THESIS

SHOUT AMANDLA!

A RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF HELEN ZILLE

Submitted by

Emily Susan Sauter

Department of Communication Studies

In partial fulfillment of the requirements

For the Degree of Master of Arts

Colorado State University

Fort Collins, Colorado

Fall 2011

Master's Committee:

    Advisor: Karrin Vasby Anderson

    Carl Burgchardt
    Sandra Davis

ABSTRACT

SHOUT AMANDLA!

A RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF HELEN ZILLE

As women have attained more prominent political positions, the study of gender, communication, and electoral politics has expanded over the last few decades. Public address scholarship in particular has covered speeches by many women, from Angelina Grimke to Hillary Clinton, from Sojourner Truth to Eleanor Roosevelt. However, as scholars in Communication Studies have begun concerning themselves with the rhetoric of political women, much of that attention has been focused on U.S. American women. This thesis expands that conversation by exploring the rhetoric of a woman politician acting outside the U.S. American context. This project examines the complex and varied rhetorical strategies employed by Helen Zille. The goal of this work is threefold: First, I hope to gain a deeper understanding of how women in developing nations impact and shape the political landscape through their rhetorical effort by examining the situation of a specific figure. I believe this case study offers important insight into the rhetoric of women leaders acting in the context of a developing, post-colonial nation. Second, this work examines how constitutive rhetoric functions in South Africa's complex political landscape. Third, this project responds to the need for more scholarship that examines

rhetoric in non-U.S. contexts. More broadly, this project addresses the question of how Zille's rhetoric functions to overcome barriers of race, class, and gender as she works towards the 2014 presidential elections. This study will be guided by two major theories, Eugene White's theory of exigential flow and Maurice Charland's theory of constitutive rhetoric. In addition, in order to truly understand how Zille's rhetoric functions, I will explore the unique post-colonial mindset of South Africa that is a defining feature of Zille's rhetorical situation.

AKNOWLEDGMENTS

Although the words on this page cannot adequately reflect the extreme amount of gratitude that I have for the people acknowledged in this section, I will nonetheless attempt to articulate the deep appreciation I share for the many people committed to my academic, professional, and personal success. This project would not have been possible without the positive encouragement that I received from my advisors, family, and friends. First and foremost I want to say thank you to my parents, Dr. Kevin and Susan Sauter. Dad, thank you so much for being my sounding board, my editor, and my academic spirit guide. Thank you for editing my papers in the early morning hours, for fielding frantic skype calls in the middle of the day when I hit a wall, for patiently listening to me moan about the hopelessness that is graduate school at the end of the semester, and supplying me with 30+ years of wisdom and classroom exercises—you truly are my secret weapon! Mom, you have been my rock and my sanity. Thank you for being my counselor, my cheerleader, and my therapist. Thank you for always knowing when I needed a pep talk and when I needed a swift verbal kick in the butt. Your boundless faith in my abilities and never-ending support and love are the reason I know that no matter what I do in my future, I will succeed because you believe in me. To my brothers, Brendan and Sean, thank you for always taking my phone calls, even if you had no idea what I was talking about! I know I always wanted a sister, but I think God did me a favor by giving me two brothers!

Undeniably, without my amazing committee, this thesis would have been an entirely different project. To Dr. Kari Anderson, thank you for taking me on and sharing your wisdom and insight. You showed me that I can be a friend, teacher, advisor, and

mother, as well as a world-class scholar. To my outside member, Dr. Burgchardt, thank you for your opposition! And I mean that in all seriousness—we may approach some topics from opposite ends of the theoretical and ideological spectrum but I have only the deepest respect for you. You pushed me to think more deeply and write more clearly, to approach an issue from all angles, and to truthfully consider the flaws of any theory. And to my outside member Dr. Sandra Davis, thank you for your insightful comments and thoughtful questions. Having you on my committee was an honor. Not only am I better writer after this process, but a better thinker and academic thanks to you all. I also owe great gratitude to the people who made Colorado State University a reality for me. Heartfelt thanks go to my undergraduate faculty at the University of St. Thomas who wrote me amazing letters and always supported my dreams of the academy, especially Dr. John Cragan, Dr. Debra Peterson, Dr. Angela High-Pippert, and Dr. Carol Bruess.

Throughout this process my colleagues have been my adopted family and your friendship made Colorado State University my home-away-from-home. To Ashton Mounton, how do I even start? You are my academic soulmate and life-partner. Thank you for the last minute edits, the many (*many*) late nights at the office, the early morning rides and McDonalds runs, always listening to my long-winded feminist rants, and helping me take much needed breaks. I always appreciated our conversations, from the theoretical to the ridiculous, and I don't know how I'm going to survive PhD without you! To Emily Moreland and Tiffany Reifschneider-Smith**,** thanks for your support, laughter, general craziness, and Thursday night margs at Zquilas. Eddy 207 is an office that will go down in infamy ladies! Aaron Keel, my advisee buddy, I will miss our thesis chats. You may not know it, but you helped me through many a roadblock! I'm sad

you're leaving the academy, but I know you will do great things in the world! To Alex Coughlin, Kyle Jonas, Jeremy Grossman, Abby Zwier, Jess Solverud, Lydia Reinig, and Alita St. Clair, a special thank you for making each day a little easier and I can't wait to see where the future takes you!

Finally, I would like to say thank you to my Minnesota friends. Kat Campbell, thank you for always making time for me, and listening to me debate the finer points of theory—even if you had no idea what I was talking about! You are my BFTD and even though we're far apart, I know I can count on your for a supportive ear and sage wisdom. To Janet Olawsky, Sami Tierney and Suzy Piper, thanks for making my undergraduate years a blast! Without your friendship, I might never have gone on to graduate school! And to everyone who was not named, rest assured that if we know each other, you had a place in my writing because you were always in my heart.

Cheers,

Emily Sauter, M.A.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

In the 1970s and 1980s world attention was riveted by the brutal images coming

out of South Africa: striking black school children braving bullets and white security

forces bulldozing homes in the black townships. South Africa was commonly compared

with other cases of intractable conflicts, most notably the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and

the troubles in Northern Ireland.[1] In September 1989 a conference was held in Bonn to

compare these three cases. The keynote address was by a distinguished British professor

of politics, Bernard Crick, which underlined the theme of intractability and made stark

assumptions about the limited possibilities of progress:

> I call the three problems "insoluble" for two formal reasons: (i) that no
> internal solution likely to guarantee peace can possibly satisfy the
> announced principles of the main disputants and (ii) that any external
> imposed solution or enforced adjudication is likely to strengthen the
> desperation and self-righteousness of the threatened group.[2]

In this context, it is clear that South Africa's transition to democracy in the first half of

the 1990s appeared so surprising to most observers that it was widely dubbed a miracle.[3]

What can be considered more miraculous—aside from the successful transition from

what was essentially a colonial dictatorship into a functioning democracy—is the ability

of South Africans to sustain their democracy.[4] Bruce Baker writes, however, that "Democracy has no automatic right to be the political ideology of Africa; sustainability means constant persuasion."[5] Baker goes on to argue that it is not just a matter of changing political institutions, or even economic policies, but a matter of changing social attitudes.[6] If democracy is to be sustained, "people must identify with the chosen unit of democratic decision making."[7] The "national question" must be resolved; that is, are the people contained within the state, despite racial and ethnic differences, committed to a "higher allegiance?"[8] The reality is that "the people cannot decide until somebody decides who are the people."[9]

Despite the sophisticated and liberal democratic framework currently in place, democracy still occupies a tenuous space in the minds of South Africans. For the masses who have struggled for political rights, often at great personal cost, political views are held intensely and do not include the tolerance which comes from a legitimate political order. A viable democracy relies upon the view that those who disagree are rivals and not enemies.[10] Genuine democratic attitudes, such as tolerance of diversity and acceptance of alternative ideas and interests, tend to be most prevalent in wealthy and educated societies, and the cruel reality of South Africa is that a large majority of the population, especially within the black community, is poor and lacking in appropriate education.[11] Ron Ottoway argues that a strong democracy *must* have a strong counter-government or opposition parties in order to ensure accountability and integrity.[12] Ottoway goes so far as to say, "The only guarantee that a government will remain democratic is the existence of a strong opposition . . . no political system can be considered democratic in the absence of countervailing centers of power."[13]

South Africa is at a critical juncture in its democracy. On the one hand, South Africa has a complex system designed to contain state power such as the provincial powers, the separation of power between the executive and the judiciary, and a respect for the rule of law, despite unfavorable political outcomes for the African National Congress (ANC), which has been in power since 1994.[14] However, in a country where much of the population is poverty stricken and uneducated, a political class has emerged that stands to lose everything if dislodged from power, which has resulted in wide-scale ethnic mobilization campaign strategies.[15] It is clear that the ANC has been electorally dominant for the last two decades and that the majority of opposition parties are too weak to provide any real challenge. The question remains, can black voters be persuaded to vote en masse for an opposition party? If they cannot, then the odds of South Africa succeeding as a democracy are not favorable.[16] South Africa, with its massive inequalities, racial and ethnic tensions, and authoritarian legacies is not an ideal environment for liberal democracy, but though "South Africa may not have the democracy it deserves, it may well have the democracy that it can sustain."[17]

It is clear that the context for democracy in South Africa is unfavorable, but not impossible. The majority population is largely uneducated, ethnic/racial tensions dominate political discussions and the economy is shaky at best. As well, though South Africa has worked to divorce itself from apartheid, any regime inevitably carries with it historical baggage that can restrict contemporary options.[18] Baker writes, "Most Africans over [the age] of 65 today have actually experienced as adults colonial rule, independent democracy, autocratic state predation and the democratic transition."[19] Despite this, South Africa has maintained its grip on democracy, and in the 2009 elections a possibility

of a real opposition party took root. On May 6, 2009, Helen Zille officially accepted the position as Premier of the Western Cape, one of the wealthiest and most influential provinces on the country. Zille is the head of the largest opposition party in South Africa, the Democratic Alliance (DA), which holds the largest majority in National Parliament as of the 2009 elections.

Since 1994 South Africa has been under the complete rule of the African National Congress. No party or candidate in the last sixteen years has been able to dent the stronghold the ANC has held on the nation, until 2009 when the Democratic Alliance led by Helen Zille produced the best results ever at the polls, scoring almost a million new voters to take its nationwide tally from 1,931,201 to just under 3,000,000, a growth of 50 per cent. This made it the only party in South Africa to have grown in all three of the most recent elections. Zille led the party to unparalleled success. In the last election the DA kept the ANC below a two-thirds majority (albeit only just), won an outright majority in the Western Cape (the first time any party had done so in post-apartheid South Africa)[20] and significantly improved its standing in parliament, taking twenty more seats in the National Assembly; whereas the ANC lost thirty-three seats.[21] Indeed, it was the only party in the entire country to increase rather than lose overall support since the 2004 elections.[22]

Helen Zille is the face of the DA, and the power behind its success. Zille herself won the Western Cape Premiership in a landslide election, and has clearly set her sights on political advancement. In 2008, Zille told reporters "Our [The DA's] plan is to become the government in 2014."[23] The biggest challenge facing Zille is the need to overcome her symbolic role as a colonial oppressor and win over black voters.

Newly commissioned research by the party showed voters of all races were looking for a political re-alignment, where "parties and people sharing the same values came together to forge an open society with equal opportunities, as opposed to a closed, patronage-driven society under the ANC."[24] What makes Helen Zille such an important figure then, both politically and historically, is that her rise to power is an unprecedented phenomenon in South African politics, especially in the DA, which unlike the ruling ANC, does not have political party quotas for women. Though women were a critical part of the resistance movement and transition into democracy, it wasn't until the early 1990s that women were placed in position of power, and Zille is arguably the most powerful women in politics in South Africa, with clear ambitions for higher office.

Zille is also an important object of study for critics of rhetoric and public address. As women have attained more prominent political positions, the study of gender, communication, and electoral politics has expanded over the last few decades. Public address scholarship in particular has covered speeches by many women, from Angelina Grimke to Hillary Clinton, from Sojourner Truth to Eleanor Roosevelt.[25] However, as scholars in Communication Studies have begun concerning themselves with the rhetoric of political women, much of that attention has been focused on U.S. American women. This thesis expands that conversation by exploring the rhetoric of a woman politician acting outside the U.S. American context. This project examines the complex and varied rhetorical strategies employed by Helen Zille. The goal of this work is threefold: First, I hope to gain a deeper understanding of how women in developing nations impact and shape the political landscape through their rhetorical effort by examining the situation of a specific figure. I believe this case study offers important insight into the rhetoric of

women leaders acting in the context of a developing, post-colonial nation. Second, this work examines how constitutive rhetoric functions in South Africa's complex political landscape. Third, this project responds to the need for more scholarship that examines rhetoric in non-U.S. contexts.[26] More broadly, this project addresses the question of how Zille's rhetoric functions to overcome barriers of race, class, and gender as she works towards the 2014 presidential elections. This study will be guided by two major theories, Eugene White's theory of exigential flow and Maurice Charland's theory of constitutive rhetoric. In addition, in order to truly understand how Zille's rhetoric functions, I will explore the unique post-colonial mindset of South Africa that is a defining feature of Zille's rhetorical situation.

