(30), 2012, p. 275.

⁶⁸ J. Teal and M. Conover-Williams, "Homophobia without Homophobes: Deconstructing the Public Discourses of 21st Century Queer Sexualities in the United States," in *Humboldt Journal of Social Relations*. Vol 38, 2016, p. 18.

⁶⁹ Judge, "Violence against lesbians and (IM) possibilities for identity and politics," p. 55.

⁷⁰ K. Burns, "Cosmopolitan sexual citizenship and the project of queer world-making at the Sydney 2002 Gay Games," in *Sexualities*. Vol 15 (3), 2012, p. 314.

about challenging or transgressing it, or working to protect and accept the other and queer identities.⁷¹

Puar has argued that the nation is constituted as heteronormative and therefore queer is “inherently an outlaw of the nation-state” because sexuality comes to be a central marker for identifying good and appropriate citizens.⁷² Queers, by disrupting heteronormativity and homonormativity, are a threat to the national project.⁷³ Thus, it is necessary that lesbian and gay citizens are incorporated and integrated into the national project, while queers are deemed unworthy and incapable of assimilating into this project.⁷⁴ Hence, lesbian and gay identities come to participate in the “incorporation and quarantining” of other or queer identities, in order to protect national identities.⁷⁵ The Constitution and the Equality Clause can be seen as example of this process, as they instilled a sense of patriotism among lesbian and gay South Africans. Later the Civil Union Act helped to assimilate them into the institution of marriage, one of the key tools of heteronormativity and patriotism.

The awarding of equal rights to lesbian and gay citizens can also be seen to be linked to global power relations. For example, nations may employ the discourse of equal rights for lesbian and gay citizens in order to position themselves as superior to other nation-states.⁷⁶ This may have contributed to the democratic South African government’s decision to afford certain rights to LGBTIAQ South Africans as this would be a way to position itself as progressive and superior to other nation-states. This may have been particularly important in light of the precarious position that South Africa held in global politics prior to 1994.

⁷¹ N. Oswin, “Critical geographies and the uses of sexuality: deconstructing queer space,” in *Progress in Human Geography*, Vol 32 (1), 2008. p. 92.

⁷² J. Puar, “Rethinking homonationalism,” in *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, Vol 45 (2), 2013, pp. 336-339.

⁷³ J.R. Jakobsen, “Can homosexuals end western civilisation as we know it? Family values in a global economy,” in A. Cruz-Malave and M.F. Manalansan (Eds), *Queer Globalisations: Citizenship and The Afterlife of Colonialism*. New York University Press: New York, 2002, p. 61.

⁷⁴ A.M. Aganthelelou, M.D. Bassichis, and T.L. Spira, “Intimate Investments: Homonormativity, Global Lockdown, and the Seductions of Empire,” in *Radical History Review*. Issue 100, 2008, p. 127.

⁷⁵ Ibid.

⁷⁶ Yue, “Queer Asian mobility and homonational modernity: marriage equality, Indian students in Australia and Malaysian transgender refugees in the media,” p. 275.

The granting of rights to (certain) LGBTIAQ people in South Africa could be considered to be an example of homonationalism, which relies heavily on Duggan's work on homonormativity.⁷⁷ Puar describes this as the admission of a select homosexual, often white and western, as "worthy of protection by nation-states."⁷⁸ Puar developed the concept of homonationalism as a means of showing the connections between neoliberalism, sexuality and race in North America and Europe.⁷⁹ Homonationalism is useful here because it allows for a link to be made between lesbian and gay rights in South Africa and the formation of the Rainbow Nation in which these homosexual bodies now come to be worthy of protection. These bodies are predominantly white bodies, and thus, one could argue that by integrating lesbian and gay South Africans under the protection of the law, white power comes to be maintained.⁸⁰ Below I discuss the Rainbow nation project or what I call the myth of the Rainbow Nation.

6.3. The Myth of the Rainbow Nation

Pride has been described in *Exit* as "a quintessentially South Africa signifier" whose "very hybridity bespeaks the 'rainbow' nation."⁸¹ It was described as representing the aspirations of the new South Africa as a collective united in its diversity and "demonstrating the 'right to be different'."⁸² In another *Exit* article written in 1994, members of the LGBTIAQ "community" were encouraged to "be there [at Pride] and take your place in the rainbow nation."⁸³ The Rainbow Nation was an important project of solidarity to unite a divided nation and soothe a people, post-apartheid. The Rainbow Nation was invoked for its metaphorical and symbolic value. The term was first coined by Archbishop Tutu as an extension and a continuation of the ANC's notion of "non-racialism."⁸⁴ It came to be adopted by the media and general society as

⁷⁷ J. Ritchie, "Pinkwashing, Homonationalism, and Israel–Palestine: The Conceits of Queer Theory and the Politics of the Ordinary," in *Antipode* Vol. 47 (3), 2015, p. 618.

⁷⁸ Puar, "Rethinking homonationalism," p. 337.

⁷⁹ Ritchie, "Pinkwashing, Homonationalism, and Israel–Palestine: The Conceits of Queer Theory and the Politics of the Ordinary," p. 620

⁸⁰ *Ibid.* p. 631.

⁸¹ T. Trengove-Jones, "Pride: the politics of the party," *Exit* November 2008, p. 12.

⁸² *Ibid.*

⁸³ Unknown author, "Gay Pride Parade," *Exit* June 1994, p. 23.

⁸⁴ M.T. Myambo, "The limits of rainbow nation multiculturalism in the new South Africa: Spatial configuration in Zakes Mda's *Ways of Dying* and Jonathan Morgan's *Finding Mr. Madini*," in *Research in African Literatures*, Vol 41 (2), 2010, p. 94; P. Gqola, "Defining people: Analysing power, language and representation in metaphors of the New South Africa," in *Transformation*, Vol 47, 2001, p. 100.

a way of describing the “new” South African nation.⁸⁵ In 1994, the first mention of the Rainbow Nation and of Mandela as president is made in *Exit*. They cite Mandela’s inauguration speech in which they spoke of how South Africans would “build a society in which all South Africans will be able to walk tall, without any fear in their hearts, assured of their inalienable rights to human dignity,” and that South Africa would be “a rainbow nation at peace with itself and the world.”⁸⁶ Here we see an attempt to build a sense of a new nation, a nation which can be thought of as “a large project of “solidarity” whereby its citizens were united through a shared past.”⁸⁷

This resonates with Anderson’s notion of the nation as an “imagined political community;”⁸⁸ a construction of collective imaginations. Under the conceptualisation of the Rainbow Nation, all South Africans are then presumed to be “united by common historical experiences, shared ideas and a common destiny as the people of South Africa.”⁸⁹ The various colours of the rainbow are seen to represent the numerous racial and ethnic groups of South Africa, now united as a collective within the new democratic state.⁹⁰

Trengove-Jones explains that “it is often said, that the rights enjoyed by LGBTI citizens in this country are in fact not enjoyed by them,” and that “they are only rights on paper.”⁹¹ They continue to speak to how rights and some aspects of transformation in South Africa are “merely ‘symbolic’” and that for many South Africans they “regard crucial measures of transformation as ‘not worth the paper they are written on’.”⁹² The focus in discussions of rights, for example the approach to lesbian and gay rights, tends to emphasise “formal equality rather than substantive equality.”⁹³ In this way, the notion of rights, as well as the notion of the Rainbow Nation exist as symbolic rather than material benefits. This is perhaps why, the idea of the “new” South Africa is also described by Bornman as “the myth of the

⁸⁵ A. Habib, “South Africa – The Rainbow Nation and prospects for consolidating democracy,” in *African Journal of Political Science*, Vol 2 (2), pp. 15-6.

⁸⁶ Unknown author, “Gay Pride Parade,” *Exit* June 1994, p. 23.

⁸⁷ E. Renan, “What is a Nation?” Conference paper at the Sorbonne, E. Rundell (trans.), 11 March 1882.

⁸⁸ B. Anderson, *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*, London: Verso, 1983, p. 4.

⁸⁹ Bornman, “The Rainbow Nation versus the colours of the rainbow: Nation-building versus diversity in post-apartheid South Africa with some notes on the role of the media,” p. 11.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.* p. 1.

⁹¹ T. Trengove-Jones, “Who are we now?,” *Exit* September 2012, p. 4.

⁹² T. Trengove-Jones, “Who needs what Pride?,” *Exit* October 2009, p. 14.

⁹³ Van Zyl, “A Sexual Politics of Belonging: Same-Sex Marriage in Post-Apartheid South Africa,” p. 60.

Rainbow Nation.”⁹⁴ The reliance on the Rainbow Nation myth is what Gqola termed “Rainbowism.”⁹⁵ They describe how the Rainbow Nation became synonymous with the “new” South Africa and that, in invoking the Rainbow Nation as a collective or unifying force, the metaphor came to suppress debates on difference and discrepancies in power.⁹⁶ As Gqola describes, a rainbow is “a reflection, a spectacular visual illusion” which is “constitutive of the new ‘truths’ in a democratic South Africa.”⁹⁷ Much like a visual illusion, there is a critical inconsistency in appearing, symbolically, to be emphasising difference while simultaneously suppressing it through the prevention of discussion in order to appear to be a collective or whole.⁹⁸ The Rainbow Nation, is essentially what Myambo terms, “a radical form of multiculturalism,”⁹⁹ which allows for only a surface level engagement with diversity and difference without necessarily challenging systems of discrimination and exclusion.¹⁰⁰ Similarly, in their interview Phamodi argued that multiculturalism is a “poisonous concept,” and that the 2012 Pride clash was “the manifest result of a rainbow nationalist identity that tried to mask over our difference and force a common cohesive multicultural identity.”¹⁰¹ They continue to explain how the multicultural project of the Rainbow Nation “is not at all interested in that which makes your experience of the society that you are located in so different and so distinct.”¹⁰² Therefore, the One in Nine Campaign’s disruption of Pride is positioned as a legitimate response to an attempt to smooth over significant differences in identities and experiences.

In their interview Mbhele says that they didn’t think that Archbishop Tutu had “an active intention” when they first used the term but rather that it was “an expression of the hope [they] had for what this country could become.”¹⁰³ Lakhani shares this sentiment, stating that it was an important metaphor and symbol at the time of transition. They felt that while it

⁹⁴ Bornman, “The Rainbow Nation versus the colours of the rainbow: Nation-building versus diversity in post-apartheid South Africa with some notes on the role of the media,” p. 1.

⁹⁵ Gqola, “Defining people: Analysing power, language and representation in metaphors of the New South Africa,” pp. 98-9.

⁹⁶ Ibid.

⁹⁷ Ibid. p. 100.

⁹⁸ Ibid. p. 98-9.

⁹⁹ Myambo, “The limits of rainbow nation multiculturalism in the new South Africa: Spatial configuration in Zakes Mda’s *Ways of Dying* and Jonathan Morgan’s *Finding Mr. Madini*,” p. 94.

¹⁰⁰ F. Stella, “Queer Space, Pride, and Shame in Moscow,” in *Slavic Review*, Vol. 72(3), 2013, p. 460.

¹⁰¹ S. Phamodi, interview with the researcher, Johannesburg. 21 March 2016.

¹⁰² Ibid.

¹⁰³ Z. Mbhele, interview with the researcher, Cape Town, 18 November 2016.

served a purpose, South Africa hid behind the symbol because it offered “a false sense of security and wonderfulness, and warmth and pride.”¹⁰⁴ The overthrowing of apartheid was a significant achievement for South Africans and so “people were allowed to have a little bit of a rest” because South Africans had been fighting against apartheid for “decades, whole lives, whole generations of families had been fighting this fight.”¹⁰⁵ This discussion highlights the way in which the emphasis on the political, and more specifically on disrupting unequal power dynamics, was relaxed in the post-1994 period. Linked to this, the notion of the Rainbow Nation conveys a sense of calmness and unity which dilutes the need for political engagement.