The goal of this first chapter is to lay the foundation upon which I will build the larger thesis project. First, I review the relevant literature that is the theoretical foundation for this project. Second, I lay out the specific steps I have taken to study Zille's rhetoric and which texts I utilize. Lastly, I provide a brief overview of the chapters that comprise my thesis.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Configurational Rhetoric and Exigential Flow

In 1968, Lloyd Bitzer changed the way rhetorical scholars analyzed public address. His theory of "the rhetorical situation" challenged critical perspectives that traditionally tended to focus on the personality, motives and background of speakers. Bitzer contended that critics should judge whether or not a speaker's response to a rhetorical situation is a "fitting" response to the situation that called forth the speech. In 1992, Eugene White extended and refined Bitzer's situational view of rhetoric by making "configuration a prominent element in his . . . formulations."[27] He created the theory of

exigential flow, which, simply put, is at once "cause, context and product" of a communicative event. What is of particular use both in this study, as well as in the field of public address scholarship broadly, is the notion that "the meaning of a body of rhetoric is not in its provoking urgencies, nor in the rhetoric's antecedents, nor in the rhetorical action itself, nor in the consequences of the rhetoric, *but in the perceived interrelationships of all these features of the event*" [emphasis in original].[28] Bitzer's contribution to the field of rhetorical studies lay primarily in his idea of exigence – that in any particular situation there is a compelling imperfection that gives rise to a rhetorical event. White takes this concept and extends it to allow for the longitudinal development of any particular exigent, an improvement that is particularly relevant when looking at a campaign spread out over time, rather than at a single speech. [29]

Much like Bitzer, White believed that a rhetor must understand a rhetorical situation in order to properly respond, but unlike Bitzer, White theorized that in addition to understanding the immediate rhetorical situation, a rhetor must understand the history leading to this particular rhetorical moment and how this moment will affect the urgency in the future.[30] White postulated that any urgency is not an isolated event, but is a result of a previous urgency and rhetorical act, and that by responding to the immediate urgency, the rhetor then alters the urgency, provoking "further rhetorical and other responding actions, generating a continuing cycle of antecedents and consequences."[31]

White goes on to construct a sophisticated method for examining the "interplaying of regularized forces constituting a historical configuration—a dynamic, cyclical movement or development—of antecedents-events-consequences."[32] White develops as a case study an extensive review of John C. Calhoun's March 4, 1850, speech to the United

7

States Senate. In Calhoun's speech, long considered a failure by historians and rhetorical critics, White sees the configuration of forces coalescing around the speech act, which provides Calhoun the opportunity to reach congruence in the situation to the greatest degree possible under the constraining influences.[33] While it is clear that Zille is a successful politician, I argue that we need a deeper understanding of the historical antecedents which constitute the exigential flow of the situation, a more in-depth analysis of the circumstances of her rise to power, and a more complex examination of the racial and gendered obstacles facing Zille to fully see the configurations influencing the rhetorical situation.

One of the key concepts from White's book guiding this study is the idea of how we experience rhetoric "as a part of a developing flow of events," or what White calls "exigential flow."[34] A rhetorical flow will posses certain patterns of forces, called "configured interplay," that identifies the flow as rhetorical and provide the means for understanding and evaluating it. White terms it an exigential *flow* because, "it is at once a cause, context, and product of communication."[35] This rhetorical flow can also provoke further rhetorical actions, subsequently generating a "continuing cycle of antecedents and consequences."[36] These cycles of antecedents, rhetorical events and consequences consist of 1) the situational constraints surrounding the communicative act, 2) the communication itself, and 3) the consequences of the communication. Like Bitzer, White believes that rhetoric arises in response to exigencies, but goes a step farther than Bitzer by arguing that the exigence is not merely satisfied or unsatisfied, but is instead altered and continued on to the next rhetorical response.[37] Again like Bitzer, White acknowledges that many exigencies may arise and die away without prompting a

rhetorical response, but that only when a situation is sufficiently "provoking" will communication take place. White argues then that the "reality" of communication therefore exists in a "flow of changing circumstances of which the communication is intrinsically a part."[38] Zille's rhetoric, therefore, cannot be looked at as a singular moment in time but as a part of the flow of changing circumstances.

When a situation does arise that can be modified by communication, what White calls a "rhetorical urgency," speakers respond to it in the hope of inducing change in the audience. A provoking rhetorical urgency is defined as "the part of the exigential flow that occurs prior to a particular communication event and provokes it."[39] It is through communication that a speaker hopes to change her audience, in order that their change will somehow alter the provoking circumstances. "The ultimate purpose of all serious communication," White proposes, "is to influence the state of affairs (the exigential flow) that made the communication possible or necessary."[40] White posits that our response is rhetorical because "our actions have the rhetorical objective of altering people whose responses (whether rhetorical or not) will have consequences affecting the circumstances that originally caused us to communicate."[41] Once the original circumstances have been altered by the rhetorical response, it is probable that the changed state will result in new provoking exigencies that will be more inclined towards speaker influence in later rhetorical efforts.

White offers the concept of constraints/satisfactions to analyze these interrelationships among forces in a configuration. He argues that it is only when rhetorical constraints are matched by appropriate rhetorical responses can persuasion take place. White defines *rhetorical constraints* as "forces in a configuration that influence the

way a persuader chooses rhetorical responses, if he or she wants to communicate

effectively."[42] A *rhetorical response*, or satisfactions, then is "those things a persuader

says or does in answer to impinging constraints."[43] The difference here between Bitzer

and White is White's emphasis on understanding how *well* the persuader used the

available means of rhetoric to influence the flow of events.[44] The limits of

constraints/satisfactions may prescribe what a persuader can or cannot say or do, leaving

limited realistic choices for attempted persuasion, but also are the "seats of rhetorical

possibilities."[45] Thus the term "constraints" actually implies freedom within limitations.

According to White, in every rhetorical situation there are six variables that will constrain

the speaker in both positive and limiting ways:

1. The potential for modification of the urgency.

2. The capacity of the listeners to alter the urgency.

3. The readiness of the listeners to be influenced.

4. The occasion—the immediate circumstances in which the communication
   takes place.

5. Relevant aspects of the persuader's self-system.

6. The persuader's real and apparent purposes in communicating.

These six variables will all fluctuate in importance depending on the situation faced by

the persuader. It is the interplay of these six factors that must be taken into account by

communicators, and "read" by those who interpret and analyze the communication.[46]

When analyzing constraints/satisfactions there are three questions the researchers

must ask themselves: 1) what is the persuader's intentions? 2) how well does the basic

"thrust" of what is said fit the potential for modifying the urgency? and 3) how well does

the persuader select rhetorical options that match the readiness of the audience to be influenced? White argues, "Before you can evaluate *any* human action you have to think about the purpose behind the action."[47] Without an understanding of what the persuaders are attempting, you cannot make an accurate assessment of how well a persuader uses rhetoric, or how rhetoric functions to change a situation. The second question is really a question of the ultimate goal of a persuader, which is not strictly to induce change in listeners, but to get the listeners to "exert pressure on the state of affairs that provoked communications or made it possible."[48] The persuader speaks in the hope of getting the listeners to see the urgency in a new light and act differently towards whatever created or sustained the urgency. This usually results in voting in a different way, buying certain products, boycotting people or places etc. White believes that this is the ultimate purpose of rhetorical discourse, getting audiences to either act differently or think differently.[49] As White reminds us, Aristotle points out, "communication is the principal agent of social change and the effecting social change is the ultimate function of society."[50] The last question White poses for scholars is to consider what the *immediate* objectives of a persuader are. As discussed, one of the main goals of speaking is to alter the provoking agency; a persuader's immediate goal is to induce change in the audience. How much and what kind of change listeners are willing and able to sustain depends on four variables: 1) the nature of the listeners' self-systems, 2) the ways they respond to the original provoking urgency, 3) the persuader herself, and, 4) the communication event.[51] What successful persuaders choose to say and how they choose to say it depends on their ability to perceive the readiness of the listeners to be influenced. This broader view of the rhetorical situation is particularly well suited to the study of South African rhetoric

because of the complex history of South Africa and the demanding and ever changing

urgencies that confront Helen Zille as she manages her and her country's political future.

Constitutive Rhetoric

In his article "Constitutive Rhetoric: The Case of the *Peuple Quebecois,*" Maurice

Charland illustrates the key role identity plays in the larger struggle for political agency.

Charland believes that constitutive rhetoric as a theory of identification permits scholars

to "examine how rhetoric affects . . . the key processes in the production of ideology,"

which Louis Althausser identifies as the "constitution of the subject," and "where the

subject is and . . . who simultaneously speaks and initiates action in discourse . . . and in

the world."[52] Kenneth Burke's theory of identification informs Charland's theory, and

considers that persuasion and audiences are not two separate concepts, but allows for

audience members to "participate in the very discourse by which they would be

'persuaded.'" [53] Ultimately, Charland argues, current theories of "rhetoric as persuasion"

do not, and cannot, account for the true audiences that rhetoric addresses.[54] The theory of

constitutive rhetoric accounts for this gap in theory. My study is particularly concerned

with the ways in which Zille's rhetoric attempts to constitute a new South African

identity. Charland builds of off Burke's theory of identity, which simply says that

identification must be present in order to persuade.[55] Where Charland differs from Burke,

and where the theory of constitutive rhetoric differs from other social movement rhetoric,

is the approach to audiences. Charland believes that what most rhetorical critics consider

to be the product or consequence of discourse, such as a social identity, religious faith, or

sexuality, are beyond the realm of rational or even free choice, and thus are beyond the

realm of persuasion. As Burke notes, identification of social identity often occurs

"spontaneously, intuitively, even unconsciously."[56] Logically, these must be present before persuasion as they form the basis of persuasion. Consequently then, attempts to "elucidate ideological or identity-forming discourse requires a subject-as-audience who is already constituted within an identity and within an ideology."[57]

According to Charland's perspective, then, audience members are not free agents to be persuaded nor are they "extra-rhetorical"; rather, audience members are historical subjects that are already constituted with an identity and ideology. Charland argues, "Persuasive discourse requires a subject-as-audience who is already constituted with an identity and within an ideology." [58] Audience members are then "interpellated" or constituted as subjects who participate in the discourse and come into being as a result of discourse. More precisely, any identity that a rhetor might "assert exists . . . becomes real only through rhetoric." Audiences therefore "do not exist in nature, but only with a discursively constituted history."[59] Paradoxically, rhetoric must constitute an audience's identity, while simultaneously presuming the identity to be "pregiven and natural" in order to form the basis for a rhetorical event.[60]

Interpellation occurs in the moment the audience recognizes and acknowledges that it is being addressed and, therefore, "occurs at the very moment one enters into a rhetorical situation."[61] Charland argues that the significance of interpellation to rhetoric is that "the acknowledgement of an address entails an acceptance of an imputed self-understanding which can form the basis for an appeal."[62] Further, interpellation is always ongoing—individuals are subjects from the moment they acquire language so that constitutive rhetoric is an inherent part of socialization. Thus, audience members "must already be an interpellated subject and exist as a discursive position" in order that they

might be "part of the audience of a rhetorical situation in which persuasion could occur."[63]

Identity—or collective subject identification—occurs through ideological effects in the narrative structure of constitutive rhetoric, and can only occur when "individuals accept living within a political myth."[64] That is, the notion of a "people" is a fiction that can only come into being when people buy into the fiction created by discourse. There are three ideological effects through which audiences are interpellated: 1) The process of constituting a collective subject (identity and ideology), 2) the positing of the collective subject as transhistorical (the past is presented as an extension of the present), and 3) the illusion of freedom (the subject is constrained by the narrative and must act to maintain its consistency because it is already spoken or written).[65]

The first ideological effect through which audiences are interpellated, the process of constituting a collective subject (identity and ideology), is done within a narrative framework that emphasizes a collective ideological vision. Charland asserts, "Narratives suppress the fact that, in a very real sense, no person is the same as he or she was a decade ago, or a year ago, or even yesterday," which shows how rhetors must use rhetoric to create an identity that the audience themselves might not even know they have themselves until that moment.[66] Collective identities form the basis of appeals and yet these collective identities themselves rely upon rhetoric. A "people" only exist through the ideological discourse that constitutes them—the people, then, exist as "a series of narrative ideological effects."[67] Narrative in rhetoric often offers an "ultimate" identification "permitting an overcoming or going beyond of divisive individual or class

interests or concerns."[68] To tell a story of a collective people is to implicitly claim the existence of a collective subject.

The second ideological effect through which audiences are interpellated, the positing of the collective subject as transhistorical (the past is presented as an extension of the present), is a type of narrative that interprets the actions of an individual with respect to a "collective agent."[69] Charland explains,

> It is within the formal structure of a narrative history that it is possible to conceive of a set of individuals as if they were but one. Thus, the "struggles" and "ordeals" of settlers, as a set of individual acts and experiences, become identified with "community," a term that here masks or negates tensions and differences between any members of society.[70]

This histories of a people creates a sense of what Burke calls "consubstantiality," a state where audience members feel "substantially one" with the rhetor.[71] This process results in a collapsing of time as narrative identification occurs—a concrete link for audience members that connects the past with the present. It is also what Charland calls "perfectly tautological."[72] He explains that, for audience members, historical narrative "is a making of sense."[73] It depends upon the "a priori acceptance of that which it attempts to prove the existence of, a collective agent that works to transcend the limitations of individuality at any historical moment" and also functions as a way to "transcends the death of individuals across history."[74] Historical narratives provide a framework for audiences to identify collectively with their past and with each other (and perhaps more significantly with the rhetor) in the present.

The final ideological effect of audience interpellation is the illusion of freedom in which the subject is constrained by the narrative and must act to maintain its consistency because the narrative is already spoken or written. Charland writes, "Subjects within

narratives are not free, they are *positioned* and so constrained" [emphasis in original]. [75]

In any given narrative, characters are inexorably moving towards their *telos*, they are

constituted with a history, motives, and an ultimate goal. Narrative then, largely offers

only the *illusion* of agency. Moreover, because the narrative is a "structure of

understanding that produces totalizing interpretations," audience members are

"constrained to *follow through*," that is, to act to maintain the narrative that in part forms

them, one that presents the characters as "freely" acting towards a fixed ending [emphasis

in original]. [76]

   Constitutive rhetorics have power because they are predominantly oriented

towards *action*. As Charland points out, "Ideology is material, existing not in the realm of

ideas, but in that of *material*. Ideology is material because subjects enact their ideology

and reconstitute their material world in its image," and constitutive rhetorics are

ideological because they "insert 'narratized' subjects-as-agents into the world"[77]

Audiences who are successfully constituted into the rhetor's ideology then go and enact

that ideology in a material world. To be effective, constitutive rhetoric positions and

motivates the audience members towards political, social, and economic action in a two-

step process:

1. Audience members must be successfully interpellated.

2. The tautological logic of constitutive rhetoric must necessitate action.

   In order to overcome what Charland calls the "giveness" of the rhetorical

situation, where the "ontological status of speaker, speech, audience, topic and occasion"

seem clearly defined and unproblematic, Charland employs constitutive rhetoric. [78]

Ultimately, this theory helps scholars recognize that the "position one embodies as a subject" is a rhetorical effect.[79]

Colonialism and Apartheid in South Africa

What makes South Africa such a unique study is the complicated relationship between the native Africans, the Indians, and the different white ethnicities that all claim a South African identity, along with a conflicting understandings about when, exactly, the country became a post-colonial republic. The state of colonialism, at its base definition, is the building and maintaining of colonies in one territory by people from another territory, usually accompanied by a set of unequal relationships between the colonizers and the indigenous population. The Dutch first began colonizing South Africa as early as 1652, when the Dutch East India Company created the first non-African colony in Cape Town. Between 1652 and 1780 the Dutch settled much of Southern South Africa and subjugated the indigenous people, the khoikhoi and began importing slaves. The khoikhoi eventually rebelled, and the British stepped in to take ownership of the Cape in 1806. In 1834 the British emancipated the slaves, a move that the Boers generally regarded as against the God-given ordering of the races. Yet the British settlers' conservatism stopped any radical social reforms, and in 1841 the authorities passed a Masters and Servants Ordinance, which continued to perpetuate white control. The Boers eventually moved north looking for their own land, engaging in vicious battles with the Zulus, and, eventually, with the British as well. By 1909, the British passed the South Africa Act that brought the colonies and republics—Cape Colony, Natal, Transvaal, and Orange Free State – together as the Union of South Africa. Under the provisions of the act, the Union remained British territory, but with home-rule for Afrikaners. The British High Commission territories of

Basutoland (now Lesotho), Bechuanaland (now Botswana), Swaziland, and Rhodesia (now Zambia and Zimbabwe) continued under direct rule from Britain.

The system left blacks and coloreds completely marginalized. The authorities imposed harsh taxes and reduced wages, while the British caretaker administrator encouraged the immigration of thousands of Chinese to undercut any resistance. The Natives' Land Act of 1913 was the first major piece of segregation legislation passed by the Union Parliament, and remained a cornerstone of apartheid until the 1990s when it was replaced by the current policy of land restitution.[80] Under the act, blacks were relatively restricted from the legal ownership of land, at that stage to 7% of the country. This percentage later increased to 13%, at about 158, 734 km² a 1/6th bigger than Greece, resulting in an estimated population density of 30/km², the same as modern USA.[81] The Act created a system of land tenure that deprived the majority of South Africa's inhabitants of the right to own land outside of reserves, which largely contained sub-par land that made it impossible to turn the land into a profitable business.

Segregationist legislation also included the Franchise and Ballot Act (1892), which limited the black vote by finance and education, the Natal Legislative Assembly Bill (1894), which deprived Indians of the right to vote; the General Pass Regulations Bill (1905), which denied blacks the vote altogether, limited them to fixed areas and inaugurated the infamous Pass System; the Asiatic Registration Act (1906) requiring all Indians to register and carry passes; the South Africa Act (1910) that enfranchised whites, giving them complete political control over all other race groups; and the previously mentioned Native Land Act (1913) which prevented all blacks, except those in the Cape, from buying land outside '"reserves."[82] The reserves were the "original homes" of the

black tribes of South Africa. The reserves later became known as bantustans, the objective of which was to make "self-governing, quasi-independent ethnically homogeneous states."[83] At this time the state effectively reserved 87% of the land which whites exclusively could purchase; the Natives in Urban Areas Bill (1918) designed to move blacks living in "white" South Africa into specific 'locations' as a precautionary security measure; the Urban Areas Act (1923) which introduced residential segregation in South Africa and provided cheap unskilled labor for the white mining and farming industry; the Color Bar Act (1926), preventing blacks from practicing skilled trades; the Native Administration Act (1927) that made the British Crown, rather than paramount chiefs, the supreme head over all African affairs; the Native Land and Trust Act (1936) that complemented the 1913 Native Land Act and, in the same year, the Representation of Natives Act, which removed blacks from the Cape voters' roll.[84] The final apartheid legislation passed by the South African parliament before the beginning of the apartheid era was the Asiatic Land Tenure Bill (1946), which banned any further land sales to Indians.[85]

Its clear that the roots of apartheid are firmly in the colonial era, yet I argue that when South Africa became an official free Republic in 1961 the country did not become a post-colonial country, it merely entered into a neocolonial time period. Though the majority of black South Africans saw the Afrikaaners as 'Other' and separate from South Africa, the Afrikaaners believed themselves to be as much a citizen of South Africa as any black citizen. This is an important distinction to make as it sets South Africa apart from other colonized countries. For the most part, colonized countries were ruled by clear and distinct outside forces, who did not consider themselves to be fully citizens of a

colonized country, unlike the Boers. Traditionally, when a country is freed from colonial power, usually by violent force or native uprising, the outside forces retreat and the country is governed by indigenous or native people. In the case of South Africa, when the country was free from British colonial rule, black South Africans would have considered the Boers just another form of colonial power, whereas the Boers saw themselves as South Africans governing other South Africans. Looking back to the base definition of colonialism, Afrikaaners would seem to be as much a colonial power as the British, and that legacy continues through a system of white, Western politics, and the predominance of both the English language and the Afrikaaner language, which is still a mandatory subject in elementary, primary and high schools throughout the country.

Another event that differentiates South Africa from other post-colonial countries is how apartheid was ended. For most post-colonial countries, the transfer of power from a colonial system of government to a native, post-colonial system of government is usually the result of local uprising, or violent coup. In the case of South Africa there was no true revolution, as the decision to end apartheid was partially spurred by the rebellion amongst Afrikaner and English-speaking youth as well as open revolt within the ruling National Party. By 1992, 68% of the white electorate voted in favor of dismantling apartheid through negotiations.[86] From April 26th to 29th, 1994, the South African population voted in the first universal suffrage general elections. The African National Congress won election to govern for the very first time, leaving the National Party and the Inkatha Freedom Party behind it and parties such as the Democratic Party and Pan African Congress took up their seats as part of the parliamentary opposition in the first genuine multiracial parliament. Nelson Mandela was elected as President on May 9, 1994 and

formed—according to the interim constitution of 1993—"a government of national unity," consisting of the ANC, the NP and the Inkatha.[87] On May 10th Mandela was inaugurated as South Africa's new president in Pretoria with Thabo Mbeki and F.W. de Klerk as his vice-presidents. This is one of the few instances were colonial power was handed over electorally, without bloodshed. Although South Africa ceased being a British colony in 1961, academic theories of post-colonialism help us understand the ways in which colonial discourses shaped South African political culture and maintained a hegemonic influence even after the establishment of an independent, South African republic.

Post-Colonialism

As I stated previously, in order to truly understands how Zille's rhetoric functions in South Africa, critics must have an in-depth understanding of the post-apartheid mindset. To accomplish this I utilized a post-colonial framework as a lens for understanding how rhetoric functions in a country where its citizenry is so impacted by the recent past. After briefly outlining how the term post-colonial has been defined in the academic literature, I explain the specific way this theoretical framework informs my project.

Post-colonial is a term scholars in multiple fields have been using for several decades to describe the immediate time-period that follows colonization. Post-colonial theory then is, broadly speaking, a type of intellectual discourse that consists of reactions to, and analysis of, the cultural legacy of colonialism. Two major schools of thought have emerged within post-colonial theory. One school of thought defines "post-colonial" as a specific time period after colonization, whereas the second, more recent, school of thought contends that "post-colonial" covers "all the culture affected by the imperial

21

process from the moment of colonization to the present day."[88]

For the purposes of this thesis, I ascribe to the broader definition of post-colonialism as outlined by Gauri Viswana, who argues that a post-colonial time period refers to an "*attitude* or position from which the decentering of Eurocentrism may ensue."[89] I further narrow the parameters of this theory to focus on the aspect of post-colonialism that deals with cultural identity in colonized societies, specifically the dilemmas of developing a national identity after colonial rule. This understanding of post-colonialism allows for a deeper understanding of how the theory addresses matters of identity, gender, race, racism and ethnicity with the challenges of developing a post-colonial national identity, of how a colonized people's knowledge was used against them in service of the colonizer's interests, and of how knowledge about the world is generated under specific relations between the powerful and the powerless. Understanding the conflicts inherent in the term post-colonialism is important not just within the bounds of this thesis, but also because "terminology itself can lead to cognitive erasures, displacements, and suppressions."[90]

The critical nature of post-colonial theory entails destabilizing Western ways of thinking and provides a framework for scholars to subvert dominant discourses in the West, challenge "inherent assumptions," and critique the "material and discursive legacies of colonialism."[91] In order to challenge these assumptions and legacies of colonialism, post-colonial studies need to be grounded, which entails working with tangible identities, connections, and processes. Post-colonial works emphasize the reconsideration of categories assumed to be natural and immutable, and deals with cultural identity in colonized societies: the dilemmas of developing a national identity

after colonial rule; the ways in which writers articulate and celebrate that identity (often reclaiming it from and maintaining strong connections with the colonizer); the ways in which the knowledge of the colonized (subordinated, or subaltern) people has been generated and used to serve the colonizer's interests; and the ways in which the colonizer's literature has justified colonialism via images of the colonized as a perpetually inferior people, society and culture.[92]

More broadly, post-colonial theory is a tool that many scholars use in hopes of combating the residual effects of colonialism on cultures around the world. I employ this particular theoretical lens because I believe that this type of scholarship can help us as a community expose and deconstruct the racist, imperialist nature of colonialist thought and bring us a step closer to moving beyond this period together, towards a place of mutual respect. Recognizing that they are not simply airy substances but have widespread material consequences for the nature and scale of global inequality makes this undertaking all the more critical. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Giffiths, and Helen Tiffin argue, "The concept of the post-colonial has been one of the most powerful means of re-examining the historical past and re-configuring our contemporary world-wide cultural concerns."[93] Furthermore, they believe that "more than any other concept, the post-colonial has facilitated the gradual disturbance of the Eurocentric dominance of academic debate,"[94] and has "empowered post-colonial intellectuals to redirect the discussion towards issues of direct political relevance to the non-Western world."[95] Further proof of post-colonialism's saliency can be found in the number of scholars utilizing the theory. Post-colonialism has experienced one of the steepest trajectories of any theoretical concept in the last two decades of the twentieth century. Rarely used in 1989, it now

raises over 10,000 hits in the Library of Congress catalogue.

By some definitions, post-colonialism can also be seen as a continuation of colonialism, albeit through different or new relationships concerning power and the control/production of knowledge, also known as neocolonialism. I argue that in the technical post-colonial era in South Africa, from 1961-1994, through the system of apartheid white South Africans actively maintained colonialism, both as a mindset as well as an economic and political reality, and furthermore, the attitude of colonialism continues to be sustained through a thoroughly Western electoral process. As South Africans struggle to discover a national identity they must decide what it is that makes them South African and how the legacy of colonialism will impact that identity. A few recent post-colonial scholars question the traditional post-colonial focus on national identity.[96] The Moroccan scholar Bin Abd al-Ali argues that what is seen in contemporary Middle Eastern studies is "a pathological obsession with . . . identity."[97] Yet, without an understanding of national identity, or lack thereof, scholars cannot fully grasp how those in power can manipulate ethno-cultural diversity to their own ends.

I would like to further refine my use of the term post-colonial by referring specifically to feminism and women in a post-colonial mindset. Post-colonial feminists can be described as "feminists who have reacted against both universalizing tendencies in Western feminist thought and a lack of attention to gender issues in mainstream post-colonial thought."[98] These post-colonial feminists are critical of Western forms of feminism, notably radical feminism and liberal feminism, because of their universalization of women's experiences.[99] Post-colonial feminists argue that cultures impacted by colonialism are often vastly different and should be treated as such. Colonial

oppression may result in the "glorification of pre-colonial culture," which, in cultures with traditions of power stratification along gender lines, specifically cultures with patriarchal tribal systems, could mean the acceptance of, or refusal to deal with, inherent issues of gender inequality.[100]

Ipshita Chanda illustrates the necessary "retooling" required of Western feminism if it is to prove liberating for "Third World" women.[101] The article exhaustively compares Indian and African women's movements, and argues that modern Indian and African women are themselves the products of colonial power relations, and their "contemporary disempowerment" is in most cases the result of the patriarchal systems invented by colonial rulers to facilitate their power.[102] Chandra poses the question, "Who then can recommend that Western feminist theories and tactics are capable of undoing these relations, and what of the precolonial relations these undoings imply?"[103] She argues we are then faced with a "'back to the future'" scenario in which matriarchal traditions, or equitable male-dominated domestic traditions, are "so far lost as to be unrecoverable," and the only way to reestablish women's power is by" reforming toward an uncertain future with no proven guides."[104] She contends, then, that the global promises of feminist equality confront the practical concerns of specific situations. Since women are not repressed by all patriarchies in quite the same way, women's paths to freedom must everywhere be different.

This post-colonial lens contextualizes Zille's rhetorical acts, and combined with White's theory of exigential flow and Charland's constitutive rhetoric allows for a complex and varied understanding of Zille's rhetorical strategies. Exigential flow creates a space for a broader view of Zille's rhetorical situation, as opposed to an analysis of one

rhetorical situation in a given context, which is particularly useful in light of South Africa's long and multifaceted history. A post-colonial framework helps us understand the ways in which colonial discourses shaped South African political culture and maintained a hegemonic influence even after the establishment of an independent South African republic. Lastly, constitutive rhetoric explains the ways in which Zille's rhetoric attempts to constitute a new South African identity.