The symbolic force¹⁰⁶ of the concept of the Rainbow Nation was momentous, and through constructing the image of a country united in difference, it came to provide stability during South Africa’s transition.¹⁰⁷ However, Lakhani described how the symbol of the Rainbow Nation “became a band aid but also became like this giant wall that we hid behind.”¹⁰⁸ South Africans hid behind the rainbow and it came to mask the inequity and complexity, projecting the idea that all “was okay, because we’re the Rainbow Nation and that’s what the world sees us as.”¹⁰⁹ This comment highlights the interplay between the local and the global and, in particular, the way in which a global gaze on South Africa during its transition to democracy may have enhanced the need to perform unity, solidarity and peace. A masking of complexities occurs because of the focus on non-racialism and inclusiveness in the “new” South Africa which constructed any form of race or ethnic awareness as a remnant of apartheid, and therefore no longer valid or appropriate.¹¹⁰ This overlaps, perhaps unintentionally, with whiteness and its dismissal of issues of race. Consequently the Rainbow Nation, with its emphasis on non-racialism, was able to enter seamlessly into dominant white discourse. This emphasis on non-racialism saw to it that “not seeing race” became associated

¹⁰⁴ I. Lakhani, interview with the researcher, Cape Town, 9 February 2016.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid.

¹⁰⁶ J. Stratton and I. Ang, “Multicultural imagined communities: Cultural difference and national identity in the USA and Australia,” in D. Bennett, (Ed.), *Multicultural States: Rethinking Difference and Identity*. Routledge: London and New York, 1998, p. 135.

¹⁰⁷ Bornman, “The Rainbow Nation versus the colours of the rainbow: Nation-building versus diversity in post-apartheid South Africa with some notes on the role of the media,” p. 13.

¹⁰⁸ I. Lakhani, interview with the researcher, Cape Town, 9 February 2016.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid.

¹¹⁰ Bornman, “The Rainbow Nation versus the colours of the rainbow: Nation-building versus diversity in post-apartheid South Africa with some notes on the role of the media,” p. 10.

with anti-racism or being anti-racist.¹¹¹ Through this not seeing of race, or adopting a “colour-blindness,” the myth of the Rainbow Nation maintains racism without the use of raced language.¹¹²

This is how, rainbowism, reinforces an illusion of equality and thus disregards the need for redress to correct and remedy the effects of apartheid.¹¹³ It comes to mask difference and in not engaging with it “reduces it to a nonentity,” such that whiteness and white power, while no longer state sanctioned, come to be “whitewashed of all meaning.”¹¹⁴ Thus, rainbowism allows the charade or illusion of unity to continue through dismissing the past and its “accompanying power dynamics which continue to influence the present.”¹¹⁵ This then comes to suggest that the injustices of the past have been eradicated and no longer persist.¹¹⁶

This avoidance of raced language due to the non-racist approach of rainbowism can be seen in Lakhani’s description of how under the Rainbow Nation, people “can’t talk about how fucked we are because we were fucked up for so long.”¹¹⁷ They continue to explain how some of this was because the international “community” had “finally recognised us, and things were wonderful, and we had this beautiful constitution, and we have Nelson Mandela, and we won the rugby.”¹¹⁸ They then speak to how if South Africans were to speak about race and confront difference, inequality and injustice, then “we’re not shiny anymore.”¹¹⁹ They said that they understood the necessity for the symbol, and that it was a “unifying force,” needed at the time but that South Africans “took it too far.”¹²⁰ Here Lakhani highlights the way in which the myth of the Rainbow Nation prevents meaningful engagement around inequality and racism and, by preventing these discussions, the discourse in fact prevents the establishment of an anti-racist society.

¹¹¹ Smit, *Challenging desire: performing whiteness in post-apartheid South Africa*, p. 37

¹¹² *Ibid.*

¹¹³ Gqola, “Defining people: Analysing power, language and representation in metaphors of the New South Africa,” p. 103.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.* p. 104.

¹¹⁷ I. Lakhani, interview with the researcher, Cape Town, 9 February 2016.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*

Lakhani argues that the concept of the Rainbow Nation is “exhausted,” and is no longer relevant because it ignores the complexity of identity in South Africa.¹²¹ Lakhani goes on to describe how “there are some people that still believe in the Rainbow Nation,” and that they “are ignorant to the complexities, to the inequalities.”¹²² They state that they “think it is nonsense.”¹²³ Mbhele said that some South Africans, like Lakhani, may “reject rainbow nationalism” because there isn’t the basis or means to consider a nation united “until we fix those structural and material and psychological issues.”¹²⁴ In the case of South Africa, as Lakhani and Mbhele have shown, the concept of the rainbow was one of hope and one that served a purpose but has come to be exhausted, although some people still believe in it as a healthy symbol. However, when viewed through a lens informed by whiteness studies and multiculturalism, one could argue that the concept of the Rainbow Nation furthers the project of whiteness. It does this by avoiding an interrogation of the past and by not challenging the privileged position that whiteness continues to hold in the South African context. To declare the violence of apartheid over and that a new nation needs to be established, does little to help process the pain of those who suffered under apartheid.

For instance, through a multicultural approach, whiteness in South Africa went mostly unchallenged, and was incorporated into the South African discourse of multicultural citizenship.¹²⁵ Vaid-Menon offers a critique of Rainbow Nation rhetoric and whiteness, writing that lesbian and gay South Africans through human rights discourse and the promotion of rights on the basis of sexuality, were able to protect whiteness. In recognising lesbian and gay rights, South Africa managed to draw the international “community’s” attention away from racial and economic injustices that would require radical structural change.¹²⁶ Ultimately, “[t]he acceptance of the gay body helped foster a whiteness that was envisioned as sympathetic, progressive, and concerned with social justice.”¹²⁷ This thereby protected whiteness, and its violence, from critique and interrogation. In failing to challenge whiteness it becomes normalised or obscured and forgotten. This process further dismisses the pain of

¹²¹ I. Lakhani, interview with the researcher, Cape Town, 9 February 2016.

¹²² Ibid.

¹²³ Ibid.

¹²⁴ Z. Mbhele, interview with the researcher, Cape Town, 18 November 2016.

¹²⁵ Vaid-Menon, *Rainbows are just refracted white light: Settler homonationalism in neo-apartheid South Africa*, p. 77.

¹²⁶ Ibid. p. 91.

¹²⁷ Ibid.

those oppressed under apartheid, and who continue to be discriminated against, while granting immunity to white people from assessing their role in apartheid and white supremacy.¹²⁸

In relation to LGBTIAQ people in South Africa, the formal recognition of rights can be seen as an attempt to integrate this group into the Rainbow Nation. However, as has been discussed previously in this thesis, the granting of these rights did not serve to eradicate, but rather only to invisibilise, the inequalities that exist between different LGBTIAQ people, for example on the basis of race and class.¹²⁹ This can be seen as an example of “the founding myth of unity in diversity” that came to emphasise equality over differences, thereby constructing difference as insignificant.¹³⁰ Trengove-Jones, in an earlier article asks if the myth of the Rainbow Nation and its people will triumph, and whether “unity in difference [will come to] be seen as so normal as not to need mentioning?”¹³¹ They then suggest that considering “the levels of racism that still prevail in this country,” that they doubt that such a state would arrive soon.¹³² Trengove-Jones’ comment highlights the tension that exists between the myth of the Rainbow Nation and the material realities of inequality that continue to shape the experiences of the majority of South Africans.

The construction of South Africa as a global leader with regards to LGBTIAQ rights, washes over issues of racism and economic exclusion, thereby allowing these violences to continue. Marginalised people are not able to experience citizenship or the benefits of equality in the same manner as privileged people because of the structural discrimination and legacy from apartheid.¹³³ In this context, white people, including white gay and lesbian people who have been able to assimilate and embrace the idea of the Rainbow Nation, participate in ongoing violence against people of colour. This is illustrative of how the notion of the South African

¹²⁸ Vaid-Menon, Rainbows are just refracted white light: Settler homonationalism in neo-apartheid South Africa, p. 77.

¹²⁹ Habib, “South Africa – The Rainbow Nation and prospects for consolidating democracy,” pp. 15-6.

¹³⁰ T. Trengove-Jones, “Pride 2000: possible or impossible,” October 2001, p. 4.

¹³¹ T. Trengove-Jones, “Pride and the Party Animal,” *Exit*, November 2000, p. 13.

¹³² *Ibid.*

¹³³ Van Zyl, “A Sexual Politics of Belonging: Same-Sex Marriage in Post-Apartheid South Africa,” p. 61.

rainbow is not only a “spectacular visual illusion” and a “fantasy”¹³⁴ but, it is also as Vaid-Menon has argued “refracted white light.”¹³⁵

6.4. Rainbow-washing

The establishment of the Constitution and the affording of rights to lesbian and gay South Africans created the perception that everyone was on an equal footing. In *Exit*, we find evidence of this, as already discussed in chapter five, where South Africans are described as “hav[ing] transcended a history of dealing with each other through their differences,” and as having moved from being “a society that was deeply divided by these artificial barriers to one which exists without such boundaries.”¹³⁶ To be able to make such a statement in light of ongoing inequality shows an absence of reflection but also a particular position of privilege. However, when one considers that the recognition of gay and lesbian rights positioned white South Africans as more liberal and accepting of difference, such a statement is not so surprising. This image of a liberal, accepting and transformed white South African enabled white South Africans to evade critiques of ongoing violence. The construction of South Africa as an example of transformation and progress in respect to gay rights results in the overshadowing of the racial and economic discrimination and inequality that many LGBTIAQ people of colour continue to experience.¹³⁷ Trengove-Jones argues that in light of the divisions of Joburg Pride, as made explicit by the clash, the image of a united collective is a fabricated one.¹³⁸

We see Rainbow Nation discourse circulating in *Exit* that South Africa “is reaching beyond geographical, social, cultural and economic boundaries and taking the lead in outlawing discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation.”¹³⁹ Part of the rhetoric of the Rainbow Nation is that it does not deconstruct the past but rather constructs a nation in relation to non-racialism that presents all South Africans as “united by common historical experiences,”

¹³⁴ Gqola, “Defining people: Analysing power, language and representation in metaphors of the New South Africa,” pp. 98-9.

¹³⁵ Vaid-Menon, “Rainbows are just refracted white light: Settler homonationalism in neo-apartheid South Africa,” p. 140.

¹³⁶ Unknown author, “Pride ’96: be there,” *Exit*, September 1996, p. 1.

¹³⁷ Vaid-Menon, “Rainbows are just refracted white light: Settler homonationalism in neo-apartheid South Africa,” p. 91.

¹³⁸ T. Trengove-Jones, “Is Joburg’s Pride mainly in vain?” *Exit*, October 2011, p. 10.

¹³⁹ Unknown author, “Pride ’96: be there,” *Exit*, September 1996, p. 1.

and hence, sharing a bond that comes to unite them, despite their differences.¹⁴⁰ In not addressing the past, the project of the Rainbow Nation allows white South Africans to continue in a social position of privilege. This is evident with the Joburg Pride “community”. This is despite the evidence that shows that for many LGBTIAQ South Africans, their actual lived experiences have not changed significantly from how they were on that historic day of the first ever Gay and Lesbian Pride march held on African soil.”¹⁴¹

I draw on the concepts of rainbowism, as articulated by Gqola,¹⁴² as well as “pinkwashing”¹⁴³ to analyse the way in which constructions of unity and equality within LGBTIAQ communities and, in particular, how this washes over the inequalities that still exist in these spaces. “Pinkwashing” is a term developed by breast cancer activists who criticised corporations for their cause-based marketing and the manner in which they promoted breast cancer awareness while making profits off of their products that promoted awareness of the disease.¹⁴⁴ It has come to be used to describe the promotion of same-sex or lesbian and gay rights by a corporation, business or nation, in order to further their own aims. One example of pinkwashing in the context of a nation-state is the way in which Israel supported gay and lesbian rights in order to draw attention away from its violation of Palestinian rights.¹⁴⁵

By combining Gqola’s discussion of rainbowism and its project of whitewashing and the notion of pinkwashing, rainbow-washing is proposed as a way to theorise the way in which white lesbian and gay people in South Africa have utilised the Constitution and legal reform in order to protect their position of privilege. In promoting homonormativity they come to police queer bodies that are primarily othered along lines of race, class, and queer-ness (transgender, intersex, queer). Rainbow-washing thus works in a similar way to pinkwashing but with the explicit aim of securing white power in South Africa. It allows for the washing

¹⁴⁰ Bornman, “The Rainbow Nation versus the colours of the rainbow: Nation-building versus diversity in post-apartheid South Africa with some notes on the role of the media,” p. 11.

¹⁴¹ T. Trengove-Jones, “Who needs what Pride?” *Exit* October 2009, p. 14.

¹⁴² Gqola, “Defining people: Analysing power, language and representation in metaphors of the New South Africa,” pp. 94-106.