METHODOLOGY

Edwin Black wrote, "Criticism is a discipline that, through the investigation and appraisal of the activities of men, seeks as its end the understanding of man himself."[105] The critic, then, must try and choose the best possible method toward that end. White lays out three key questions that a researcher must ask him or herself: 1) What is the persuader's intentions? 2) How well does the basic "thrust" of what is said fit the potential for modifying the urgency? And 3) how well does the persuader select rhetorical options that match the readiness of the audience to be influenced? In order to answer these questions, I utilize the two theories described above—Eugene White's theory of exigential flow and Maurice Charland's theory of constitutive rhetoric—as well as a post-colonial understanding of the South African mindset.

Post-colonial theory contextualizes Zille's rhetorical acts. How South Africans understand themselves is heavily influenced by their experience as post-colonial subjects, and in order to understand the constraints facing Zille, scholars need to acknowledge the affects of post-colonialism on the audience. This understanding is key when analyzing how Zille uses constitutive rhetoric to try and create a "new" South African audience, one not constrained by race, class and gender.[106] In addition, I employ White's theory of

exigential flow for a more global understanding of Zille's rhetorical strategies over time. Exigential flow shows how Zille responds to modifications of the exigent as she moves through her campaign and how her rhetorical strategies change (or do not change) in response to modified exigencies.

For this study, I analyzed a series of rhetorical objects that provide a global understanding of Zille's rhetorical strategies. The texts chosen illuminate the multiple avenues of persuasion open to political candidates, and the time frame is long enough to include the changes in Zille's rhetorical strategies as they evolved over time. The study focuses on three rhetorical forms and five specific texts; two speeches delivered by Zille on May 6, 2009 and April 27, 2010, Zille's Facebook page, and 2 radio interviews given by Zille on March 10, 2010 and January 1, 2011. The first speech was delivered on May 6, 2009, as Zille officially accepted the post of Premier of the Western Cape and laid out her agenda for the coming term. The second speech was given at the Constitutional Court in Johannesburg on April 27, 2010, part of the party's Freedom Day celebrations. The Facebook analysis assesses Zille's page from its creation on May 16, 2008 to March 26, 2011. The radio interviews were both given on "black" radio stations and focus on the political policies of the DA.[107]

I chose my texts with three criteria in mind. First, I looked for texts that were aimed at multiple audiences—specifically audiences with various economic statuses, education levels, and different races and gender. By analyzing a range of rhetorical objects I was be able to gain insight into Zille's strategies of audience analysis and the similarities and differences that emerge from her discourse. Another benefit to looking at

an assortment of texts is the ability to get more complete picture of Zille's repertoire of rhetorical tactics.

The second criterion was the mode of delivery and accessibility. I selected texts that were delivered to a wide range of the public, and were easily accessible to a diverse audience. Economics plays an essential role in Zille's rhetorical strategies. South Africa is a country with a population that largely resides below the poverty line, and it is critical for Zille to reach the poor majority. Simultaneously, however, Zille needs to appeal to the richer population of South Africa, a critical segment that provides the monetary backing for her campaign and is the backbone of South Africa's economy. The speeches reached the widest range of economic diversity. Transcripts are available online, but also appear in local newspapers and are broadcast multiple times on the day of the speech. Though the majority of poor South Africans have limited access to the Internet, televisions and radios are comparatively cheap and can be easily accessed in public venues such as bars, restaurants, grocery stores and coffee shops. Internet access clearly is less accessible to the poorest of the poor but caters to her wealthier audiences—those who will be funding her campaign and are critical to her ability to reach out to her poorer audiences through physical appearances in townships or paper campaign literature. Zille must strike a balance between the poor voters that make up the majority and the rich voters who will financially support her campaign.

The last criterion was to look for a variety of texts that spanned a specific time frame, that of the first year and half of Zille's tenure as Premier of the Western Cape. A spectrum of texts is necessary to evaluate the long-term rhetorical strategy of Zille, to

identify the similarities and differences among platforms and audiences and understand how Zille works rhetorically to control and modify the flow of the controlling urgency.

In order to facilitate the broad goal laid out in the beginning of this chapter, to study the complex and varied rhetorical strategies employed by Helen Zille, I looked for common themes that appeared across the multiple texts. In order to identify the key narratives that emerged, this study adapted Robert L. Ivie's five steps for identifying key themes in a speech.[108] The five steps are 1) familiarize yourself with the text and context of the speeches; 2) do a close reading of the selected text; 3) identify major themes as they present themselves in the text; 4) cluster the themes and name the categories, and 5) analyze the clusters for rhetorical significance. By identifying themes within a single text I can then compare those themes to the different themes uncovered in other texts. I employ Ivie's method of clustering analysis to uncover the ways in which Zille responds to the exigencies of a post-colonial world, how she employs constitutive rhetoric to create a new South African identity and to discover the rhetorical themes across platforms.

OVERVIEW OF CHAPTERS

In the last section of this chapter, I outline each subsequent chapter of this thesis project. To begin with, chapter one has introduced the research topic, presented the theories to be used in my analysis of Zille's rhetorical strategies, presented a justification for this research, explained the critical method to be employed and discussed the artifacts to be examined. Chapter two focuses on the post-colonial lens and the context in which Zille's rhetoric is operating. I discuss the speaker's background, outline the historical context within which Zille is acting, and summarize the present political situation. Chapter three consists of an analysis of Zille's speeches. Chapter four contrasts the

arguments and strategies employed in Zille's Facebook page and in two the radio interviews. Lastly, chapter five concludes the project. Within the conclusion, I summarize and discuss my project's major findings, the project's limitations and indicate areas for future research.

The rhetoric of women like Zille has remained a largely unexplored avenue of study in the field of communication studies. As previously discussed, the broad goals of this work are threefold: first I hope to gain a deeper understanding of how women in developing nations impact and shape the political landscape through their rhetorical effort by examining the situation of a specific figure.[109] I believe this case study offers important insight into the rhetoric of women leaders acting in the context of a developing, post-colonial nation. Second, this work will examine how constitutive rhetoric functions in South Africa's complex political landscape to create a new South African identity, and thirdly, this project responds to the need for more scholarship that examines rhetoric in non-U.S. contexts.[110]

Notes

[1]Adrian Guelke, "South Africa: The Long View on Political Transition," *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 15 (2009): p. 417–435.

[2] Bernard Crick, "The High Price of Peace," in *The Elusive Search for Peace: South Africa, Israel and Northern Ireland* (Cape Town: Oxford University Press, 1990): p. 265.

[3] Guelke, "Long View," p. 418.

[4] See for example, Patti Waldmeir, *The Anatomy of a Miracle: The End of Apartheid and the Birth of the New South Africa* (London: Viking, 1997).

[5] Baker, Bruce, "Can Democracy in Africa Be Sustained," *Commonwealth & Comparative Politics* 38 (2000): p. 9-34.

[6] Baker, "Democracy in Africa," p. 10.

[7] Baker, "Democracy in Africa," p. 15.

[8] Baker, "Democracy in Africa," p. 16.

[9] Georg Sorensen, *Democracy and Democratization* (Boulder, Westview Press, 1993): p. 41.

[10] Robert Schrire, "The Realities of Opposition in South Africa: Legitimacy, Strategies and Consequences," *Democratization* 8 (2001): p. 135-148.

[11] Schrire, "Realities of Opposition," p. 137.

[12] Schrire, "Realities of Opposition," p. 137.

[13] Ron Ottoway in Baker, "Democracy in Africa," p. 20.

[14] Robert Mattes and Jessica Piomba, "Opposition Parties and the Voters in South Africa's 1999 Election," *Democratization* 8 (2001): p. 46-120.

[15] Schrire, "Realities of Opposition," p. 137.

[16] Mattes and Piomba, "Opposition," p. 58.

[17] Schrire, "Realities of Opposition," p. 148.

[18] Baker, "Democracy in Africa," p. 16.

[19] Baker, "Democracy in Africa," p. 9.

[20] Bear in mind that the DA won through a series of coalitions with other, smaller political groups.

[21] General Elections in the Republic of South Africa, *2009 Election Results*, http://electionresources.org/za/ (accessed October 7, 2010).

[22] General Elections in the Republic of South Africa.

[23] Gaye Davis, "DA Plans to Rule SA From 2014." *IOL News,* November 11, 2008 http://www.iol.co.za/news/politics/da-plans-to-rule-sa-from-2014-1.423754, (accessed October 7, 2010).

[24] Davis, "DA Plans."

[25] See Karlyn Kohrs Campbell, "Stanton's 'The Solitude of Self': A Rationale for Feminism." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 66 (1980): p. 304-312; Karlyn Kohrs Campbell, "The Rhetoric of Women's Liberation: An Oxymoron," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 59 (1973): p. 74-86; Bonnie Dow and Mari Boor Tonn, "Feminine Style and Political Judgment in the Rhetoric of Ann Richards," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 79 (1993): p. 286-302; Phyllis Japp, "Esther or Isaiah?: The Abolitionist-Feminist Rhetoric of Angelina Grimke," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 71 (1985): p. 335-48; Diane Helene Miller, "From

One Voice a Chorus: Elizabeth Cady Stanton's 1860 Address to the New York Legislature," *Women's Studies in Communication* 22 (1999): p.152-189; Barbara Mae Gayle and Cindy Griffin, "Mary Ashton Rice Livermore's Relational Feminist Discourse: A Rhetorically Successful Feminist Model," *Women's Studies in Communication* 21 (1998): p. 55-76; Susan Schultz Huxman "Perfecting the Rhetorical Vision of Woman's Rights: Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Anna Howard Shaw, and Carrie Chapman Catt," *Women's Studies in Communication* 23 (2000): p. 307-336; Karrin Vasby Anderson, "Hillary Rodham Clinton as 'Madonna': The Role of Metaphor and Oxymoron in Image Restoration," *Women's Studies in Communication* 25 (2002): p. 1-24; Suzanne Daughton, "The Fine Texture of Enactment: Iconicity as Empowerment in Angelina Grimke's Pennsylvania Hall Address," *Women's Studies in Communication* 18 (1995): p. 19-44.

[26] Chandra Mohanty, Ann Russo, and Lourdes Torres, *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991); Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, "Can the Subaltern Speak?" in *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. Eds. Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1988): p. 271-313.

[27] Eugene E. White, *The Context of Human Discourse: A Configurational Criticism of Rhetoric* (Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press, 1992): p. 13.

[28] White, *Context of Human Discourse*, p. 105.

[29] White, *The Context of Human Discourse,* 14.

[30] White uses urgency and exigent interchangeably. He defines a rhetorical urgency as "A situation that exists that can or should be modified by communication," p. 35, though he argues that an urgency differs subtly from Bitzer's definition of an exigence. He asserts that "this tension evoking gesture is not necessarily 'an imperfection . . . a defect, an obstacle, something to be corrected" . . . On the contrary, the juncture may even represent a joyous state of affairs." p. 291.

[31] White, *Context of Human Discourse*, p. 34.

[32] White, *Context of Human Discourse*, p. 34.

[33] White, *Context of Human Discourse*, p. 60; Sauter, Kevin, "Overcoming the Fractious Convention: Humphrey's Civil Rights Address before the 1948 Democratic National Convention." Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, 1994.

[34] White, *Context of Human Discourse*, p. 34.

[35] White, *Context of Human Discourse*, p. 34.

[36] White, *Context of Human Discourse*, p. 34.

[37] Though Bitzer does acknowledge there are enduring and changing exigencies, White builds on that and goes into much more detail on how a rhetorician would analyze that phenomena.

[38] White, *Context of Human Discourse*, p. 35.

[39] White, *Context of Human Discourse*, p. 105.

[40] White, *Context of Human Discourse*, p. 106.

[41] White, *Context of Human Discourse*, p. 35.

[42] White, *Context of Human Discourse*, p. 37.

[43] White, *Context of Human Discourse*, p. 35.

[44] Though Bitzer talks at length about constraints, he does not really touch on satisfactions beyond saying a rhetor must work within constraints, that is have a "fitting" response. White believes that to understand a situation, a scholar must look closely at the satisfactions used by the rhetor, that is, "How well does the persuader(s) select rhetorical options that match the readiness of readers/listeners to be influenced?" (White, p. 42).

[45] White, *Context of Human Discourse*, p. 38.

[46] The key difference here between Bitzer and White is point six; "The persuader's real and apparent purposes in communicating," (p. 43). White believes that in order to understand any communicative situation you must first ask what the persuader's intentions were. He argues that you cannot make a realistic assessment of how well a persuader meets the constraints without making assumptions about what the rhetor is after. This is not easy to do from historical documents or third person perspective, but it can be done, and with interviews (which will be conducted for the project) a scholar can make deeper connections between constraints and satisfactions.

[47] White, *Context of Human Discourse*, p. 39.

[48] White, *Context of Human Discourse*, p. 39.

[49] White, *Context of Human Discourse*, p. 40.

[50] White, *Context of Human Discourse*, p. 40. This is a direct quote of White paraphrasing Aristotle, but he did not provide a citation to show where he got this.

[51] White, *Context of Human Discourse*, p. 43.

[52] Maurice Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric: The Case of the *Peuple Quebecois,"* *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 73 (May 1987): p. 133.

[53] Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric," p. 133.

[54] Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric," p. 134.

[55] Kenneth Burke, *Language as Symbolic Action: Essays on Life, Literature, and Methods* (Berkley: University of California Press, 1966); Kenneth Burke, *A Rhetoric of Motives* (1950; rpt, Berkley: University of California Press, 1969).

[56] Burke, in Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric," p. 134.

[57] Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric," p. 134.

[58] Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric," p. 134.

[59] Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric," p. 137.

[60] Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric," p. 137.

[61] Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric," p. 138.

[62] Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric," p. 138.

[63] Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric," p. 138.

[64] Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric," p. 138.

[65] Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric," p. 138-140

[66] Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric," p. 139.

[67] Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric," p. 139.