¹⁴³ Ritchie, “Pinkwashing, Homonationalism, and Israel–Palestine: The Conceits of Queer Theory and the Politics of the Ordinary,” p. 618.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁴⁵ Vaid-Menon, Rainbows are just refracted white light: Settler homonationalism in neo-apartheid South Africa, p. 14; Ritchie, “Pinkwashing, Homonationalism, and Israel–Palestine: The Conceits of Queer Theory and the Politics of the Ordinary,” p. 618.

over of differences within LGBTIAQ communities and serves to promote a sense of community that only caters to white lesbian and gay South Africans who desire assimilation or access to rights afforded to heterosexual citizens. Whiteness thus can be seen as driving the depoliticisation of Pride in that whiteness facilitates a political position which disguises itself as apolitical.

While the granting of Constitutional rights has placed some LGBTIAQ people on more equal footing to the rest of South Africa, for many LGBTIAQ people of colour Constitutional equalities remain abstract concepts that do little to disrupt the violence they experience.¹⁴⁶ In order for attention to be focused on homophobic violence, the discourse of the Rainbow Nation would have to be deconstructed and LGBTIAQ people in positions of privilege would have to admit that all is not fine. Thus, while violence against the “community” presents an opportunity for Joburg Pride to articulate a political direction, Pride does not take up this opportunity because it would contradict the equality rhetoric of the Rainbow Nation, as well as endanger the festive opportunity for profits that Pride presents. In not acknowledging the violence experienced by the majority of LGBTIAQ people, Joburg Pride organisers (rainbow) wash over the terror and fear of the majority of its members.¹⁴⁷

In order to protect their rights and privileges white lesbian and gay South Africans must choose to overlook the violence against LGBTIAQ people of colour. It is then not a matter of not knowing about the violence experienced by members of their “community” but rather choosing to remain silent in order to retain individual privileges. To a great extent this mirrors the position of many white South Africans under apartheid, who were aware of the violence being perpetrated by the system but chose to comply with its occurrence. In the post-1994 context, the siding of LGBTIAQ people with the heteronormative power of the centre results in terrible and terrifying experiences being overlooked. Employing the rhetoric of the Rainbow Nation seeks to rainbow-wash the pain, lived experiences and differences of LGBTIAQ people. It masks the terror to keep the myth of a country united in diversity alive. It appears that it is

¹⁴⁶ Thoreson, “Somewhere over the Rainbow Nation: Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Activism in South Africa,” pp. 695

¹⁴⁷ M. Hengeveld and T.J. Tallie, “This is my route!” Race, Entitlement and Gay Pride in South Africa,” In *Africa’s a country*, 15 October 2012, <http://africasacountry.com/2012/10/this-is-my-route-race-entitlement-and-gay-pride-in-south-africa/>, n.p.

easier to do the work of producing and maintaining a myth than to interrogate and explore the diversity of individuals, groups or organisations in South Africa. In moving the focus away from race, the Rainbow Nation project allows social inequalities to continue unchecked. In order to uphold the myth of the Rainbow Nation, identities and experiences are repressed. However over time we see them return. What has been silenced for so long has been made visible, for instance by the 2012 clash. The clash, and other social movements focused on intersectional inequalities, challenge the idea of equality and the unified collective. The national project, LGBTIAQ communities, and Joburg Pride all employ rainbow-washing, at different times and in different ways. However the purpose appears remarkably similar; to construct a unified group of people in order to diminish the inequalities that exist within this group. This may be for the sake of maintaining the perception of a unified South Africa in the gaze of the international “community” or in order to pull off a “slick”, lucrative Pride parade. Rainbow-washing allowed (and allows) whiteness to persist unchecked until it was momentarily disrupted in 2012 when Joburg Pride organisers and marshals clashed with One in Nine activists. In 2012 the Rainbow Nation is called into question. Trengove-Jones writes that the claim that South Africans are united in their diversity is “a wish not a fact.”¹⁴⁸ They describe how the myth of a “happily coagulated difference was blown apart,” and that for some this was painful, while for others it was inescapable.¹⁴⁹ The disruption of Pride in 2012 happened shortly after the Marikana Massacre, in which 34 striking mineworkers were killed on 16 August 2012 by South African Police Service officers at a Marikana mine in the North West Province of South Africa.¹⁵⁰ Trengove-Jones compares these two moments, describing how with both “there was a death: the death of the now mendacious ideology of ‘unity in diversity’.”¹⁵¹ They explain that the mantra of unity in diversity “cannot hold the contending forces. The ideal that was to hold us together is no longer compelling.”¹⁵² They explain that in relation to Marikana and South Africa broadly, faith in leadership had declined significantly, and they ask why Joburg Pride should be any different, explaining that the One in Nine disruption “stemmed from the conviction that our current representatives are not

¹⁴⁸ T. Trengove-Jones, “Pride 2012: ‘Fight those heinous pissers back’,” *Exit* November 2012, p. 4.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁰ Unknown author, “Marikana Massacre 16 August 2012,” in *South African History Online*, 16 August 2013, <http://www.sahistory.org.za/article/marikana-massacre-16-august-2012>.

¹⁵¹ Trengove-Jones, “Pride 2012: ‘Fight those heinous pissers back’,” p. 4.

¹⁵² *Ibid.*

legitimate.”¹⁵³ They speak to the violence of the event and how it grew from anger, but that, unlike Marikana, “bullets didn’t fly, but insults, including racial ones did. So much for the one happy family’.”¹⁵⁴ Trengove-Jones continues that those who “lament the fracas” are “lamenting the bursting of a bubble,” and “decrying the collapse of any plausible belief that we are in fact united in our diversity.”¹⁵⁵ Trengove-Jones calls for the LGBTIAQ “community” and “the Rainbow people,” to take notice that “the counter demonstration that occurred at Pride this year was our own Marikana. Fortunately, unlike Marikana, no one actually died.”¹⁵⁶ While this comparison is perhaps valuable in demonstrating the continuation of various forms of violence in the post-apartheid period, as with the comparison of the gay rights movement to the liberation or anti-apartheid movement, it can also be seen to diminish the severity of what occurred at Marikana in 2012. This comparison can be seen to be rooted in white privilege as it collapses the different experiences of violence into each other, and does not account for the structural contexts that make different kinds of violence possible. For example, the way in which the violence of Marikana is rooted in economic inequalities which have been extended by neoliberal policies in the “new” South Africa.

As Trengove-Jones has suggested, the clash in 2012 that occurred at Joburg Pride, as well as Marikana speak to something more. We continue to see this with the student movements, #RhodesMustFall and #FeesMustFall, which call for the addressing of the past, decolonisation of academic institutions, and “a radical abolition and re-imagination of entire social structures.”¹⁵⁷ While these movements are based at tertiary institutions, they look beyond the context of the university. They have drawn attention to “the global predicament of neoliberalism,” and interrogated neoliberalism, colonial violence, and white owned capital.¹⁵⁸ If we look to these moments, Joburg Pride 2012, Marikana, #RhodesMustFall, and #FeesMustFall, then we can see that the Rainbow Project props up systems of whiteness and neoliberalism. The absence of discussions around race, and instead the focus on “unity in diversity,” resulted in the repression of the pain of the violence of the apartheid system and

¹⁵³ Trengove-Jones, “Pride 2012: ‘Fight those heinous pissers back’,” p. 4.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid.

¹⁵⁷ A. Publia, 2016, “South African Students’ Question: Remake the University or Restructure Society,” *abolition journal*, 22 December 2016, <https://abolitionjournal.org/south-african-students-question-remake-the-university-or-restructure-society/> n.p.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid.

allowed for the violence to persist in other forms. There is a political choice being made here, opting for an apolitical or depolitical stance that ignores the reality that the majority of South Africans experience on a daily basis is still a political position. This allows whiteness to persist and neoliberalism to persist. Within this context the violent reaction of Joburg Pride organisers, marshals and participants to the protest action of the One in Nine Campaign is unfortunately not at all surprising. Rather it is the inevitable outcome of a challenge to the illusion of the rainbow.

6.5. Conclusion

The Rainbow Nation was a myth employed by both the LGBTIAQ “community” and by South Africans more broadly to create a sense of unity in diversity. However, in reality there is little engagement with identities and almost no desire to engage politically in debate or dialogue in order to build a sense of belonging or community. There can be no unity in diversity when all South Africans experienced the past differently; some as violent, some as privileged. These contradictions facilitated the clash at Joburg Pride 2012. The clash highlighted the need for queering notions of citizenship and equality and by framing these issues in relation to intersections of race, class, gender and sexuality. To leave positions of privilege unchallenged only serves to reinforce their dominance.¹⁵⁹

The Rainbow Nation project, and the myth that we are all equal, absolves white people of their complicity in the production of whiteness, and its subsequent violence. In articulating their discrimination on the basis of their sexual orientation as equivalent to discrimination faced by persons of colour under apartheid, white lesbian and gay South Africans came to appropriate the human rights discourse for their own means. This resulted in white people continuing to hold a position of power in post-apartheid South Africa, which enables them to escape accountability for their complicity in the apartheid system. While the Equality Clause and the advocacy around equal rights on the basis of sexual orientation did serve to grant rights and protection to lesbian and gay South Africans, it also detracted from ongoing systemic racism and the consequences thereof. In constructing South Africa as a now progressive and transformed country in which even lesbian and gay people are granted rights, the Rainbow Nation project resulted in an overlooking of the structural issues that continue

¹⁵⁹ Taylor, “Queer presences and absences: citizenship, community, diversity – or death,” p. 339.

to impact the majority of South Africans. In this chapter I have argued that the Rainbow Nation is “so far from the truth, that it’s not relevant at all.”¹⁶⁰ The rainbow should not be considered to be “exhausted,”¹⁶¹ but rather to be “dead.”¹⁶²

When we acknowledge this, we must acknowledge how the symbol of the Rainbow Nation came to wash over the systems of violence of apartheid, and the persistent trauma and colonial violence (no longer legally enforced and protected, but still existent). To account for the discrepancies of power and protection afforded to white lesbian and gay South Africans, while many LGBTIAQ of colour are at risk of homophobic violence, the role of lesbian and gay rights in the perpetuation of whiteness and white power must be acknowledged.¹⁶³ White lesbian and gay South Africans enjoy privileges and benefits that LGBTIAQ people of colour do not because of the intersection of race, class and gender. White South Africans see this privilege as natural and normal, to the point that when sexual identity is discussed, it is done so outside of discussions of race and class. This serves to position sexuality as disconnected from race and fails to acknowledge the way in which the construction of the legitimate LGBTIAQ citizen is most often the construction of a white, middle-class, gay man.

¹⁶⁰ I. Lakhani, interview with the researcher, Cape Town, 9 February 2016.

¹⁶¹ Trengove-Jones, “Pride 2012: ‘Fight those heinous pissers back’,” p. 4.

¹⁶² R. Pithouse, “The Rainbow is dead – beware the fire, SA,” in *Mail and Guardian*, 4 March 2016, <https://mg.co.za/article/2016-03-03-the-rainbow-is-dead-beware-the-fire-sa>.

¹⁶³ Vaid-Menon, “Rainbows are just refracted white light: Settler homonationalism in neo-apartheid South Africa,” p. 69.

CHAPTER SEVEN: CONCLUSION

7.1. Introduction

Joburg Pride in 1990, Africa's first Pride event and a defiant and defining moment for South Africa's LGBTIAQ people, was firmly rooted in the political. Through this event LGBTIAQ people demanded "rights as full, proud, productive participants in a fully equal society."¹ It can be argued that public events such as Pride played a crucial role in visibilising LGBTIAQ people and their call for rights in the lead up to 1994. Although the granting of legal protection for LGBTIAQ people under the Constitution was a significant victory, these rights have resulted in discourses of equality, unity and rainbowism, which constructs South Africans as "all fine". These discourses mask the continuing inequalities, which prevent those who are queer, poor and people of colour from accessing the protections promised to them in the Constitution. These inequalities have not been addressed or even acknowledged within spaces such as Joburg Pride. Pride has increasingly distanced itself from these political issues, instead centring fun, sponsorship, and financial profits.

In 2012 the One in Nine Campaign protested at Joburg Pride. I read this protest as an attempt to recentre the political, in particular the homophobic violence that is experienced by LGBTIAQ people of colour. This thesis has used this protest moment, including the responses from Pride organisers, marshals and participants, to explore the inequalities and fractures which exist within the Pride "community" and LGBTIAQ communities more broadly. This thesis has also attempted to situate the 2012 clash within the broader context of post-1994 South Africa.

7.2. Summary of the Findings

This study has drawn on a theoretical framework informed by poststructuralism, anti-racist queer feminism, queer theory, intersectionality, critical and critical race theory, as well as whiteness studies in order to analyse *Exit* articles and interviews with key stakeholders involved in the clash. The study has explored issues of depoliticisation, commercialisation, "community", assimilation, whiteness, racism, rainbowism and rainbow-washing.

¹ E. Cameron, "Foreword," in S. De Waal and A. Manion (Eds), *Pride: Protest and Celebration*, Fanele: Johannesburg, 2006, p. 4.

The analysis has highlighted the relationship between depoliticisation and commercialisation. It has demonstrated how, through Pride organisers' increasing focus on issues on financial viability and corporate sponsorship, Joburg Pride is constructed as an "apolitical" event. However, I have argued that by aligning itself with fun, entertainment and commodification Joburg Pride has not avoided the political. Rather it has aligned itself with a particular politics; that of neoliberal capitalism.² This neoliberal capitalist position is particularly problematic within the context of the "new" South Africa, as it constructs inequalities as individual rather than structural issues. Within this context it is perhaps not surprising that the One in Nine Campaign's protest and its attempt to highlight issues of structural violence, came as such a shock to Pride organisers, marshals and participants.

Linked to this, this thesis has presented an analysis of how "community" is constructed and employed within the context of Joburg Pride. The leadership of Joburg Pride by virtue of organising a "community" event, is implicated in the construction of community. Although the organisers made continual reference to "the community" they did not appear to have reflected on or interrogated what this means. This can be seen in the construction of the "community" as a single, homogenous entity. However, the analysis has highlighted that it is more useful to view the LGBTIAQ "community" as a collection of multiple communities that exist within or under the LGBTIAQ umbrella. I have proposed that under the LGBTIAQ umbrella, Joburg Pride can be considered a wispy community.³ This is by virtue of its annual (single day) occurrence, its focus on entertainment, sociability and fun, as well as the "transitory sense" of belonging that it provides.⁴

The analysis has also highlighted the way in which the construction of "community" is constituted in relation to the notion of the "respectable gay". I have shown how in order for LGBTIAQ people to assimilate into dominant heterosexual culture, and gain the privileges associated with this, they must be able to present themselves as respectable individuals, deserving of rights. In this way LGBTIAQ people, and organisations such as Joburg Pride may

² M. Huber, "Revisiting places of queer crisis," in *Spheres: Journal for Digital Cultures*, Vol. 1(1), 2014, <http://spheres-journal.org/revisiting-places-of-queer-crisis/>, p. 1.

³ Fine and Van Den Scott, "Wispy Communities: Transient gatherings and imagined micro-communities," p. 1326.

⁴ S. Singh, "Overcoming heteronormative hegemony: queer resistance to neoliberalism in Chile," Master's thesis, National University of Singapore, Singapore, 2015, p. 2.

attempt to highlight issues of sameness rather than difference.⁵ However, as the analysis has demonstrated, it is only individuals who occupy a position of privilege, for example middle-class, gay white men who are able to assimilate.⁶ In order to reinforce their assimilationist position, these LGBTIAQ people may regulate and police “other” LGBTIAQ people. This process comes to produce inequalities within LGBTIAQ communities, as only certain identities are regarded as acceptable and respectable.⁷

Within the context of Joburg Pride, notions of acceptability and respectability are constituted by whiteness. The analysis has shown how whiteness, which positions itself as universal and “normal” serves to invisibilise and trivialise the experiences of those it constructs as other.⁸ For example, the way in which Pride organisers, marshals and participants responded to the One in Nine Campaign protesters demonstrates a lack of recognition of queer people of colour’s experiences of violence. This thesis has argued that whiteness affords those who hold privilege a wilful ignorance which makes it possible for them to disengage from issues of structural violence.

This thesis has also explored the way in which whiteness positions itself as victimised.⁹ For example, I have argued that the establishment of Black Pride was constructed as a threat to the unity of the LGBTIAQ “community”.¹⁰ By positioning Black Pride as a threat the white organisers of Pride are able to avoid interrogating what it is about Joburg Pride that made it necessary for LGBTIAQ of colour to establish an alternative event. Within this context it is possible to understand the violent responses of Pride “community” members to the One in Nine protest. This violence can be read as an attempt to maintain the dominance of whiteness, and its resultant privilege, in the face of a challenge to this order of things.

⁵ A. Ghaziani, “Post-Gay Collective Identity Construction,” in *Social Problems*, Vol 58(1), p. 117.

⁶ D. Collins, “‘We’re there and queer’: Homonormative mobility and lived experience among gay expatriates in Manila,” in *Gender & Society*. Vol 23 (4), 2009, p. 467.

⁷ Teal and Conover-Williams, “Homophobia without Homophobes: Deconstructing the Public Discourses of 21st Century Queer Sexualities in the United States,” p. 16.

⁸ S. Smit, *Challenging desire: performing whiteness in post-apartheid South Africa*, Doctoral thesis, Rhodes University, Grahamstown, 2014, p. 26; N. Falkof, *The end of whiteness: Satanism and family murder in late apartheid South Africa*, Jacana: South Africa, 2016; M. Steyn, “*White talk: White South Africans and the strategic management of diasporic whiteness*,” Doctoral thesis, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, 2003.

⁹ Steyn, “White Talk,” p. 131.

¹⁰ Unknown author, “After party advantage,” *Exit* October 2001, p. 1.

Finally, the analysis has interrogated the way in which the Rainbow Nation project has shaped fractures and inequalities within Pride, LGBTIAQ communities, and broader South African society. I have argued that the discourse of the Rainbow Nation, which sought to unite South African during the precarious period of transition, has resulted in the construction of a post-race society. This discourse has made it possible for white lesbian and gay South Africans to argue that they were equally oppressed under the apartheid state and therefore they are not held accountable for their complicity with apartheid state violence.

A key theoretical contribution of this thesis is the concept of “rainbow-washing”. The concept of rainbow-washing, which draws on rainbowism¹¹ and pinkwashing,¹² is used to explain how white lesbian and gay people have been able to maintain a position of privilege within LGBTIAQ communities. Through the struggle for LGBTIAQ rights leading up to the establishment of the Constitution in 1996, LGBTIAQ people have been positioned as oppressed by the apartheid state. The establishment of legislation such as the Equality Clause and the Civil Union Act have led to South Africa being celebrated as a progressive, tolerant and liberal nation state.¹³ Within the context, LGBTIAQ South Africans and South Africans more broadly, are positioned as “all equal”. However, this discursive process of rainbow-washing obscures the ongoing inequalities faced by certain LGBTIAQ people. This process makes it possible for Harford to say there are no longer any “burning issues.”¹⁴ Rainbow-washing makes it possible for the Pride organising committee to throw a commercial rather than a political parade and to respond with violence towards protesters who draw attention to those who have been left out of the Rainbow Nation, and continue to experience intersecting forms of violence.

This thesis has argued that deep inequalities remain within LGBTIAQ communities, as well as between LGBTIQA people and other groups of South Africans. Although members of LGBTIAQ communities may have ties to each other on the grounds of discrimination on the basis of

¹¹ P. Gqola, “Defining people: Analysing power, language and representation in metaphors of the New South Africa,” in *Transformation*, Vol 47, 2001, pp. 98-9.

¹² J. Ritchie, “Pinkwashing, Homonationalism, and Israel–Palestine: The Conceits of Queer Theory and the Politics of the Ordinary,” in *Antipode*, Vol. 47(3), p. 618.

¹³ A. Vaid-Menon, “Rainbows are just refracted white light: Settler homonationalism in neo-apartheid South Africa,” Honours thesis, Stanford University, Stanford, 2013, p. 91.

¹⁴ T. Harford, interview with the researcher, Johannesburg (Skype), 25 January 2016.

sexual identity, race, class, gender, and other differences “remain too vast”¹⁵ for the formation of an inclusive community. However, through engaging with these intersecting inequalities and emphasising diversities, Joburg Pride could begin to work towards constructing a more inclusive and representative space; one that could accommodate a variety of LGBTIAQ identities in one “community”. Below I return to the concept of an ethical community, presented in chapter four, and discuss how this concept could be applied to Joburg Pride.

7.3. Ethical Community as a Solution

An ethical community approach could facilitate the building of more inclusive LGBTIAQ spaces. As suggested in chapter four, the One in Nine Campaign appeared to be calling for this in their disruption of Joburg Pride 2012. The concept of ethical community is aligned with intersectionality and anti-racist queer feminism in that it considers the intersecting and interdependent nature of social life. Johannesburg People’s Pride which was formed in 2013, as a response to the need for an inclusive and diverse Pride in Johannesburg, provides an example of an ethical community. Cooper argues that ethical communities take “seriously the relativity of cultures” and diversity in society.¹⁶ Johannesburg People’s Pride described themselves as “a diverse group of people from suburbs and townships, queer and non-queer, workers and unemployed people, black and non-black, differently-abled and able-bodied activists, feminists, conscious and interested people.”¹⁷ Johannesburg People’s Pride explains that its members “come from economically advantaged and disadvantaged backgrounds, with competing interests and visions, yet joining in the call to Reclaim Our Pride.”¹⁸

The ethical community positions ethical principles and values as central to the development of a community. These principles must be chosen freely, examined, interrogated and understood by all, with the option for members to review and change them over time.¹⁹ Values and principles are thus adopted in a collaborative manner instead of enforced through rules and laws. Cooper provides six steps for building an ethical community. They are: the

¹⁵ Unknown author, “Talking Pride Once Again”, *Exit* June 2006, p. 4.

¹⁶ T.L. Cooper, “Building Ethical Community”. In *The American Review of Public Administration*, Vol 41 (1), 2011, p. 10.

¹⁷ Unknown author, “Whither Joburg Pride?” in *Exit*, May 2013, p. 1.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ Cooper, “Building Ethical Community,” p. 10.

community must emphasise “the interdependent areas of our lives;” ethical discussion and debate must be central to the process; public officials should reconsider their roles and obligation to the community; public officials must create the space for deliberation over the interdependent areas of life mentioned in the first step; members must acknowledge that building an ethical community will entail unavoidable conflict that must be engaged with; and lastly, long-term engagement is vital to the process, members must recognise that the formation of an ethical community will not come about immediately.²⁰ Below I apply these steps to Joburg Pride.

The first step in building ethical community is to recognise and emphasise the interdependent areas of the lives of the community’s members.²¹ In “the public areas of lives,” the behaviour and actions of people impacts on the lives of those around them.²² In light of this, it is necessary to cultivate a means of “engag[ing] our differences thoughtfully through deliberation.”²³ It is here, at the intersection of differences and interdependent areas of lives where the building of ethical community efforts must be focused. This is supported by Gevisser and Reid’s argument in 1994 that a parade or march that is “divorced from the realities of South African society would divorce our own future from the future of other oppressed groups in the country.”²⁴ They continue to suggest that to hold such a parade would have been ethically indefensible, “as well as strategically shortsighted.”²⁵

One way to address and include the vast array of differences and to account for the interdependence, overlaps and influences of members of the LGBTIAQ community would be to involve members, LGBTIAQ organisations, and the surrounding community or city in the organising of Joburg Pride. It is integral that Pride be organised by a group truly representative of the LGBTIAQ “community” and South Africa at large, rather than by predominantly white members who represent only a small number of people. To do so would facilitate a more intersectional approach to the organising of Joburg Pride. This kind of approach is essential in

²⁰ Cooper, “Building Ethical Community,” p. 18.

²¹ Ibid. p. 17

²² Ibid.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ M. Gevisser and G. Reid, “Pride or protest?: Drag queens, comrades, and the Lesbian and Gay Pride March,” in M. Gevisser and E. Cameron (Eds), *Defiant Desire: gay and lesbian lives in South Africa*. Ravan Press: Braamfontein, 1994, p. 283.

²⁵ Ibid.

a context such as post-apartheid South Africa which is constituted by multiple, intersecting inequalities.