[68] Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric," p. 139.

[69] Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric," p. 140.

[70] Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric," p. 140.

[71] Burke, "A Rhetoric of Motives," p. 2.

[72] Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric," p. 140.

[73] Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric," p. 140.

[74] Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric," p. 140.

[75] Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric," p. 140.

[76] Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric," p. 141.

[77] Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric," p. 143.

[78] Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric," p. 148.

[79] Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric," p. 148.

[80] Roger Beck, *The History of South Africa* (Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 2000).

[81] Nigel Worden, *The Making of Modern South Africa*, 4th Ed. (Boston: Blackwell Publishing, 2007).

[82] Worden, *Modern South Africa,* p. 12.

[83] Worden, *Modern South Africa,* p. 12.

[84] Worden, *Modern South Africa,* p. 13.

[85] John Allen, *Apartheid South Africa: An Insider's Overview of the Origin and Effects of Separate Development*, in Nigel Worden, *The Making of Modern South Africa*, 4th Ed. (Boston: Blackwell Publishing, 2007): p. 15.

[86] Beck, *History of South Africa,* p. 28.

[87] Government Information of South Africa, "Constitution of the Republic of South Africa Act 200 of 1993," http://www.info.gov.za/documents/constitution /93cons.htm (accessed September 14, 2010).

[88] Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Giffiths, and Helen Tiffin, *The Empire Writes Back* 2nd ed. (New York: Routledge, 2002): p. 1.

[89] Deepika Bahri and Mary Vasudeva, "Pedagogical Alternatives: Issues in Post-Colonial Studies: An Interview with Gauri Viswanathan," Eds. Deepika Bahri and Mary Vasudeva, *Between the Lines: South Asians and Postcoloniality* (Philedelphia: Tempe University Press, 1996): p. 35-54

[90] Deepika Bahri, "Once More with Feeling: What Is Postcolonialism?" *Ariel* 26 (1995): p. 53.

[91] Dictionary of Human Geography. Blackwell Publishing (2007): p. 561.

[92] Ashcroft, Giffiths, and Tiffin, *Empire Writes Back*, p. 2-3.

[93] Ashcroft, Giffiths, and Tiffin, *Empire Writes Back*, p. 219.

[94] Ashcroft, Giffiths, and Tiffin, *Empire Writes Back*, p. 219.

[95] Ashcroft, Giffiths, and Tiffin, *Empire Writes Back*, p. 219.

[96] See for example Kimberlé Crenshaw Williams, "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color," in Martha Albertson Fineman and Rixanne Mykitiuk, Eds. *The Public Nature of Private Violence* (New York: Routledge, 1994): p. 93-118; David Campbell, *Writing Security. United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity* (University of Minnesota Press, Revised Edition, 1998); Walker Connor, "Ethnology and the Peace of South Asia," *World Politics* 22 (1969): p. 51–86; Gad Barzilai, *Communities and Law: Politics and Cultures of Legal Identities* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2003); Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, "Can the Subaltern Speak?" in Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossbery, eds. *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture* (London: Macmillon, 1988).

[97] Bin 'Abd al-'Ali in Nazih Ayubi, *Overstating the Arab State* (Bodmin: I.B. Tauris & Co Ltd, 2001): p. 148.

[98]Sara Mills, "Postcolonial Feminist Theory," in Stevi Jackson and Jackie Jones, 2nd ed., *Contemporary Feminist Theories* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1998): p. 98–112.

[99]Mills, "Postcolonial Feminist Theory," p. 98.

[100]Andrew Greenwald, "Postcolonial Feminism in Anthills of the Savannah," *African Post-colonial Literature in English: In the Post-colonial Web*, http://www.postcolonialweb.org/achebe/greenwald3.html (accessed November 23, 2010).

[101] The term "third world" is a highly contested phrase, but many transnational feminists use it deliberately, preferring it to "postcolonial" or "developing countries." Chandra Talpade Mohanty, Ann Russo, Lourdes Torres in their book *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism* argue that the term "refers to the colonized, neocolonized, or decolonized countries (of Asia, Africa, and Latin America) whose economic and political structures have been deformed within the colonial process . . . Thus the term does not merely indicate a hierarchical cultural and economic relationship between 'first' and 'third' world countries; it intentionally foregrounds a history of colonization and contemporary relationships of structural dominance between first and third world peoples . . . The term is also a form of empowerment," (p. 23).

[102] Ipshita Chanda," Feminist Theory in Perspective," in *A Companion to Postcolonial Studies,* ed. Schwarz and Ray Sangeeta, (Boston: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2005): p. 486.

[103] Chanda," Feminist Theory in Perspective," p. 486.

[104] Chanda," Feminist Theory in Perspective," p. 486.

[105] Edwin Black, *Rhetorical Criticism: A Study in Method* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1965): p. 9.

[106] There are some similarities between social movement theory and Charland, however, since I am not studying a social movement, per se, but am instead examining how one rhetorician (who does not fit the general criteria of a "social movement leader") works to constitute a particular South African identity, Charland provides a unique framework from which to study Zille that social movement theory does not.

[107] Helen Zille, *Overcoming the Political Paradox of Our Times,* Weekly e-Newsletter, May 28, 2010, (accessed November 25, 2010).

[108] Robert L. Ivie, "Metaphor and the Rhetorical Invention of Cold War 'Idealists,'" *Communication Monographs* 54 (1987): p. 165-182; Robert L. Ivie, "Metaphor and Motive in the Johnson Administration's Vietnam War Rhetoric," in *Texts in Context: Critical Dialogues on Significant Episodes in American Political Rhetoric*, ed. Michael Leff and Fred Kauffeld (Davis, CA: Hermagoras Press, 1989): p. 121-141; Robert L. Ivie, "A New Cold War Parable in the Post-Cold War Press," *Deadline* 5 (1990): p. 1-9; Robert L. Ivie, "Commentary: The Metaphor of Force in Prowar Discourse," *Critical Questions: Invention, Creativity, and the Criticism of Discourse and Media*, ed. William L. Nothstine, Carole Blair, and Gary A. Copland (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994): p. 259-263.

[109] This contribution subscribes to a more instrumental understanding of rhetoric than what Charland is strictly interested in, but it is a minor wrinkle in the theory.

[110] Chandra Mohanty, Ann Russo, and Lourdes Torres, *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991); Gayatri

Chakravorty Spivak, "Can the Subaltern Speak?" *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. Eds. Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1988): p. 271-313.

CHAPTER 2: BIOGRAPHICAL AND HISTORICAL FRAMEWORK

Public address does not operate within a vacuum, but is situated within a specific social and political location. In *The Practice of Rhetorical Criticism*, James Andrews contends that the criticism of discourse must be based upon a full understanding of the meaning of the events from which the discourse arose.[111] It follows, then, that the critic's job is to determine the nature and the context of the setting in which the speaker performs. Scholars of rhetoric understand that "the responsibility of critical appraisal depends heavily on the critic's ability to understand the historical trends, the motivating forces, [and] the immediate occasion . . ."[112] The context and historical background of any text provides a framework in which contemporary developments can be analyzed and assessed. As historians Glenn Moss and Ingrid Obery write, "The present and the future do not spring, fully grown, from nowhere. They are formed and structured in the crucible of the past, and carry with them all the marks and burdens of history."[113]

In addition to an in-depth understanding of the historical framework, critics should have an in-depth understanding of the orator. Rhetorical criticism can provide insight into various forms of discourse, but it can also provide the critic with illumination about the ways a speaker thinks and interprets the world around them. Andrews

concludes that "Rhetorical criticism can thus contribute much to biographical study since it uncovers the rhetor's ideas in action as he or she seeks to persuade those over whom that speaker would exert influence."[114] Therefore, just as it is important to have an understanding of the meaning of historical trends, motivating forces, and immediate occasion, it is also important to know the orator's background. This chapter provides a brief biography of Helen Zille and a narrative of the major events that have shaped South Africa's political and social present from which the rhetorical acts emerged and illuminates the post-colonial situation in which these rhetorical acts are engaged.

ZILLE'S BIOGRAPHY

Zille began her life in the public as a political journalist for the *Rand Daily Mail*, South Africa's leading liberal newspaper during apartheid, and became famous for exposing the death of anti-Apartheid activist Steven Biko in 1977.[115] His death was claimed to have been "a result of self-inflicted wounds" but in reality was a consequence of torture by the police.[116] Zille was also a member of the Black Sash white women's resistance movement and a vigorous peace activist in her hometown of Cape Town.

The Black Sash was a non-violent white women's resistance organization founded in 1955 in South Africa by Jean Sinclair. The Black Sash initially campaigned against the removal of Colored or mixed race voters from the voters' roll in the Cape Province by the National Party government. As the apartheid system began to reach into every aspect of South African life, Black Sash members demonstrated against the Pass Laws and the introduction of other apartheid legislation. The National Director of the Black Sash, Marcella Naidoo, characterized the organization as using the "relative safety of their privileged racial classification to speak out against the erosion of human rights in the

country."[117] She went on to say, "Their striking black sashes were worn as a mark of mourning and to protest against the succession of unjust laws. But they were not only on the streets. Volunteers spent many hours in the national network of advice offices and in the monitoring of courts and pass offices."[118]

Between 1955 and 1994, the Black Sash provided widespread and visible proof of white resistance towards the apartheid system. Its members worked as volunteer advocates to families affected by apartheid laws, held regular street demonstrations, spoke at political meetings, brought cases of injustice to the attention of their Members of Parliament, and kept vigils outside Parliament and government offices. Many members were vilified within their local white communities, and it was not unusual for women wearing the black sash to be physically attacked by supporters of apartheid.[119]

After her time as a journalist Zille began to work for the University of Cape town as Director of Communication and a policy consultant.[120] She re-entered public life in 1999 when she joined the liberal Democratic Party, which became the Democratic Alliance in 2000, and was elected as a member of the Western Cape provincial legislature in 1999. She served as executive council member (MEC) for education until 2001 and then as leader of the opposition before being elected as an MP to the South African Parliament in 2004, also in Cape Town.[121] Part of her success is due to her fluency in English, Afrikaner and Xhosa, which has allowed her to cultivate a broad range of support, from white Afrikaners to residents of the black townships around Cape Town.[122]

In March 2006 Zille was elected mayor of Cape Town and resigned from Parliament. According to the BBC, "Her position as mayor was fiercely contested by the governing African National Congress (ANC) and elevated her status, making her one of

the Democratic Alliance's most high-profile figures" and in May of 2007 she became the leader of the Democratic Alliance (DA).[123] The DA is a fairly new party in post-Apartheid South Africa, but has its roots in earlier liberal, multi-racial parties, most notably the Progressive Party of Helen Suzman. Throughout apartheid the Progressive Party was the "principal opposition" movement within Parliament.[124] During the late 1990's the DA was formed from the alliance of several smaller parties and has since become the official opposition party to the ruling ANC party.

In 2009, Zille led the efforts of the DA to try and dent the "perpetual dominance" of the ANC in South African politics. Though the ANC remained in power nationally, the DA won 16.6% of the seats in the National Assembly and, more significantly, Zille was able to unseat the ANC-led provincial administration to become Premier of the Western Cape, which is South Africa's richest province and the heart of their wine, cheese and fruit trade.[125] Much of her success is credited to her time as Mayor of Cape Town, which is the only major city not governed by the ANC. Because of the close margins in the city elections in 2006, Zille and the ANC, in both the city council and the provincial legislature, started off with a strained relationship. Cape Town has seen a steady succession of discredited ANC mayors and interim leaders on account of predecessors caught up in corruption and Internet porn scandals. Zille, in contrast, has won accolades from the community for her work. Her aggressive anti-drug policies actually led to her arrest in 2007 on charges of "participating in an illegal gathering,"[126] though the charges were later dropped and she "issued her own action for wrongful arrest."[127]Another high-profile incident was her vocal opposition to the disbanding of the anti-corruption Scorpions unit, and her accusations of corruption within the South African police force.

These incidents were widely touted as evidence of her devotion to the people, and in 2008 she won the World Mayor award by City Mayors, an international think-tank.[128]

COLONIZATION AND APARTHEID: A BRIEF HISTORY

The single most significant factor distinguishing South Africa from other African countries is its particular experience of colonialism and apartheid. European colonization began in the 17th century with Dutch and Huguenot settlement in the Cape. Initially, the impact of white settlement was mainly limited to the Cape but grew as the Dutch speaking Boers, also called the Voortrekkers, moved north to escape British rule.[129] With the expansion of white settlement north and east, plus the arrival of British settlers in Xhosaland and Natal as an outgrowth of British imperialism, pressure on Bantu-speaking African groups became increasingly intense. The most direct aspect of this pressure was the dispossession of land by whites, through which African farmers were forced either to retreat to other areas, or to become sharecroppers or farm laborers. While African agriculture continued to thrive for a time and, indeed, posed a highly resented source of direct competition to white farmers, it was gradually reduced by further land conquests, as well as efforts to curb sharecropping.[130]

In the latter half of the 19th century, the discovery first of diamonds and then of gold led to a rapidly growing demand for black mine workers. Various white governments introduced laws and policies to facilitate the supply of this labor. The Natives Land Act dating from 1913, in particular, formalized the distinction between the African reserves and white farming areas, prohibiting Africans from acquiring, owning, and renting land in the latter. This had the effect of limiting their economic options so severely as to compel many to sell their labor to the mines and white farms.[131] Around

the same time, there were some 180,000 African mineworkers in the country, of whom around half were from South Africa, and half from Lesotho, Swaziland, Mozambique and elsewhere.[132]

Control of Africans' mobility remained a high priority for the government through most of the 20th century. The government sought to balance the "legitimate" demand for African workers for mines and unskilled and semi-skilled work in urban areas with the desire to keep white settlements insulated from "surplus" Africans.[133] Since at least the late 19th century, a pattern emerged whereby Africans and coloreds were relegated to townships adjacent to white towns, not only to separate the "slumyards" from white residential areas, but just as importantly to segregate the black poor from the white poor.[134] The Natives (Urban Areas) Act of 1923 formalized the powers of local authorities to demarcate urban settlements according to race. In 1950, H.F. Verwoerd, who was then Minister of Native Affairs but later to become Prime Minister, introduced the Urban Labor Preference Policy, signaling the intentions of the ascendant National Party both to continue and to fortify the discriminatory system of labor and pass controls.[135] Among the more destructive effects of the system was to force many families to be split for long periods, with men working in the mines or in the cities, and women remaining in the rural reserves. Meanwhile, conditions in the reserves deteriorated as ever more people were forced to settle there. During 1955–69, population density in the reserves increased from 60 to 110 persons per square mile.[136] Effectively, many households in so-called rural areas were and remain landless, while many others were left with tiny amounts of land.