Johannesburg People's Pride's intersectional approach actively worked to "connect Black, poor, disabled, transx grassroots movements from all over the city," in order to bring about "a radical reconceptualisation of queer-led organising and participation."²⁶ Phamodi explained that People's Pride consciously and intentionally made space "to collectively and reflexively find one another and recognise the interconnectedness of our struggles and our freedoms."²⁷ People's Pride was deliberately organised along intersectional queer lines, with "an aspiration towards critical feminist praxis."²⁸ Johannesburg People's Pride established a working group, instead of an organising committee; recognising the importance of language in constructing power dynamics. This working group was "set with the task of forming a different kind of practice in the community building around and organising of pride that could hold the contradictions we live within our still fractured society."²⁹ Their approach is consistent with Huber's suggestion that Pride can be viewed as a Borderland; one where celebration and protest could occur simultaneously.³⁰

The second step in the building of ethical community is to make ethical discussion and debate central to the community's formation. This requires conversations that go beyond surface-level concerns and, rather, promote members' curiosity and interest in each other and in different lived experiences. This is necessary to facilitate an understanding of differences in order to move past prejudice and discrimination founded on underexposure to lives different to one's own.³¹ Cooper suggests that this process facilitates respect between community members.

In working towards respect and understanding others' lived experiences, members are then open to building an inclusive and ethical community. However, this process was not applied by the group who took over the organising of Joburg Pride after the committee disbanded in

²⁶ S. Phamodi, "Movement building is the technology for feminist resistance," *Take Back the Tech*, 28 November 2017, <https://www.takebackthetech.net/blog/movement-building-technology-feminist-resistance>, n.p.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ M. Huber, "Revisiting places of queer crisis," in *Spheres: Journal for Digital Cultures*, Vol 1(1), 2014, pp. 1-4; Phamodi, "Movement building is the technology for feminist resistance," n.p.

³¹ Cooper, "Building Ethical Community," p. 17.

2013. This new group contested the formation of an inclusive Pride event, arguing that the members who would go on to organise Johannesburg People's Pride "refus[ed] 20,000 people's voices [who took part in pride last year] to be heard because just 10% of people want to change the essence of pride."³² Here we see a replication of Joburg Pride's previous exclusionary structures and an ongoing unwillingness to diversify Pride. It appears that the new group would rather continue serving the 20000 people who attended Pride in 2012, than seeking to expand to focus of Pride to include other LGBTIAQ people.

Phamodi explains that within People's Pride, the group of "just 10% of people," worked to build consensus around issues, were transparent in their meetings, and encouraged participation.³³ In its organising of People's Pride, the working group actively sought out "who wasn't in the room, why, and how we could facilitate their direct participation."³⁴ This was done in order to create a Pride event that did not seek to wash over queer identities but rather to include them in a way that did not assimilate or absorb these identities but rather actively encouraged their expression and celebration.³⁵

This third step in the process of creating an ethical community asks that those who are elected as public officials or representatives of the group carefully reconsider their roles and obligation to the community. This is about promoting leadership that is deliberate and community-centric. This process encourages elected leaders to recognise that they cannot possibly represent the diverse community by themselves and thus must move away from authoritative methods of leadership. Instead, they should reconsider their roles to be facilitative in nature; more about facilitating and holding space for deliberation and co-construction and less about decision-making and enforcing rules.³⁶ When applied to the LGBTIAQ "community", this asks that Pride organisers hold the space for all members of the community, and thus, are inclusive of lived experiences. This requires being reflective of the consequences of apartheid that persist in contemporary South Africa, in order to distribute power beyond the white, commercial and neoliberal project.

³² Staff writer, "Joburg Pride crisis: Future still uncertain," in Mambaonline, 23 April 2013, <http://www.mambaonline.com/2013/04/23/joburg-pride-crisis-future-still-uncertain/>, n.p.

³³ Phamodi, "Movement building is the technology for feminist resistance," n.p.

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ Cooper, "Building Ethical Community," p. 17.

Linked to this, the fourth step asks that public officials create the space for deliberation over interdependent areas of life.³⁷ In relation to Joburg Pride, organisers would need to move from leading and making decisions on behalf of the LGBTIAQ “community” to instead being facilitators of the group. This requires introducing community collaboration on decision-making processes. For instance, we see this with Johannesburg People’s Pride where members of the community were encouraged to be involved. The working group actively sought out those who were not included and encouraged them to participate in order to create such a more inclusive space.

The fifth step in building an ethical community is acknowledging that conflict is inevitable and that, while it may be difficult, it is necessary to engage with this conflict. Where there are differences in lived experiences, there will inevitably be differences in approaches, values and perspectives. Members of the community must hold each other accountable and do the work necessary to engage with conflicts, in order to build the foundations for an ethical community. Rather than striving to suppress difference and diversity, by creating a uniform identity which excludes those who do not conform to it, an ethical community would celebrate difference and diversity.

The final step asks that members recognise that the establishment of an ethical community will not be immediate and that long-term engagement is necessary.³⁸ This can be applied to the establishment of a democratic state, such as the “new” South Africa. An ethical community must be formed by the entire group and the group must recognise that community building is an endless process that will not be achieved in one meeting but must take place over decades and generations.³⁹ The Rainbow Nation project failed to recognise this. Instead of sustained time and effort, rainbowism created a myth of a nation united in its diversity and hoped that this rhetoric would serve to do the work that is necessary to build an ethical community after decades of apartheid government. In contrast, Johannesburg People’s Pride implemented this step. They spent months organising workshops to engage various stakeholders and members of the community. These workshops served to politicise

³⁷ Cooper, “Building Ethical Community,” p. 17

³⁸ Ibid. p. 18.

³⁹ Ibid. p. 10.

members, engage differences and to serve as spaces for mobilisation along various aspects of LGBTIAQ identity and experience.⁴⁰

7.4. Concluding Thoughts

I have argued that through employing the six steps of ethical community, a more inclusive Joburg Pride could be created. However, the concept of ethical community can also be applied beyond Pride, to LGBTIAQ communities more generally, as well as to other communities and the nation building project of South Africa. The establishment of ethical communities is necessary in order to counter the shame and violence that many still experience, both within LGBTIAQ communities, and beyond. Pride events, be they Joburg Pride, or other Pride events organised throughout the country, have the potential to operate as disruptive spaces; spaces which challenge the status quo, claim space for marginalised identities, and contextualise the LGBTIAQ experience within the broader South African experience. This can be seen in alternative Pride events such as Soweto Pride, Johannesburg People's Pride, and the Alternative Inclusive Pride which all push for recognition and acknowledgement of the experiences of LGBTIAQ people, while simultaneously celebrating their diverse identities. Lakhani described People's Pride as "very unmoving and unapologetic in that this is going to be collaborative."⁴¹ They continue to note that "what was powerful about it was the fact that they t[ook] on multiple issues and multiple struggles and the acknowledgement that 'yes, we're LGBTI people, but yes we want land, yes we want access to water'."⁴² Johannesburg People's Pride shows that it is possible to organise a Pride event in South Africa in an ethical and collaborative manner and to do the work of "restor[ing] the traditions of activism, assertion and equality" by situating the organising of the event and the event itself within the context of the lived experiences of many South Africans.⁴³ In a way Johannesburg People's Pride responded to the One in Nine Campaign's rallying call at Joburg Pride 2012, "it is time for everyone – queer, lesbian, femme, trans, gender resistant, straight, butch, bisexual, gender fluid, black and non-black – to bring back to pride the spirit of revolution. Not only an LGBT revolution but a sexual revolution, a workers' revolution, an anti-capitalist revolution, a

⁴⁰ Phamodi, "Movement building is the technology for feminist resistance," n.p.

⁴¹ I. Lakhani, interview with the researcher, Cape Town, 9 February 2016.

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ M. Heywood, "'Go back to the townships' – the shame of gay South Africa," in *Daily Maverick*, 23 October 2012, <https://www.dailymaverick.co.za/opinionista/2012-10-23-go-back-to-the-townships-the-shame-of-gay-south-africa#.WSQJJKGMdV>.

revolution of unemployed people, a revolution of people living with HIV and AIDS, a revolution of immigrants, a revolution of sex workers, a revolution of single people, a revolution of students without textbooks, a queer feminist revolution.”⁴⁴ This formation of Pride moved beyond the whiteness and commercialisation to begin to address violent structures and systems that excluded LGBTIAQ people of colour from the leadership positions within Pride organisations. Johannesburg People’s Pride made strange whiteness as the default LGBTIAQ experience and therefore made space for the expression and celebration of diverse identities.

As I have argued, it is necessary to acknowledge that the time of the rainbow has passed. Although, it was a useful and unifying symbol during the precarious transition to democracy, it has impeded the formation of an ethical South Africa. In looking to the rupture in the rainbow that occurred as a result of the clash at Joburg Pride in 2012, it is apparent that this rupture was constituted by the multiple ruptures that characterise South African society. Because of this we can use the lessons learnt from Joburg Pride not only to create safer and more inclusive spaces for LGBTIAQ people but to challenge “white-supremacist, capitalist and heteropatriarchal violence” across spaces in South Africa.⁴⁵

⁴⁴ One in Nine Campaign, 8 October 2012, copy of the leaflet distributed at Joburg Pride 2012, www.facebook.com/groups/10123398375/, n.p.

⁴⁵ Phamodi, “Movement building is the technology for feminist resistance,” n.p.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

- Achmat, Z., "That banner: not particularly funny nor radical!" *Exit* December 1996, p.16.
- Aguilar, D.D., "Tracing the roots of intersectionality," *MRZine*, 12 April 2012, at mrzine.monthlyreview.org/2012/aguilard120412.html.
- Barr, C., "Inequality index: where are the world's most unequal countries?" in *The Guardian*, 26 April 2017, at <https://www.theguardian.com/inequality/datablog/2017/apr/26/inequality-index-where-are-the-worlds-most-unequal-countries>.
- Blignaut, C., "A matter of Pride," *Mail and Guardian*, 26 September 1997.
- Bohobout, S., "Pride after party organiser responds," *Exit* December 1998, p. 7.
- Cooper, S., interview with researcher, Pietermaritzburg (Skype), 3 February 2016.
- DeBarros, L., "Breaking: Shock as Joburg Pride Shuts Down," 3 April 2013, at www.mambaonline.com/article.asp?artid=8011.
- De Wet, J., "Pride 2000," *Exit* September 2000, p. 3.
- Fernwinkel, "Save the community – eat the artists," *Exit* December 1996, p. 2.
- Gay Pride March interrupted by activists*, 7 October 2012, at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LYjp-xbdFS0>.
- Harford, T., interview with the researcher, Johannesburg (Skype), 25 January 2016.
- Hayward, G., interview with the researcher, Johannesburg, 24 March 2016.
- Hayward, G., "Joburg Pride 2012: in the news for the wrong reasons," *Exit* November 2012, p. 1.
- Hayward, G., "Pride at 16 not all sweet," *Exit* October 2005, p. 1.
- Hayward, G., "Pride parade unfazed," *Exit* October 2004, p. 1.
- Helman, R., "I know what it is to be strangled, penetrated'," 8 December 2016, at <https://www.iol.co.za/capetimes/news/i-know-what-it-is-to-be-strangled-penetrated-2096023>.
- Heywood, M., "'Go back to the townships' – the shame of gay South Africa," in *Daily Maverick*, 23 October 2012, <https://www.dailymaverick.co.za/opinionista/2012-10-23-go-back-to-the-townships-the-shame-of-gay-south-africa#.WSQJUKGMdV>.
- Joburg Pride Festival Company, "Joburg Gay Pride Festival Company board votes to stop production of annual Joburg Pride event," 3 April 2013, <https://www.facebook.com/joburgpride/posts/615596805134764>.

Joburg Gay Pride Festival Company, "Joburg Pride Response to One in Nine protest," 8 October 2012, at <https://www.facebook.com/joburgpride/posts/126936200787842>.

Knoessen, E., "Has Pride become meaningless?" *Exit* December 2003, January 2004, p. 5.

Lakhani, I., interview with the researcher, Cape Town, 9 February 2016.

Lesbian and Gay Pride Committee, "Pride – the committee's report (abridged)," *Exit* November 1999, p. 5.

Lesbian and Gay Pride Committee, "Unity in the Community" poster, *Exit* September, October 1990, p. 16.

Mansuy, A., "PRIDE 2005 – Quite a disaster," *Exit* November 2005, p. 2.

Marusic, K., "Here's what happened when a city sold their pride march," 20 June 2017, at <http://splinternews.com/here-s-what-happened-when-a-city-sold-their-pride-march-1796264248>.

Mbhele, Z., Interview with the researcher, Cape Town, 18 November 2016.

McLean, N., "Zwischen Party und Protest," in *Sudlink*. No 174, 2015, p. 17.

Mtsetwa, P., "The speech you didn't hear at Joburg Pride," in *Exit*, November 2009, p. 2.

Nath, D., "Gay Pride is political," 10 October 2012, at <http://thoughtleader.co.za/dipikanath/2012/10/10/gay-pride/>.

Nathan, M., "Johannesburg Pride Cancelled as Board Dissolves," 3 April 2013, at <https://oblogdeoblogda.me/2013/04/03/johannesburg-gay-pride-cancelled-as-board-dissolves/>.

Nel, M., "Queer Africa. From whence we come," *Exit* October 1997, p. 14.

One in Nine Campaign, "Now is the time to reclaim our pride: One in Nine Statement on the dissolution of Joburg Gay Pride Festival Company," 4 April 2013, at https://www.facebook.com/events/377097409070969/?acontext=%7B%22ref%22%3A%224%22%2C%22feed_story_type%22%3A%22308%22%2C%22action_history%22%3A%22null%22%7D.

One in Nine Campaign, "Copy of the leaflet distributed at Joburg Pride 2012," 8 October 2012, at www.facebook.com/groups/10123398375/.

Phamodi, S., "Movement building is the technology for feminist resistance," *Take Back the Tech*, 28 November 2017, at <https://www.takebackthetech.net/blog/movement-building-technology-feminist-resistance>.

Phamodi, S., interview with the researcher, Johannesburg, 21 March 2016.

Phamodi, S., "Interrogating the Notion of 'Corrective Rape' in Contemporary Public and Media Discourse," 23 November 2011, at <http://www.ngopulse.org/article/interrogating-notion-%E2%80%98corrective-rape%E2%80%99-contemporary-public-and-media-discourse>.

Pithouse, R., "The rainbow is dead – beware the fire, SA," in *Mail and Guardian*, 4 March 2016, at <https://mg.co.za/article/2016-03-03-the-rainbow-is-dead-beware-the-fire-sa>.

Publia, A., "South African Students' Question: Remake the University or Restructure Society," *Abolition Journal*, 22 December 2016, at <https://abolitionjournal.org/south-african-students-question-remake-the-university-or-restructure-society/>.

Rhodes Must Fall, "Bremner Occupation Statement," 23 March 2015, at <https://www.facebook.com/RhodesMustFall/posts/1558533494422143>.

Rissik, G., "Do we have Pride?" *Exit* November 2010, p. 14.

Scott, L., "Gay Pride: The politics of disruption," 19 June 2017, at <http://queerconsciousness.com/gay-pride-the-politics-disruption/>.

Staff reporter, "SA's middle-class pink currency," in *Mail and Guardian*, 18 June 1999, at <https://mg.co.za/article/1999-06-18-sas-middle-class-pink-currency>.

Staff writer, "Joburg Pride crisis: Future still uncertain," in Mambaonline, 23 April 2013, at <http://www.mambaonline.com/2013/04/23/joburg-pride-crisis-future-still-uncertain/>.

Tomas, "You need Pride',??" *Exit* October 2009, p. 2.

Trengove-Jones, T., "Pride 2012: 'Fight those heinous pissers back'," *Exit* November 2012, p. 4.

Trengove-Jones, T., "Who are we now?" *Exit* September 2012, p. 4.

Trengove-Jones, T., "Make a point of pride," *Exit* October 2010, p. 13.

Trengove-Jones, T., "You need pride: prepare to meet your sponsor," *Exit* November 2009, p. 13

Trengove-Jones, T., "Who needs what Pride?" *Exit* October 2009, p. 14.

Trengove-Jones, T., "Pride: the politics of the party," *Exit* November 2008, p. 12.

Trengove-Jones, T., "Dreams, denial and pride," *Exit* November 2007, p. 12.

Trengove-Jones, T., "Freedom cries: A different hue of pride," *Exit* October 2007, p. 12.

Trengove-Jones, T., "The significance of Pride," *Exit* October 2006, p. 4.

Trengove-Jones, T., "Talking Pride Once Again", *Exit*, June 2006, p. 4.

Trengove-Jones, T., "Can we Pride ourselves on PRIDE?" *Exit* November 2005, p. 4.

Trengove-Jones, T., "The sad decline of pride," *Exit* November 2004, p. 4.

Trengove-Jones, T., "Mincing for marriage?" *Exit*, October 2004, p. 4.

Trengove-Jones, T., "Pride again" *Exit*, September 2004, p. 4.

Trengove-Jones, T., "Pride 2003: Benighted we fall," *Exit* November 2003, p. 4.

Trengove-Jones, T., "Pride and spring: Under African skies," *Exit* October 2003, p. 4.

Trengove-Jones, T., "What purpose did pride 2002 serve?" *Exit* November 2002, p. 4.

Trengove-Jones, T., "Are we really proud of pride?" *Exit*, September 2002, p. 6.

Trengove-Jones, T., "W(h)ither Pride?" *Exit* November 2001, p. 4.

Trengove-Jones, T., "Pride 2000: possible or impossible," *Exit* October 2001, p. 4.

Trengove-Jones, T., "Is Joburg's Pride mainly in vain?" *Exit* October 2001, p. 10.

Trengove-Jones, T., "Pride and the Party Animal," in *Exit*, November 2000, p. 13.

Unknown author, "Whither Joburg Pride?" *Exit* May 2013, p. 1.

Unknown author, "Marikana Massacre 16 August 2012," in *South African History Online*, 16 August 2013 at <http://www.sahistory.org.za/article/marikana-massacre-16-august-2012>.

Unknown author, "Gay Pride," *Exit* June, July 2008, p. 2.

Unknown author, "Coming of age: Joburg Pride 2007: A new kind of Pride," *Exit* September 2007, p. 28.

Unknown author, "Letter," *Exit* November 2001, p. 2.

Unknown author, "After party advantage," *Exit* October 2001, p. 1.

Unknown author, "Pride: out there, everywhere," *Exit* October 2001, p. 9.

Unknown author, "Pride gifts for children," *Exit* July 1997, p. 9.

Unknown author, "Pride '96: be there," *Exit* September 1996, p. 1.

Unknown author, "Gay Pride Parade," *Exit* July 1994, p. 23.

Unknown author, "Imagine all the people," *Exit* May 1993, p. 8.

Unknown author, "Marching for our rights," *Exit*, July, August 1992, p. 11.

Unknown author, "Viva Gay Pride! Viva! Viva!" *Exit* November, December 1990, p. 1.

Unknown author, "GLOW turns 2," *Exit* May, June 1990, p. 7.

Unknown author, "Gay Pride," *Exit* June, July 1988, p. 2.

Valenza, A., "One in Nine Campaign," in *ILGA*, 9 October 2012, at <http://ilga.org/one-in-nine-campaign/>.

Van Heerden, D., "Not a parade downtown again!" *Exit* August 2001, p. 2.

Van Vuuren, D., and Khan, G.H., "Grappling with Gauteng's Pride Problem," in Mambaonline, 16 October 2014, at <http://www.mambaonline.com/2014/10/16/grappling-gautengs-pride-problems/>.

Zeller, S., "Backward March: Why are Gays Protesting a Gay Rights March?" in *The New Republic*, 17 April 2000.

Ziyad, H., "When white people enter a space, anti-Blackness always does too," in *Black youth project*, 6 June 2017, at <http://blackyouthproject.com/white-people-enter-space-anti-blackness-always/>.

Secondary Sources

Adam, B.D., Duyvendak, J.W., and Krouwel, A., *The Global Emergence of Gay and Lesbian Politics*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1999.

Aganthelelou, A.M., Bassichis, M.D., Spira, T.L., "Intimate Investments: Homonormativity, Global Lockdown, and the Seductions of Empire," in *Radical History Review*. Issue 100, 2008, pp. 120–43.

Alexander, J., and Gibson, M., "Queer Composition(s): Queer Theory in the writing classroom," in *JAC*, Vol 24 (1), 2004, pp. 1-21.

Anderson, B., *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*, London: Verso, 1983.

Anzaldúa, G., *Borderlands: the new mestiza = La frontera*, San Francisco: Spinsters/Aunt Lute, 1987.

Aronson, J., "A pragmatic view of thematic analysis," in *The Qualitative Report*. Vol 2 (1), 1994, pp. 1-3.

Augoustinos, M. and Every, D., "The Language of "Race" and Prejudice: A Discourse of Denial, Reason, and Liberal-Practical Politics," in *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*. Vol 26 (2), 2007, pp. 123-141.

Barret, D.C., and Pollack, L.M., "Whose Gay Community? Social Class, Sexual Self- Expression, and Gay Community Involvement," in *Sociological Quarterly*, Vol 46(3), 2005, pp. 437–56.

Barthes, R., *Mythologies*, New York: Hill and Wang, 1972.

Beasley, C., *Queer Theory: Jagose, Seidman*, in C. Beasley (Ed), *Gender and sexuality: critical theories, critical thinkers*, Sage publications: Los Angeles, London, New Delhi and Singapore, 2005, pp. 161-174.

- Bell, D. and Binnie, J., *The Sexual Citizen: Queer Politics and Beyond*, Polity Press: Cambridge, 2004.
- Bernstein, M., "Celebration and Suppression: The Strategic Uses of Identity by the Lesbian and Gay Movement," in *American Journal of Sociology*. Vol. 103, No. 3, 1997, pp. 535-565.
- Bhavnani, K., "Tracing the contours: feminist research in Ireland: developing policy and practice with men who batter," in *Administration*, Vol 43 (3), 1993, pp. 57–81.
- Binnie, J. and Skeggs, B., "Cosmopolitan knowledge and the production and consumption of sexualized space: Manchester's gay village," in *The Sociological Review* Vol 52 (1), 2004, pp. 39–61.
- Bless, C., Higson-Smith, C. and Kagee, A., *Fundamentals of Social Research Methods: An African Perspective*, Fourth Edition. Juta: Cape Town, 2006.
- Bornat, J., "Oral history and qualitative research," *Timescapes Methods Guides Series*, Guide No: 12, 2012.
- Bornman, E., "The Rainbow Nation versus the colours of the rainbow: Nation-building versus diversity in post-apartheid South Africa with some notes on the role of the media," inaugural lecture, University of South Africa, Pretoria, 2014.
- Boyd, N.A., "Who is the subject? Queer theory meets oral history," in *Journal of the History of Sexuality*. Vol 17 (2), 2008, pp. 177-189.
- Bruce, K.M., "LGBT Pride as a Cultural Protest Tactic in a Southern City," in *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, Vol 42 (5), 2013, pp. 392-429.
- Buckingham, D., "Introducing identity," in D. Buckingham (Ed.), *Youth, Identity and Digital Media*. Buckingham, Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 2008, pp. 1–24.
- Burns, K., "Cosmopolitan sexual citizenship and the project of queer world-making at the Sydney 2002 Gay Games," in *Sexualities*. Vol 15 (3/4), 2012, pp. 314-335.
- Butler, J., *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, London: Routledge, 1990.
- Cameron, E., "Foreword," in S. De Waal and A. Manion (Eds), *Pride: Protest and Celebration*. Fanele: Johannesburg, 2006, pp. 4-6.
- Camfield, D., "Theoretical Foundations of an Anti-Racist Queer Feminist Historical Materialism," in *Critical Sociology*. Vol. 42(2), 2016, pp. 289-306.
- Carolin, A., "Apartheid's Immorality Act and the fiction of heteronormative whiteness," in *Tydskrif vir letterkunde*. Vol 54 (1), 2016, pp. 111-128.

- Chasin, A., *Selling Out: The Gay and Lesbian Movement Goes to Market*. New York: Palgrave, 2000.
- Chasin, A., "Interpenetrations: A Cultural Study of the Relationship between the Gay/Lesbian Niche Market and the Gay/Lesbian Political Movement," in *Cultural Critique*, No. 44, 2000, pp. 145-168.
- Closson, R.B., "Critical Race Theory and Adult Education," in *Adult Education Quarterly*, Vol 60 (3), 2010, pp. 261-283.
- Collins, D., "'We're there and queer': Homonormative mobility and lived experience among gay expatriates in Manila," in *Gender & Society*, Vol 23 (4), 2009, pp. 465-493.
- Collins, P.H., "Toward a New Vision: Race, Class and Gender as Categories of Analysis and Connection," in *Race, Sex & Class*, Vol. 1 (1), 1993, pp. 25-45.
- Comaroff, J.L., "Reflections on the Colonial State in South Africa and Elsewhere: Factions, Fragments, Facts and Fictions", in *Social Identities*, Vol. 4 (3), 1988, pp. 321-361.
- Cooper, T.L., "Building Ethical Community," in *The American Review of Public Administration*, Vol 41 (1), 2011, pp. 3-22.
- Cosson, F., "Voice of the community? Reflections on accessing, working with and representing communities," in *Oral History*. Vol 38 (2), 2010, pp. 95-101.
- Craven, E., "Racial identity and racism in the gay and lesbian 'community' in post-apartheid South Africa," Master's thesis, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, 2011.
- Crenshaw, K., "Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics," in *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, Vol 140, 1989, pp. 139-167.
- Cruells, M. and Coll-Planas, G., "Challenging equality policies: The emerging LGBT perspective," in *European Journal of Women's Studies*. Vol 20 (2), 2013, pp. 122-137.
- Cruz-Malave, A. and Manalansan, M.F., "Introduction: Dissident sexualities/Alternative globalisms," in A. Cruz-Malave and Manalansan, M.F (Eds), *Queer Globalisations: Citizenship and The Afterlife of Colonialism*. New York University Press: New York, 2002, pp. 1-10.
- Culler, J., *On deconstruction: Theory and criticism after structuralism*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1982.