The logical conclusion of this process came in the 1960s and 1970s, when the apartheid government "elevated" the status of the African reserves to ten putatively self-governing homelands, some of which were declared independent states. These homelands were thus set up with their own assemblies, government departments, rights to confer citizenship, etc. The idea of "separate development" was that they would also have their own economies. But, given that these reserves comprised only 13% of the country's land area, were often geographically isolated, and had terrible infrastructure, this was not plausible.[137] Poorly conceptualized investments in agricultural irrigation schemes benefited mainly a few score white development experts and consulting firms.[138] The industrial decentralization policy made some inroads, but disintegrated once wage subsidies were removed after 1994. The main source of formal employment within the homelands was the public service itself.[139] As a result, the homelands had virtually no tax base, and so had to rely almost entirely on transfers from the apartheid government. Poor healthcare services and vastly inferior "Bantu education" were among the consequences. Because of the dearth of meaningful income-earning opportunities within the homelands, the migrant labor system remained one of the most important survival strategies for African households, notwithstanding its high personal costs. In the early 1970s, 54% of all Africans lived outside of the homelands in the "white areas."[140]

The consequences of these historical developments are easy to observe. Based on a poverty line of R322 ($48 USD) per capita per month (the "lower-bound" poverty line) 33.2% of all households are below the poverty line, while 53.3% of households consumed less than the "upper-bound" poverty line (R593 per capita per month or $88 USD).[141] There is also a strong geographical dimension to the incidence of poverty.

Based on the same data set, 72% of those below the poverty line reside in rural areas, and 71% of all rural people are poor.[142] By most measures, the poorest provinces are those encompassing the most populous former homeland areas, namely KwaZulu-Natal, Limpopo Province, and Eastern Cape. With regard to education, 22.3% of black Africans have received no schooling, 18.5% have had some primary school, 6.9% have completed only primary school, 30.4% have had some high school education, 16.8% have finished only high school, and only 5.2% of the black population has an education higher than the high school level. Overall, 22.0% of black Africans have completed high school.[143] Unemployment is at and all time high at 23.5%, the majority of the unemployed being black Africans.[144]

WOMEN IN SOUTH AFRICAN POLITICS

What makes Helen Zille such an important figure is that her rise to power is an unprecedented phenomenon in South African politics, especially in the DA, which unlike the ruling ANC, does not have political party quotas for women. Though women were a critical part of the resistance movement it wasn't until the early 1990s that women were placed in positions of leadership. To understand the impact of Zille and the progress of women in general in South Africa one must understand the past of women in South Africa.

When talking about women in South Africa there are four distinct groups of women within the country, each with their own unique struggles. White English-speaking women, Afrikaner women, colored women and black women each faced very different challenges before, during and after Apartheid. [145] Feminist scholars Beth Goldblatt and Sheila Meintjes argue that colonialism, and later apartheid, relied on both racial and

gender hierarchies: "Patriarchy was embedded within the social fabric of Apartheid in particular ways and meant that women and men from different racial, class and cultural backgrounds experienced life very differently."[146] Though there were undoubtedly strict gender roles before colonialism these patterns were "heightened, deepened and ingrained to ensure white male power, especially within the South African context."[147] Academic Hanna Britton contends that colonial conquest was "both a violent and a gendered process, which exploited preexisting social divisions within African culture" and led to "an increased vulnerability of African women."[148]

Somewhat ironically, it was actually during apartheid that women, particularly black women, began to increase their power in both the home and in their communities. As discussed before, during this time black South Africans were forced onto small, barren land reserves. Because of the poor quality of the land black men were forced to go into cities and towns to look for work, leaving a disproportionately large number of women and children in rural areas.[149] The result has had broad and long-lasting effects for the black women of South Africa. Women had less access to economic opportunities, jobs, basic education, healthcare, and ultimately had less control over their basic reproduction functions due to lack of birth control and the use of rape and violence as a way to intimidate and silence women's protests. In addition they also had to take on all the roles they had to traditionally share with men. According to Winnie Mandela this was the central reason black women became politically active before white women did. She explained, "When they removed our husbands and our fathers from the rural areas to work in the mines . . . the Black woman found herself acting as head of her family. As well as raising her family, she had to look after the cattle and till the land. So it has not

required any special transformation for women in the urban areas to be in the forefront of a struggle."[150] Indeed, according to Hilda Bernstein, a South African activist and founder of the Federation of South African Women, the black women of South Africa "emerged as primary catalysts for protest and challengers of the Apartheid regime."[151]

What is so unique about black women in South Africa, and indeed in much of Africa at large, is the connection made between women's power and women's roles as mothers and leaders of the household. As black women, and eventually colored women, began to occupy more and more areas of political activism such as in labor unions and political parties, they did not eschew their traditional roles, rather they "preserved and often drew strength from their domestic lives and maternal identities."[152] Motherhood was actually a mobilizing force that led to support for radical political change and, occasionally, support for "revolutionary violence" in South Africa.[153] They did this however, in an unusual fashion. Their tactics were highly militant, very aggressive and nontraditional – what some called "conservative militancy."[154]

White women, both English-speaking and Afrikaner, and colored women, on the other hand, were much less active. The apartheid system, while deeply gendered, still allowed for a level of privilege and comfort for these women that inhibited widespread involvement in the apartheid resistance movement. Afrikaner women were especially reluctant to involve themselves in the resistance.[155] While Afrikaner culture is highly patriarchal, Afrikaner women were seen to have a "complementary and equally significant role" in the preservation of Afrikaner language and culture. Men were tasked with preserving the Afrikaner way of life in the public, political and economic spheres of life while the women were "supposed to promote, preserve, and uplift" the Afrikaner

culture by "raising children and making a home for their families."[156] English-speaking

white women have traditionally enjoyed more freedom and choices than Afrikaner

women. It was English-speaking women who pushed for women's suffrage for nearly

three decades before it was won in 1930, and it was an English-speaking women named

Helen Suzman who led the Progressive Party, the precursor to the DA, which was one of

the most active white resistance groups in the 1970s and 1980s and became a rallying

point for the resistance.[157]

      Though women were active throughout apartheid, especially in the 1970s and

1980s, women were still "the soldiers on the ground, but the generals remained men."[158]

Women were certainly leaders in the struggle but were excluded from formal leadership

roles. Even up to the early 1990s women were excluded from any positions of power or

influence. As Lindiwe Zulu, an MP from the ANC, asserts "When the negotiation process

led by the ANC started in 1994, women were not involved – not because of unwillingness

on their part but because the negotiators had not thought it necessary to involve

women."[159] However, the process of democratization in Africa has traditionally allowed

women key opportunities to move into political office, where there is space open for new

ideas and movements. [160] As women struggled alongside their male counterparts during

apartheid they simultaneously developed a national gender that would ultimately lead to

constitutional protection and electoral success.[161] No longer did women focus solely on

women's rights for their particular race, they also began to re-conceptualize feminism

and women's rights as human rights that crossed racial lines.

      The collective voice of women had power during the transition to democracy

specifically because they had been vital members of the struggle and this power allowed

them to create a multiparty coalition focused on securing a place for gender equality in the national constitution and ensured the pursuit of affirmative action measures in the recruitment of women for national office. The involvement of women in the building of nations is one of the best ways to develop a successful democracy according to UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan: "Study after study has shown that there is no effective development strategy in which women do not play a central role . . . When women are fully involved the benefits are immediate, families are healthier and better fed and their income, savings and investments go up. And what is true of families is also true of communities and, in the long run, of whole countries."[162]

As a result, women in South Africa have a much more powerful voice than most women in African countries. South Africa ranks fourth out of fifty-three African countries for its record on women's rights, and in the World Economic forum's "gender gap index" it comes in sixth out of 134 countries in the world.[163] According to the *Economist,* "On paper, South Africa has one of the world's most impressive legal arsenals for protecting women's rights."[164] In the "founding provisions" of South Africa's 1996 constitution, sexism was given equal weight as racism. The ANC has introduced a large number of new laws in the past sixteen years to try and promote women's rights in a country that has historically been overwhelmingly patriarchal.[165]

However, the gap between principal and practice is often wide. In some arenas, particularly politics, women do very well. Women hold 44% of parliamentary seats (the third highest proportion in the world), 41% of cabinet posts, including defense, agriculture, foreign affairs, mining, science and technology and home affairs. In other areas, however, women's progress has been slower. More than a decade after the passage

of the Employment Equity Act, which requires companies with over 50 people to hire and promote women (as well as blacks and the disabled) in proportion to their representation in the population as a whole (52%), white men still dominate senior management and company boards in both the public and private sectors.[166] The Women's Business Association says that a fifth of the country's private-sector boards have no women (and that only 10% of chief executives and board chairpersons are women).[167] Universities, where more than half of undergraduates are now female, have done more, with women now accounting for 45% of academic staff. About a quarter of judges are female.[168]

Although women make up nearly half the labor force, most are in lower-wage sectors, particularly domestic service. Women are also more likely to be unemployed and to head the poorest households. The introduction of a child-support grant for children up to the age of 15, recently raised to 18, has helped, but it amounts to only 250 rand ($36) a child each month.[169] It is in the home, particularly in black ones, where women continue to struggle the most against gender discrimination. Men continue to dominate as head of the household, oftentimes imposing their authority with drug- or alcohol-fuelled brutality. In its latest world report, Human Rights Watch, a New York-based lobby, describes the level of physical and sexual violence against South African women as "shockingly high."[170] South Africa has one of the highest incidences of reported rape in the world. In a study by the World Health Organization, 40% of South African women claimed that their first experience of sex was non-consensual.[171]

The founder of a new women's-rights lobby called the Sonke Gender Justice Network–led by a black man—says "his biggest challenge is to convince men that

abusing women is culturally unacceptable."[172] Violence is often seen as a normal part of male-female relations. According to recent research by the Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation, a Johannesburg-based group, most black women believe a man has a right to have sex with his wife or partner whenever he wants. Another study showed that most black teenagers felt it is fine to force sex on a girl if you know her or if she accepts a drink from you.[173]

Traditional customs are also difficult to undo, especially when role modeled by authority figures. President Jacob Zuma has at least twenty-one children by at least ten different women, four of whom he married; he is now engaged to another, who is pregnant.[174] In certain rural areas women are still expected to walk a few paces behind their husbands. In KwaZulu-Natal "thousands of bare-breasted maidens display their virginal beauty in a dance before the polygamous Zulu king, Goodwill Zwelithini."[175] In villages in the eastern Cape teenage girls continue to be forced into marriages with older men who treat them as virtual slaves. Women who do not fit into the community are still sometimes burned as witches. Lesbians are gang-raped to "cure" them of their abnormality.[176] The situation for women in South Africa is complex, and without an understanding of their unique situation, there can be no wholesale understanding of any communicative phenomena in the country.

Zille's gender has certainly been an issue in her political career. In May 2009, shortly after being elected Premier, Zille wrote a letter to the Cape Argus newspaper that was accidentally copied by her spokesperson to the left-wing Sowetan newspaper. Responding to criticism from gender lobby groups and the ANC over her all-male provincial cabinet, Zille stated in the letter that the ANC had never even been led by a

woman, and that its leaders set bad examples on gender issues. She cited South African

President Jacob Zuma's "deeply sexist views," accused him of being a "womanizer," and

condemned him for putting "all his wives at risk of contracting HIV" by having

unprotected sex with an HIV positive woman.[177] Zuma, a polygamist, admitted in his

rape trial that he had known that the woman with whom he had had sex was HIV

positive.[178]

Zille's condemnation of Zuma's behavior was then used by *The Sowetan* as the

basis of a front-page story entitled "Zuma an AIDS risk." The paper stated that Zille had

"launched an extraordinary new attack" on Zuma.[179] This began a wave of attacks on

Zille from both the ANC and a number of its left-wing alliance partners. The ANC Youth

League claimed Zille was racist, and that her all-male cabinet consisted of "boyfriends

and concubines so that she can continue to sleep around with them."[180] The Umkhonto

we Sizwe Military Veterans Association restated the Youth League's sex claims, and

warned it would launch "a political program aimed at rendering the Western Cape

ungovernable."[181] The ANC also criticized Zille, but distanced itself from the remarks of

its Youth League, stating that they were "deeply embarrassing."[182] In response, Zille

claimed that the dispute exemplified South Africa's warped approach to gender issues:

> The (male) gender commissioner has remained silent about the extreme sexism of
> the ANC Youth League and the Umkhonto we Sizwe War Veterans Association
> that both accused me of appointing men to my Cabinet in return for sexual
> favours. Contrast the commissioner's silence on this issue with his vocal threats to
> take me to court to impose quotas on the Western Cape Cabinet. His obsession
> with quotas is actually a useful diversion from the real issues that oppress women
> in South Africa. Have you ever heard the gender commissioner challenge the
> assumption, still held by millions of South African men, that multiple unprotected
> sexual encounters are their right? This is the worst manifestation of South African
> patriarchy, and it is encouraged by the behaviour of some leaders. It is also the
> main reason why we cannot bring the AIDS pandemic under control and why
> women bear the greatest burden of this disease. I will keep making these points no

matter how much outrage it elicits. Denial and political correctness are far easier than challenging deep-rooted cultural norms of sexual dominance that are the root cause of gender oppression.[183]

THE DEMOCRATIC ALLIANCE, THE AFRICAN NATIONAL CONGRESS, AND DIFFERING VISIONS OF SOUTH AFRICAN IDENTITY

The African National Congress (ANC) has been South Africa's governing left-wing political party, supported by its tripartite alliance with the Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU) and the South African Communist Party (SACP), since the establishment of non-racial democracy in April 1994. It defines itself as a "disciplined force of the left."[184] The most powerful party in the country, the ANC is the party of the people, thanks in large part to Nelson Mandela and the work of other ANC leaders during apartheid. In order to fully understand the challenges facing Zille and the DA in the present, the power of the ANC must be seen through its past.