- David, O. and Bar-Tal, D., "A Sociopsychological Conception of Collective Identity: The Case of National Identity as an Example" In *Personality and Social Psychology Review*. Vol 13, 2009, pp. 364-388.
- Davidson, G., and Nerio R., "Exit: Gay publishing in South Africa," in M. Gevisser and E. Cameron (Eds), *Defiant Desire: gay and lesbian lives in South Africa*, Ravan Press: Braamfontein, 1994, pp. 225-231.
- Derrida, J., Bernd, M., and Cullenberg, S., *Specters of Marx: the state of debt, the work of mourning and the new International*, New York: Routledge, 2006.
- De Waal, S., and Manion, A., *Pride: Protest and Celebration*. Fanele: Johannesburg, 2006.
- Dhamoon, R.K., "Considerations on Mainstreaming Intersectionality," in *Political Research Quarterly*. Vol 64 (1), 2011, pp. 595-607.
- Dimitrova, R., Chasiotis, A., Bender, M., and Van de Vijver, F.J.R., "From a Collection of Identities to Collective Identity: Evidence from Mainstream and Minority Adolescents in Bulgaria," in *Cross-Cultural Research*, Vol 48 (4), 2014, pp. 339-367.
- Dyer, R., *White: Essays on Race and Culture*. Abingdon: Routledge, 1997.
- Duggan, L., "The new homonormativity: The sexual politics of neoliberalism," in R. Castronovo and D. Nelson (Eds), *Materializing Democracy: Toward a Revitalized Cultural Politics*, Durham: Duke University Press, 2002, pp. 175-194.
- Ebert, T.L., "Ludic Feminism, the Body, Performance, and Labor: Bringing 'Materialism' Back into Feminist Cultural Studies," in *Cultural Critique*, No. 23, 1993, pp. 5-50.
- Eder, K., "A Theory of Collective Identity Making Sense of the Debate on a 'European Identity,'" in *European Journal of Social Theory*. Vol 12 (4), 2009, pp. 1-21.
- Einwohner, R.L., Reger, J., and Myers, D.L., "Introduction," in J. Reger, D.L. Myers and R. L. Einwohner (Eds), *Identity Work in Social Movements*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008, pp. 1-17.
- English Oxford Living Dictionary, <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/they>.
- Enguix, B., "Identities, Sexualities and Commemorations: Pride Parades, Public Space and Sexual Dissidence," in *Anthropological Notebooks*. Vol 15 (2), 2009, pp. 15-33.
- Epstein Jayaratne, T. and Stewart, A.J., "Quantitative and Qualitative Methods in the Social Sciences; Current Feminist Issues and Practical Strategies," in M.M. Fonow and J.A. Cook (Eds.), *Beyond Methodology: Feminist Scholarship as Lived Research*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991, pp. 85-100.

- Erasmus, Z., "The Nations, its populations and their recalibration: South African affirmative action in a neoliberal age," in *Cultural Dynamics*. Vol 27 (1), 2015, pp. 99-115.
- Fairclough, N., *Critical discourse analysis: the critical study of language*. London: Longman, 1995.
- Fairclough, N., *Discourse and social change*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992.
- Fairclough, N., *Language and Power*, London: Longman, 1989.
- Falkof, N., *The end of whiteness: Satanism and family murder in late apartheid South Africa*, Jacana, South Africa, 2016.
- Fine, G.A. and Van Den Scott, L.J., "Wispy Communities: Transient gatherings and imagined micro-communities," in *American Behavioural Scientist*, Vol 55 (10), 2011, pp. 1319-1335.
- Foucault, M., *Archaeology of Knowledge*, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2002.
- Foucault, M., *Discipline and Punish: the birth of the prison*, Trans. A. Sheridan, New York: Vintage Books, 1977.
- Fourie, C., "Pride 2000 – unforgettable," *Exit* November 2001, p. 1.
- Freud, S., "Further remarks on the neuro-psychoses of defence," in J. Strachey (Ed.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud*, London: Hogarth Press, Vol. 3, 1896, pp. 159-185.
- Gal, N., Shifman, L., and Kampf, Z., "'It gets better': Internet memes and the construction of collective identity," in *new media & society*. Vol 18(8), 2016, pp. 1698-1714.
- Gevisser, M., "A different fight for freedom: a history of South African lesbian and gay organisation – the 1950s to the 1990s," in M. Gevisser and E. Cameron (Eds), *Defiant Desire: gay and lesbian lives in South Africa*. Ravan Press: Braamfontein, 1994, pp. 14-86.
- Gevisser, M., and Cameron, E., *Defiant Desire: gay and lesbian lives in South Africa*. Ravan Press: Braamfontein, 1994.
- Gevisser, M., and Reid, G., "Pride or protest?: Drag queens, comrades, and the Lesbian and Gay Pride March," in M. Gevisser and E. Cameron (Eds), *Defiant Desire: gay and lesbian lives in South Africa*, Ravan Press: Braamfontein, 1994, pp. 278-283.
- Ghaziani, A., "Post-Gay Collective Identity Construction," in *Social Problems*, Vol 58(1), 2011, pp. 99-125.
- Ghaziani, A., and Fine, G.A., "Infighting and Ideology: How Conflict Informs the Local Culture of the Chicago DykeMarch," in *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society*. Vol. 20 (1), 2008, pp. 51-67.

- Gibson, A., and Macleod, C., ““(Dis) allowances of lesbians’ sexual identities: Lesbian identity construction in racialised, classed, familial, and institutional space,” in *Feminism & Psychology*, Vol 22 (4), 2012, pp. 462-481.
- Gorman-Murray, A., and Nash, C., “Transformations in LGBT consumer landscapes and leisure spaces in the neoliberal city,” in *Urban Studies*. Vol 54 (3), 2017, pp. 786-805.
- Gqola, P., “Defining people: Analysing power, language and representation in metaphors of the New South Africa,” in *Transformation* Vol 47, 2001, pp. 94-106.
- Green, I., “Queer Theory and Sociology: Locating the Subject and the Self in Sexuality Studies,” in *Sociological Theory*. Vol 25 (1), 2007, pp. 26-45.
- Groenmeyer, S., “Intersectionality in Apartheid and Post-apartheid South Africa: Unpacking the Narratives of Two Working Women,” in *Gender, Technology and Development*. Vol 15 (2), 2011, pp. 249-274.
- Guest, G., MacQueen, K.M., and Namey, E.E., *Applied Thematic Analysis*, Sage Publications, 2012.
- Habib, A., “South Africa – The Rainbow Nation and prospects for consolidating democracy,” in *African Journal of Political Science*, Vol 2 (2), pp. 15-37.
- Hall, S., “Who needs ‘identity?’” in P. Du Gay, J. Evans, and P. Redman (Eds), *Identity: A reader*, Sage Publications: London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi and Singapore, 2002, pp. 15-30.
- Hamilton, C., Harris, V., and Reid, G., “Introduction,” in C. Hamilton., V. Harris, J. Taylor., M. Pickover, G. Reid., and R. Saleh (Eds), *Refiguring the archive*, David Philip: Cape Town, 2002, pp. 6-17.
- Harcourt, B., “An Answer to the Question: “What Is Poststructuralism?” Paper delivered at the Seminar on Law and Political Theory, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, 2007.
- Harris, B., “The Archive, Public History and the Essential Truth: The TRC Reading the Past,” in C. Hamilton., V. Harris, J. Taylor., M. Pickover., G. Reid., and R. Saleh (Eds), *Refiguring the archive*, David Philip: Cape Town, 2002, pp. 161-177.
- Harris, V., “A shaft of darkness: Derrida in the Archive,” in C. Hamilton., V. Harris, J. Taylor, M. Pickover., G. Reid., and R. Saleh (Eds), *Refiguring the archive*, David Philip: Cape Town, 2002, pp. 61-81.
- Harris, V., “The Archival Sliver: A Perspective on the Construction of Social Memory in Archives and the Transition from Apartheid to Democracy,” in C. Hamilton., V. Harris, J. Taylor., M.

- Pickover., G. Reid., and R. Saleh (Eds), *Refiguring the archive*, David Philip: Cape Town, 2002, pp. 135-151.
- Helman, R., "Why are all rapes not grievable?" in *South African Journal of Psychology*, Editorial, 2017, pp. 1-4.
- Hengeveld, M., and Tallie, T.J., "'This is my route!' Race, Entitlement and Gay Pride in South Africa," 15 October 2012, at <http://africasacountry.com/2012/10/this-is-my-route-race-entitlement-and-gay-pride-in-south-africa/>, n.p.
- Hesse-Biber, S.N., "Oral History: A collaborative Method of (Auto) Biography Interview," in S.N. Hesse-Biber and P. Leavy (Eds), *The Practice of Qualitative Research*. Sage Publications, 2005, p. 156.
- Huber, M., "Revisiting places of queer crisis," in *Spheres: Journal for Digital Cultures*. Vol. 1 (1), 2014, at <http://spheres-journal.org/revisiting-places-of-queer-crisis/>.
- Huber, M., "(Re-)Covering Queer: Restarting public space and sexual politics," in M.J. Belbel and R. Reitsamer, *dig me out: Discourses of Popular Music, Gender and Ethnicity*, Art Centre Arteleku, Spain/Austria, 2009, pp. 1-18.
- Hughes, M., and Kentlyn, S., "Older LGBT people's care networks and communities of practice: a brief note," in *International Social Work*, vol. 54, no. 3, 2011, pp. 436-444.
- Ivanic, R., and Simpson, J., "Who's who in academic writing?" in N. Fairclough (Ed), *Critical language awareness*, Longman: London and New York, 1992, pp. 141-173.
- Iverson, S.V., "Camouflaging Power and Privilege: A Critical Race Analysis of University Diversity Policies," in *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 43, No. 5, 2007, pp. 586-611.
- Jagose, A., *Queer theory: an introduction*, New York: New York University Press, 1996.
- Jagose, A., "Way Out: The Category "Lesbian" and the Fantasy of the Utopic Space," in *Journal of the History of Sexuality*, Vol. 4(2), Special Issue, Part 1: Lesbian and Gay Histories, 1993, pp. 264-287.
- Jakobsen, J.R., "Can homosexuals end western civilisation as we know it? Family values in a global economy," in A. Cruz-Malave and M.F. Manalansan (Eds), *Queer Globalisations: Citizenship and The Afterlife of Colonialism*. New York University Press: New York, 2002, pp. 49-70.
- Johal, G.S., "Order in K.O.S. on Race, Rage and Method," in G.S.Dei and G.S Johal (Eds), *Critical Issues in Anti-racist Research Methodologies*, Peter Lang: New York, 2005, pp. 269-290.

- Johnson, C., "Heteronormative citizenship and the politics of passing," in *Sexualities*. Vol 5 (3), 2002, pp. 317-336.
- Jorgensen, M., and Phillips, L., *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. Sage Publications: London, 2002.
- Judge, M., "Violence against lesbians and (IM) possibilities for identity and politics," Doctoral thesis, University of the Western Cape, Cape Town, 2015.
- Kantsa, V., "The price of marriage: Same-sex sexualities and citizenship in Greece," in *Sexualities*. Vol 17(7), 2014, pp. 818-836.
- Kates, S.M., and Belk, R.W., "The meanings of Lesbian and Gay Pride Day: Resistance through consumption and resistance to consumption," in *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*. Vol 30 (4), 2001, pp. 392-429.
- Kates, S.M., "Making the Ad Perfectly Queer: Marketing 'normality' to the gay men's community?" in *Gender and Multicultural Issues*. Vol 28 (1), 1999, pp. 25-37.
- Kay, R., "Identity and Marginality," in *eSharp*. Issue 6 (1), 2005, pp. 1-6.
- Knight Abowitz, K., and Harnish, J., "Contemporary discourses in citizenship," in *Review of Educational Research*, Vol 76 (4), 2006, pp. 653-690.
- Kozinets, R.V., *Netnography: Doing ethnographic research online*. Sage publications: Los Angeles. London, New Delhi. Singapore, Washington DC, 2010.
- Laurore, C. L., "'Rhodes Must Fall': Student Activism and the Politics of Memory at the University of Cape Town, South Africa," Honours Thesis, Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, 2016.
- Logie, C.H., James, L.L., Tharao, W., and Loutfy, M.R., 2012. "'We don't exist': a qualitative study of marginalization experienced by HIV-positive lesbian, bisexual, queer and transgender women in Toronto, Canada," in *Journal of the International AIDS Society*. Vol 15 (2), 2012, at <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3494165/>.
- Lopez, A.J., *Postcolonial whiteness: a critical reader on race and empire*, Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005.
- Lynch, I. and Maree, D.J.F., "Negotiating heteronormativity: Exploring South African bisexual women's constructions of marriage and family," in *Feminism & Psychology*. Vol 23 (4), 2013, pp. 459-477.
- Lynn, M., "Toward a Critical Race Pedagogy: A Research Note," in *Urban Education*, Vol. 33 (5), 1999, pp. 606-627.

- Marinucci, M., *Feminism is queer: the intimate connection between queer and feminist theory*, Zed Books: London and New York, 2010.
- Mbembe, A., "The power of the archive and its limits," in C. Hamilton, V. Harris, J. Taylor, M. Pickover, G. Reid., and R. Saleh (Eds), *Refiguring the archive*, David Philip: Cape Town, 2002, pp. 19-26.
- McKenna, S., "A critical investigation into discourses that construct academic literacy at the Durban Institute of Technology," Doctoral thesis, Rhodes University, Grahamstown, 2004.
- Mcleod, C., "Radical plural feminisms and emancipatory practice in post-apartheid South Africa," in *Theory & Psychology*, Vol 16 (3), 2006, pp. 367-389.
- Meskel, L., and Scheermeyer, C., "Heritage as Therapy: Set pieces from the New South Africa," in *Journal of Material Culture*. Vol 13 (2), 2008, pp. 153-173.
- Milani, T.M., "Are 'queers' really 'queer'? Language, identity and same-sex desire in a South African online 'community'," in *Discourse & Society*, Vol 24 (5), 2013, pp 1-19.
- Mohanty, C.T., *Feminism without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003.
- More, M.P., "Locating Frantz Fanon in Post-Apartheid South Africa," in *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, 2014, pp. 1-15.
- Myambo, M.T., "The limits of rainbow nation multiculturalism in the new South Africa: Spatial configuration in Zakes Mda's *Ways of Dying* and Jonathan Morgan's *Finding Mr. Madini*," in *Research in African Literatures*, Vol 41 (2), 2010, pp. 93-120.
- Narrain, A., "Rethinking citizenship: A queer journey," in *Indian Journal of Gender Studies*, Vol 16 (41), 2007, pp. 61-71.
- Nieuwenhuis, J., "Qualitative research designs and data gathering techniques," in K. Maree (Ed.), *First Steps in Research*, Van Schaik Publishers: Pretoria, 2011, pp. 70-97.
- Oswin, N., "Critical geographies and the uses of sexuality: deconstructing queer space," in *Progress in Human Geography*. Vol 32 (1), 2008. pp. 89-103.
- Parker, L., and Lynn, M., "What's Race Got to Do With It? Critical Race Theory's Conflicts With and Connections to Qualitative Research Methodology and Epistemology," in *Qualitative Inquiry*, Vol 8, No 7, 2008, pp. 7-22.
- Payne, R., and Davies, C., "Introduction to the special section: Citizenship and queer critique," in *Sexualities*, Vol 15 (3/4), 2012, pp. 251-256.

- Pillow, W., "Confession, catharsis, or cure? Rethinking the uses of reflexivity as methodological power in qualitative research," in *Qualitative Studies in Education*. Vol 16 (2), 2003, pp. 175-196.
- Puar, J., "Rethinking homonationalism," in *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, Vol 45 (2), 2013, pp. 336-339.
- Quraishi, M., and Philburn, R., *Researching Racism: a guide book for academics and professional investigators*, Sage publications: London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi and Singapore, 2015.
- Quinn, B., and Wilks, L., "Festival connections: people, place and social capital," in G. Richards, M.P. De Brito, and L. Wilks, *Exploring the social impacts of events*, Routledge: London and New York, 2013, pp. 15-30.
- Rape Crisis Cape Town, *Annual Report 2015/2016*, 2016, at <http://rapecrisis.org.za/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/AnnualReport2016.pdf>.
- Ratcliff, J.J., Miller, A.K., and Krolikowski, A.M., "Why pride displays elicit support from majority group members: The meditational role of perceived deservingness," in *Group Process Intergroup Relations*, Vol 16 (4), 2013, pp. 462-475.
- Ratele, K., "Sexuality as constitutive of whiteness in South Africa," in *NORA – Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research*, Vol 17 (3), 2009, pp. 158-174.
- Ratele, K., and Laubscher, L., "Making white lives: Neglected meanings of whiteness from apartheid South Africa," in *Psychology in Society*, Vol 40, 2010, pp. 83-99.
- Reid, G., "'The History of the Past is the Trust of the Present': Preservation and Excavation in the Gay and Lesbian Archives of South Africa," in C. Hamilton, V. Harris, J. Taylor, M. Pickover, G. Reid, and R. Saleh (Eds), *Refiguring the archive*, David Philip: Cape Town, 2002, pp. 193-207.
- Renan, E., "What is a Nation?" Conference paper at the Sorbonne, E. Rundell (trans.), 11 March 1882.
- Reygan, F., and Lynette, A., "Heteronormativity, homophobia and 'culture' arguments in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa," in *Sexualities*. Vol 17 (5/6), 2014, pp. 707-723.
- Richardson, D., "Desiring sameness? The rise of a neoliberal politics of normalization," in *Antipode*, Vol 37(3), 2005, pp. 515-537.
- Richardson, D., "Claiming citizenship? Sexuality, citizenship and lesbian/feminist theory," in *Sexualities*, Vol 3 (2), 2000, pp. 255-272.

- Richardson, J.E., *Analysing Newspapers: An Approach from Critical Discourse Analysis*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- Rimmerman, C.A., *The Lesbian and Gay Movements: Assimilation or Liberation?* Boulder, CO: West-view Press, 2008.
- Ritchie, J., "Pinkwashing, Homonationalism, and Israel–Palestine: The Conceits of Queer Theory and the Politics of the Ordinary," in *Antipode* Vol. 47 (3), 2015, pp. 616-634.
- Roy, A., "Towards a practice of democratic citizenship," in *Indian Journal of Gender Studies*. Vol 14 (1), 2007, pp. 1-15.
- Sanchez, G.R., and Vargas, E.D., "Taking a Closer Look at Group Identity: The Link between Theory and Measurement of Group Consciousness and Linked Fate," in *Political Research Quarterly*. Vol 69(1), 2016, pp. 160-174.
- Sarup, M., *An Introductory Guide to Post-structuralism and Postmodernism*, University of Georgia Press, 1993.
- Selvick, S., "Positive Bleeding: Violence and Desire in Works by Mlu Zondi, Zanele Muholi, and Makhosazana Xaba, in *Safundi*, Vol 16 (4), 2015, pp. 443-465.
- Singh, S., "Overcoming heteronormative hegemony: queer resistance to neoliberalism in Chile," Master's thesis, National University of Singapore, Singapore, 2015.
- Smit, S., "Challenging desire: performing whiteness in post-apartheid South Africa," Doctoral thesis, Rhodes University, Grahamstown, 2014.
- Statistics South Africa, "Mid-year population estimates," 31 July 2017, at <http://www.statssa.gov.za/publications/P0302/P03022017.pdf>.
- Steedman, C., "Culture, Cultural Studies and the Historians," in S. During (Ed), *The Cultural Studies Reader*, Second Edition, Routledge: London and New York, 1999, pp. 46-56.
- Stella, F., "Queer Space, Pride, and Shame in Moscow," in *Slavic Review*. Vol. 72 (3), 2013, pp. 458-480.
- Steyn, M., "White Talk," in A.J. Lopez (Ed), *Postcolonial Whiteness: A Critical Reader on Race and Empire*, Albany NY: State University of New York Press, 2005, pp. 119-135.
- Steyn, M., "*White talk: White South Africans and the strategic management of diasporic whiteness*," Doctoral thesis, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, 2003.
- Steyn, M., and Foster, D., "Repertoires for talking white: Resistant whiteness in post-apartheid South Africa," in *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Vol. 31(1), 2007, pp. 25-51.

Stratton, J., and Ang, I., "Multicultural imagined communities: Cultural difference and national identity in the USA and Australia," in D. Bennett, (Ed.), *Multicultural States: Rethinking Difference and Identity*. Routledge: London and New York, 1998, pp. 135-162.

Strydom, P., *Contemporary Critical Theory and Methodology*, Routledge: London and New York, 2011.

Tamboukou, M., "Archival research: unraveling space/time/matter entanglements and fragments," in *Qualitative Research*, 2013, pp. 617-633.

Taylor, J., *Playing It Queer: Popular Music, Identity and Queer World-Making*. Peter Lang: Bern, 2012.

Teal, J., and Conover-Williams, M., "Homophobia without Homophobes: Deconstructing the Public Discourses of 21st Century Queer Sexualities in the United States," in *Humboldt Journal of Social Relations*, Vol 38, 2016, pp. 12-27.

The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, Act 108 of 1996.

The Civil Union Act, Act 17 of 2006.

The Gay and Lesbian Archives at <http://www.gala.co.za/>.

The Immorality Act, Act 5 of 1927; Act 21 of 1950.

The One in Nine Campaign at <http://www.oneinnine.org.za/>.

Thoreson, R., "Somewhere over the Rainbow Nation: Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Activism in South Africa," in *Journal of Southern African Studies*, Vol. 34 (3), 2008, pp. 679-697.

Tucker, A., "Framing Exclusion in Cape Town's Gay Village: The Discursive and Material Perpetration of Inequitable Queer Subjects," in *Area*, Vol 41 (2), 2009, pp 186-197.

Tyson, L., *Critical Theory Today: A User-Friendly Guide*, Garland Publishing Inc: New York and London, 1999.

Vaid-Menon, A., "Rainbows are just refracted white light: Settler homonationalism in neo-apartheid South Africa," Honours Thesis, Stanford University, Stanford, 2013.

Van Zyl, M., "A Sexual Politics of Belonging: Same-Sex Marriage in Post-Apartheid South Africa," Doctoral thesis, Stellenbosch University, Stellenbosch, 2015.

Ward, J., "White normativity: The cultural dimensions of whiteness in a racially diverse LGBTI organization," in *Sociological Perspectives*. Vol 51 (3), 2008, pp. 563-586.

Warren, J.T., "Whiteness and cultural theory: Perspectives on research and education," in *The Urban Review*, Vol. 31, No. 2, 1999, pp. 185-203.

- Weber, L., "A conceptual framework for understanding race, class, gender, and sexuality," in *Psychology of Women Quarterly*. Vol 22, 1998, pp. 13-32.
- Wells, H., and Polders, L., "Anti-Gay Hate Crimes in South Africa: Prevalence, Reporting Practices, and Experiences of the Police," in *African Feminisms*, Vol 2 (3), 2006, pp. 20-28.
- Williams, J., *Understanding Poststructuralism*, Acumen Publishing Limited: Chesham, 2005.
- Wilks, L., "Introduction," in G. Richards, M.P. De Brito, and L. Wilks, *Exploring the social impacts of events*, Routledge: London and New York, 2013, pp. 1-11.
- Young, L., "'Race', identity and cultural criticism," in K. Bhavnani, *Oxford Readings in Feminism: Feminism & 'Race'*, Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2001, pp. 171-183.
- Yue, A., "Queer Asian mobility and homonational modernity: marriage equality, Indian students in Australia and Malaysian transgender refugees in the media," in *Global Media and Communication*, Vol 8(30), 2012, pp. 269-287.
- Zelizer, B. 1993. "Journalists as Interpretive Communities". *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, Vol. 10, pp. 219-237.