The history of the ANC shows three key ideological influences feeding into the making and the complexity of the ANC: the first is that of the Christian liberal-democrats, a legacy of its founding rulers and later leaders such as Albert Luthuli and Oliver Tambo. The second key influence is the Africanists and their endorsement of a Black African-biased African nationalism. The third influence is that of the communists and their non-racialism and socialist economic ideals. Added to these influences is the ideological complexity the ANC's organizational structure, which also has three distinct elements: 1) an external mission based in Europe and Africa, 2) an internal movement grouped around the United Democratic Front (UDF) and Congress of South African Trade Unions (Cosastu), and 3) the Robben Island prison diaspora. All these complicated and competing factors shed light on the current internal factions within the ANC. They

explain its broad support base, which maintains its dominance and they provide insight into the ANC's current policies and actions.

The first of the three influences originates from its founders. In 1912, a group of black African men and women created the South African Native National Congress (SANNC), the beginning of what was to become the ANC. Its leadership consisted of a small group of black middle-class citizens including lawyers, doctors, journalists and landowners—those who stood to lose most from the post-Union political dispensation.[185] Its members were largely drawn from the *kholwa*, a Zulu word meaning Christian converts, who promoted Victorian values of moral progress, material advancement and personal respectability.[186] The ANC's founding leaders tended to be the product of the early Christian missionaries, who provided missionary schools such as Lovedale in the Ciskei and Adams College in Natal.[187] Unsurprisingly, the government did not provide education for black Africans so those who received an education did so at these missionary schools, an education in the "relatively liberal Western tradition."[188] The early ANC's call for inclusion in the South African body politic was as "citizens of a common, non-racial society," informed by Christian and liberal conceptions of justice and humanity.[189] The leadership was committed to "a method of opposition that emphasized responsible citizenship and spurned popular protest and demonstrations."[190] Rather, they were deeply committed to constitutionalism. Thus, the first tradition can be described as one of liberal-democracy based on Christian values.

In the 1920s the ANC became increasingly influenced by the ideals of pan-Africanism—an "Africa for Africans"—and communism. In 1921 the Communist Party of South Africa was created, and a relationship between them and the ANC formed in

1928 when the Communist Party adopted the call for 'an independent native republic' as its key objective.[191] The Communist Party was, initially, the only political organization in South Africa to recruit members from all racial groups as "the party adhered to the principle that 'working class unity transcended racial divisions'"[192] It was not a large party, but it was highly organized, its centralized structure drawn from the Leninist model.[193] This influence of communist and Africanist groupings within the ANC would have considerable long-term significance for the organization. The communists and Africanists situated themselves at polar ends of the ANC, the former emphasizing non-racialism and class solidarity, and the latter stressing African self-sufficiency and the pre-eminence of the racial struggle.[194] The Africanists were suspicious of communism, believing it merely served to hide another version of white paternalism: "Africans are a conquered race—they do not suffer class oppression—they are oppressed as a group, as a nation."[195] Nevertheless, at key periods, the two traditions would unite to produce a type of indigenous radicalism embodied in the idea of African socialism.

The 1940s saw the rise in pre-eminence of pan-Africanist consciousness, an influence that became evident in the ANC's 1943 seminal document African Claims. It differed significantly from previous ANC official discourse, as polite requests turned into demands, and it called for a future, which promoted a more interventionist state. The ANC Youth League was formed in 1943 with Anton Lembede as its key mover. Lembede's philosophies differed from those of his elders as they indicated a move towards revolutionary militancy and racial exclusivism: "Africa, the League declared, was 'a Black man's country.'"[196] In 1949, the ANC adopted the ANC Youth League's *Program of Action*, a document that served as a manifesto for campaigns of mass action

in the 1950s. The objective of the ANC, under the program, was defined as the achievement of national freedom, which meant "freedom from white domination and the attainment of political independence."[197] It committed the ANC to a campaign of boycotts, strikes and civil disobedience. However, although it was developing into a radical mass nationalist movement, the ANC was neither organizationally nor ideologically unified.

The South African Communist Party (SACP), a reconfigured Communist Party of South Africa, became a key influence in the development and ideology of the ANC during the 1960s as it began to play "a dominant role within MK [*Umkhonto we Sizwe* - the "Spear of the Nation"] and, through MK, the ANC itself."[198] When the ANC was banned in 1960, its structure as a mass organization made it difficult to move into underground activity; it thus became more reliant on the SACP. Gevisser writes, "The key effect of this influence was undoubtedly the move from non-violence into armed struggle."[199] As Ellis and Sechaba recognize, "the decision to build a guerrilla organization and to declare war on the government greatly increased the Party's weight in its alliance with the ANC."[200] Much of the essential material and military resources that the ANC received from Moscow were a result of the SACP's links. Communist members within the ANC were able to arrange for volunteers to travel to Eastern Europe, China and Africa for training and to acquire equipment.[201] The SACP also provided the ANC with "organizational discipline, revolutionary theory and ideological conviction."[202] Together with the party's contribution of intellectual and organizational competencies came the "entrenchment of authoritarian 'democratic-centralist' practices and attitudes."[203] Membership of the SACP was for "only a select few—a 'vanguard'

handpicked by the Party leadership," recruited through a highly secretive process.[204] Its democratic centralism allowed for tight control of members from the centre. It was an organization where "secrecy was more than a necessity—it was a cherished virtue and a mark of true revolutionary."[205] Although the SACP had been instrumental in the ANC's adoption of a non-racial outlook, it was nevertheless one of the last communist parties in the world to reject Stalinism.[206] In addition, it had already acknowledged, in 1927, that a 'black republic' was the first step to socialism; this led to the ANC-SACP alliance being based on a "two-stage theory of revolution: democracy first, socialism second."[207]

Besides the above three differing traditions influencing the composition, direction and policies of the ANC, a further significant watershed event would produce an additional three influences on the make-up of the organization—the 1964 Rivonia Trial. The ANC would practically cease to exist in South Africa, as its key leaders were either in jail on Robben Island or had been forced into exile. London became the centre of its external mission with forward bases established in African "frontline" states. During this period, Oliver Tambo's leadership style, which "combined pragmatism, collective leadership and deep Christian beliefs, provided an important source of strength, enabling the ANC to function as a broad coalition and to lay claim to the moral high ground."[208] As a result of the trial, three spheres of ANC activity began to feed into the composition and character of the organization: 1) those incarcerated on Robben Island, 2) those in exile, and 3) the internal domestic and labor struggle, led by organizations aligned with the ANC, namely the UDF and Cosatu.[209]

There were vast cultural and organizational differences between these various components of the ANC.[210] The Robben Islanders were hierarchically organized,

disciplined, but nevertheless fairly democratic within limitations. The Island was known as the "University" since emphasis was placed on political and theoretical learning; as a result they tended to be open to debate. Internally, the UDF and its affiliates mobilized a broad base of support against the apartheid regime, focusing on massive community mobilization in black areas while also including targeted initiatives in white suburbs. The UDF, founded in 1983, was an effort to coordinate internal opposition to apartheid, by a thousand delegates from all races, representing 575 organizations, including trade unions, sporting bodies, community groups and women's organizations.[211] It had a culture of openness, discussion and tolerance of alternative viewpoints and was non-racial and inclusive. The UDF endorsed the Freedom Charter and recognized the need for "unity in struggle through which all democrats, regardless of race, religion or color shall take part together."[212] By contrast, the exiles comprised different groupings, ranging from those in the camps in the frontline states to those in European capitals. As a result they tended to be hierarchically organized, "with information tightly guarded and decision making centralized . . . The vanguardist, democratic centralist aspects of the organization in exile betrayed Leninist roots, while an additional Stalinist dimension saw the party as paramount and loyalty as the crucial currency."[213]

Professor Ben Turok, veteran ANC MP, admits that "we currently live in a period of massive contradictions—contradictions between the aspirations of the ANC and the way we run the country . . . between our socialist views and our practise in government."[214] As Butler points out "the liberation movement's democratic tendencies coexist with democratic centralist and hierarchical conceptions of legitimate authority."[215] These internal inconsistencies culminated in the change of leadership at the

ANC's Polokwane Conference in 2007. It can be argued that the faces may be different, but the underlying world-views have not changed and as a result there are strong beliefs among the people that the ANC will be more open to criticism and debate, with fewer hierarchical decision-making procedures.

The DA is a much younger party, having formed from an alliance with the Nationalist Party (NP) and the Democratic Party (DP) in 2000. The NP was established in 1914 and has traditionally been an all-white party. The NP acted as the architects of apartheid and supported a *volksstaat*, or Afrikaner homeland. In 1990 the NP renounced apartheid and in 1994 won a surprising amount of votes from minorities: 49% white, 30% colored, 14% blacks, and 7% Asian. However, it quickly became apparent that the party held little long-term appeal and party leaders began to talk of a "united opposition party." The DP was founded in 1989, though its roots go back to the Progressive Party (PP), which was founded in 1959. The DP was already a mix of various white political parties and swiftly overtook the NP in terms of white voters. When the two parties merged, they first had to reconcile their greatly differing policies; the DP was considered very liberal, while the NP was characterized as technocratic. The current DA has largely managed to maintain the reputation of the DP, that of a liberal party, though it is considered to be broadly centrist. For example, their economic policy supports a mix of high spending on crucial social services such as education and health care, a basic income grant, and a strong regulatory framework, with more moderate policies such as a lower budget deficit and a deregulated labor market. They believe in limited government and "do not believe that a state, with limited capacity, should over-reach itself."[216]

In many ways DA and ANC policies are very similar; they both are founded in

basic liberal beliefs, they both support policies of non-racialism, and both believe in a strong unified South African state. The biggest difference lies in their differing views of the role of government. The DA, much like the Republican Party in the United States, believes in a very limited role for national government with an emphasis on local government and personal responsibility. The ANC, much like the Democratic Party in the United States, believes in a strong central government and social liberalism. The two parties are also divided along racial lines, though that seems to have more to do with the country's historical background and identity politics, rather than any true difference in political views. Zille faces the challenge of reaching out to black voters without alienating her largely white base. To accomplish this Zille is trying to position herself as the next phase in South African politics, a leader of a party, and hopefully a country, where race is no longer a motivating factor but rather where the focus is on government policies. The struggle she faces when trying to sell this vision to black voters is that without racial divisions being drawn, blacks lose the opportunity for redress in the form of affirmative action policies.

Apartheid social engineering was shot through with contradictions, uncertainties, irrationalities, and lapses of control. Yet the system endured for over four decades. This tenacity derived in large measure from the repressive might of the apartheid state. But it also had a lot to do with the systematic bureaucratization and normalization of race. With the advent of apartheid (which built on white supremacist foundations laid decades earlier), South Africa became one of the most thoroughly racialized social orders in the world and despite the end of apartheid and the repeal of legislation like the Popular Registration Act, the demarcation of South African society into whites, Indians, coloreds,

and Africans has been continued to be normalized—for many, a "fact" of life. Though there has been limited conversation on the topic of race as a hindrance to democracy in South Africa, it remains the norm for articles and letters in the press, reports on radio and television, and other modes of conversation and commentary to identify social actors in racialized terms, attesting to the lingering importance of these racial constructions within social consciousness. Paradoxically, one of the principal legal instruments for redressing the racial imbalances of the apartheid past—the Employment Equity Act (Act 55 of 1998)—reproduces the racial categories enacted in the Population Registration Act as the basis on which affirmative action is to be instituted and measured.[217] This legislation names "black people" as one of three "designated groups" identified as the targets for affirmative action. But "black people" are in turn defined as those who were previously classified as "Africans," "Coloreds," and "Indians."[218] If, as Paul Gilroy argues, "action against racial hierarchies can proceed more effectively when it has been purged of any lingering respect for the idea of 'race,' then the residues of apartheid's racial categories remain a daunting obstacle to the pursuit of a nonracial democracy in South Africa."[219] The issue of race is not relegated to black South Africans alone. White South African identity is heavily rooted in racial superiority, class, and a fear of black dominance. To give up one's status as "white" is to lose the privilege and power that comes with that racial designation. Zille's attempt to articulate a South African identity that privileges policy over race is a daunting task that ironically requires Zille to continue to acknowledge race in order to reach and persuade different audiences.

CURRENT POLITICAL CONTEXT

In 1994 Mandela was inaugurated as the first democratically elected president of South Africa. The "New South Africa" was immediately accorded international acceptance.[220] It was welcomed into the Organization of African Unity, it was readmitted into the Commonwealth, and it established itself as a leader in Africa. Inside the country, there was an emphasis on the building of a "new" nation: the South African Defense Force was combined with Umkhonto we Sizwe and APLA guerilla forces, the new flag combined the old colors with those of African Nationalism, and the former national anthem was merged with the liberation hymn *Nkosi Sikele iAfrika* (God Bless Africa). In 1996 the new government approved one of the most liberal constitutions in the world, and set up commissions to safeguard gender and individual human rights.[221] There was a rapid growth of a black middle-class in business and professions, encouraged by affirmative action policies modeled on the successful promotion of Afrikaner interests under the apartheid government. At the same time, Mandela stressed the importance of creating an inclusive nation, following the principles of the Freedom Charter that "South Africa belongs to all who lives in it, black and white."[222]

But granting everybody the vote and espousing equality could not undo all the social and economic harm done by the apartheid system. There is still crippling poverty, an HIV/AIDs epidemic (more people are infected with HIV/AIDs in South Africa than anywhere else in the world), systemic and widespread violence (215,000 people were murdered in the first decade after the end of apartheid), and serious issues of corruption within the ANC (Jacob Zuma disbanded the police's anti-corruption unit upon taking office).[223] Despite these issues, the ANC has been the dominant party with 60–70% of the vote. But the ANC's power does not go unchecked. A robust civil society grew out of the

movement that ended apartheid; its various parts—newspapers, activist organizations, and churches—have become "surrogate checks and balances to complement those that are ostensibly provided in the constitution."[224] There are more than 26,000 registered NGOs, and many are effective at both providing services the government doesn't and advocating for better policies. Active news media get "under the thin skin" of the country's leaders, and religious leaders, such as Archbishop Desmond Tutu, are among the ANC's loudest critics.[225] Arguably the most public and influential critic, as well as the "official" opposition, is Helen Zille and the Democratic Alliance.

In the most recent election in 2009, many already considered Zille a "star player" and a true threat to the monolithic ANC.[226] This was partly due to the interparty issues the ANC was facing. In the beginning of the campaign the ANC underwent a public and acrimonious split and in October of 2008 former South African President Thabo Mbeki was dismissed a month before his term expired and was replaced by Kgalema Motlanthe, and ally of the then favorite Jacob Zuma, who was expected to become president after the election year.[227] This "humiliating" dismissal led to "A bitter spat between rival camps" that "exploded onto the front pages of South African newspapers . . . when one party member rebuked another for charging that the party had become a threat to democracy."[228] *LA Times* writer Robyn Dixon wrote, "Opponents complained that Mbeki was aloof and intolerant of criticism. They regarded his policies as too pro-business, criticized his failure to improve the lot of the poor and abhorred his failure to act more urgently to fight AIDS."[229] Zuma had his share of problems as well. During the campaign he was charged with corruption, fraud and racketeering. Though these charges were

thrown out on a technicality, suspicion remained, and he frequently had to address the issue during his candidacy. [230]

Zille was quick to take advantage of the opening, claiming that an ANC split would strengthen democracy. In her weekly online letter Zille wrote, "The dominant party is beginning to fracture and the opposition is beginning to coalesce around common core values."[231] These core values, Zille claimed, were embodied in the DA, and the split was a sign that it was time for South Africa to have new leadership. At the DA's elections campaign launch in Kliptown, Soweto, Zille also claimed the split meant that the DA could beat the ANC and take back the Western Cape in this year's elections.[232] To a crowd of 5,000 supporters Zille proclaimed, "Politics have changed. The ANC has split, it is no longer guaranteed majorities in every province in South Africa," and that the DA was "in it to win it."[233] This message had particular significance because of the location of the kick-off celebration. The *Cape Town Times* wrote "The DA chose to launch its campaign at the site where the Congress of the People adopted the Freedom Charter in 1955 sending the message that the split in the ANC, which gave rise to COPE (Congress of the People), had opened the door to it ascending to power."[234]

Another factor in favor of the DA was the fact that the Independent Democrats (ID) decided not to side with the ANC. The ID, though not a nationally powerful party, had numerous supporters in the Western Cape provinces, enough that if the ID had decided to side with the ANC during the 2009 elections Zille would have faced a much tougher campaign that she did. As it was, by February 2009 Zille was "the most likely of all the candidates to be the Western Cape premier."[235] On Election Day lines were out the doors for hours in the Western Cape, and Zille was quoted as saying "I am expecting a

good result. I think South African voters know what we need to do to save democracy and to ensure that a government delivers. I know that they know what to do to prevent a criminal state and they'll go out today and do it."[236] As expected, Zille swept Cape Town, and emerged victorious as the new Premier of the Western Cape after "winning an outright majority in the province with more than 51 percent of votes."[237] The Cape Times reported that "It [was] the first time since the end of apartheid that a party has scored an overall majority in the province and the result of a driven campaign by DA leader Helen Zille to unseat the ANC."[238] The Western Cape was the only region where the opposition managed to defeat the ANC in the elections in the history of South Africa after apartheid and on May 6, 2009 Zille formally accepted the position as Premier of the Western Cape.[239] Since then she has continued to campaign for votes, and battle the ANC for power.

The events surrounding Zille's rise to power have deep social, political and historical underpinnings. This chapter has attempted to provide a better understanding of the historical trends, the motivating forces, and the immediate occasion from which Zille's rhetoric arose, as well as the current policies and constraints facing Zille and the DA as a result of apartheid's legacy. In discerning these various constituents of the historical framework I illuminate the constraints that have been placed on Zille based on her race and gender, as well as the restraints and opportunities posed by contemporary events. Clearly, these are important factors that deeply impact Zille's rhetorical messages. The brief biography of Zille provides an understanding of the ethos that she brings to the table, and shows how she has the potential to use her history to sway audiences. In the

next chapter, I analyze how Zille navigates these competing forces through her public

speeches.

Notes

James Andrews, *The Practice of Rhetorical Criticism*, 2nd ed. (New York: Longman, 1990): p. 17.

112 Lester Thonssen, Craig Baird, and Walden B. Braden, *Speech Criticism* (Florida: Robert E. Krieger Publishing, 1981): p. 348.

113 Glenn Moss and Ingrid Obery, *South Africa Contemporary Analysis: South African Review,* 5th ed. (London: Hans Zell Publishers, 1989), p. xxii.

114 Andrews, *Rhetorical Criticism*, p. 10.

115 Andrew Stevens, "Helen Zille: Mayor of Cape Town to Premier of the Western Cape," *City Mayors,* May 1, 2009, http://www.citymayors.com/mayors/ capetown_mayor.html (accessed February 27, 2010).

116 Sebastian Mallaby, *After Apartheid: The Future of South Africa* (New York: Times Books, 1992).

117 Hilda Bernstein, *For Their Triumphs and for Their Tears - Women in Apartheid South Africa* (London, United Kingdom: International Defense & Aid Fund, 1975).

118 Bernstein, *Triumphs.*

119 "Historical Background of the Black Sash," Black Sash Archival Website http://www.lib.uct.ac.za/blacksash/index.php?pg=background&sub_menu=background (accessed January 2009).

120 Stevens, *Mayors.*

121 "Profile: Helen Zille," *BBC News*, April 15 2009, http://news.bbc.co.uk/ 2/hi/7998328.stm (accessed October 10, 2010).

122 "Zille best candidate for West Cape," *Independent Online*, March 2, 2009, http://www.iol.co.za/index.php?set_id=1&click_id=13&art_id=iol1235997628406W211 (accessed October 10, 2010).

123 "Profile."

124 Stevens, *Mayors.*

125 Donna Bryson, "South Africa Election: ANC Leads In Preliminary Results," *The Huffington Post,* May 23, 2009, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2009/04/23/south-africa-election-anc_0_n_190459.html (accessed October 11, 2010).

126 Stevens, *Mayors*.

127 Stevens, *Mayors*.

128 "Profile."

129 Robert Ross, *A Concise History of South Africa* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

130 Timothy J. Keegan, *Rural Transformations in Industrializing South Africa: The Southern Highveld to 1914* (Johannesburg: Ravan Press, 1986) and Stanley Trapido, "Putting a Plough to the Ground: A History of Tenant Production on the Vereeniging Estates, 1896–1920." In W. Beinart, P. Delius, & S. Trapido (Eds.), *Putting Plough to the Ground: Accumulation and Dispossession in Rural South Africa, 1850–1930* (Johannesburg: Ravan Press, 1986).

131 Colin Bundy, *The Rise and Fall of the South African Peasantry* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1979); Rodney Davenport, "Can Sacred Cows be Culled? A Historical Review of Land Policy in South Africa," *Development*

Southern Africa 4 (1987): p. 388–400; Fred Hendricks, *The Pillars of Apartheid: Land Tenure, Rural Planning and the Chieftaincy* (Uppsala: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1990).

[132] South Africa currently contains two independent nations within its borders; Swaziland and Lesotho.

[133] Michael Aliber, "Chronic Poverty in South Africa: Incidence, Causes and Policies," *World Development* 31 (2003): p. 473–490.

[134] John Iliffe, *The African Poor: A History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

[135] Aliber, *Poverty in South Africa*.

[136] Peter Delius, and Stefan Schirmer, "Towards A Workable Rural Development Strategy," *TIPS Conference 2000 Annual Forum*, 2000.

[137] Aliber, *Poverty in South Africa*.

[138] Aliber, *Poverty in South Africa*.

[139] Aliber, *Poverty in South Africa*.

[140] Jeffrey Butler, Robert Rotberg, and John Adams, *The Black Homelands of South Africa* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977).

[141] Paula Armstrong, Bongisa Lekezwa and Krige Siebrits, "Poverty in South Africa: A Profile Based on Recent Household Surveys," Stellenbosch Economic Working Papers, University of Stellenbosch, Department of Economics, Cape Town, South Africa, April 2008, http://ideas.repec.org/p/sza/wpaper/wpapers52.html (accessed February 11, 2011).

[142] Armstrong, et al. "Poverty."

[143] *Statistics South Africa: Census 2001*, prepared by the by the South African Statistics Council, Bureau of the Census, http://www.statssa.gov.za/census01/html/default.asp (accessed March 10, 2011).

[144] Rob M. Stewart, "South Africa Unemployment Hits 25.2%" *The Wall Street Journal*, May 4, 2010, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB100014240527487038 66704575223993865587422.html (accessed March 10, 2011).

[145] Hannah Britton, *Women in South African Parliament* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2005), p. 3-32. In the South African, context, the term "Colored" (also known as *Bruinmense*, *Kleurlinge* or *Bruin Afrikaners* in Afrikaans) refers or referred to an ethnic group of mixed-race people who possess some sub-Saharan African ancestry, but not enough to be considered black under the law of South Africa. They are mixed race and often possess substantial ancestry from Europe, Indonesia, Madagascar, Malaya, Mozambique, and Southern Africa.

[146] Beth Goldblatt and Sheila Meintjes, "South African Women Demand the Truth." In Meredith Turshen and Clotide Twagiramariya (ed.), *What Women Do in Wartimes: Gender and Conflict in Africa* (New York: Zed Books, 1998), p. 27-61.

[147] Britton, *Women in South Africa*, p. 8.

[148] Britton, *Women in South Africa*, p. 8.

[149] Joanne Feddler, "Women's Day: It's Time to End State Neglect of Women" *Johannesburg Mail and Guardian*, August 8, 1997, http://archive.mg.co.za (accessed February 13, 2011).

[150] Britton, *Women in South Africa*, p. 11.

[151] Britton, *Women in South Africa*, p. 11.

[152] Britton, *Women in South Africa*, p. 15.

[153] Jacklyn Cock, *Colonels and Cadres: War and Gender in South Africa* (Cape Town: Oxford Press, 1991), p. 150-200.

[154] Cock, *Colonels and Cadres,* p. 182.

[155] In the South African context, Afrikaner white women, decedents of the Duch, are seen as very different from English-speaking white women, decedents of the British.

[156] Britton, *Women in South Africa*, p. 13.

[157] Britton, *Women in South Africa*, p. 23.

[158] Britton, *Women in South Africa,* p. 21.

[159] Britton, *Women in South Africa,* p. 21.

[160] Karen Beckwith, "Beyond Compare? Women's Movement in Comparative Perspective," *European Journal of Political Research* 37 (2000): p. 431-468.

[161] Rhoda Kadalie, "Women in the New South Africa: From Transition to Governance." In Sandra Liebenberg, *The Constitution of South Africa from a Gender Perspective* (Cape Town: David Phillip1995): p. 64-78.

[162] Gumisai Mutume, "Women break into African politics," *Africa Recovery* 18 (2004): p. 4, http://www.un.org/ecosocdev/geninfo/afrec/vol18no1/181women.htm (accessed November 15, 2010).

[163] "Women in South Africa: Walking Several Paces Behind," *The Economist*, October 7, 2010, Middle East & Africa Section, http://www.economist.com /node/17204625 (accessed November 16, 2010).

[164] "Women in South Africa."

[165] These laws include legalizing abortion, giving women equal power in marriages, cracking down on domestic violence, criminalizing sexual harassment, outlawing gender discrimination in hiring and promoting, and introducing an affirmative action bill that covers access to education, healthcare and employment. Another gender-based bill is in the works now and is due to be passed within the year.

[166] "Women in South Africa."

[167] "What We Do: Leadership Building," *Association of Women's Business Centers*, http://www.runmyclub.com/AWBC/Resources.asp?RID=1 (accessed December 2010).

[168] "Women in South Africa."

[169] "Women in South Africa."

[170] "Women in South Africa."

[171] WHO as cited in "Women in South Africa."

[172] "Women in South Africa."

[173] Romi Sigworth, *Anyone Can Be A Rapist: An Overview of Sexual Violence in South Africa*, Center for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation, November 2009, http://www.csvr.org.za/images/docs/sexualviolence.pdf (accessed December 2010).

[174] "Women in South Africa."

[175] "Women in South Africa."

[176] Sigworth, *Sexual Violence*, p. 14.

[176] "Women in South Africa."

[177] "Zille in 'Racist' Zuma HIV Attack," *BBC News*, May 12, 2009, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/8045981.stm (accessed November 23, 2010).

[178] "Zille in Racist Attack."

[179] Anna Majavu, "Zuma an AIDS risk" *The Sowetan*, April 26, 2009. The original article was deleted from the newspaper, but a copy can be found on Zille's Facebook page, in the discussion section, http://www.facebook.com/topic.php?uid=2419649066&topic=11580 (accessed May 17, 2011).

[180] ANC Youth League Statement About Zille," *The Southern Tip of Africa*, May 13, 2009, http://www.thesoutherntip.net/anc-youth-league-statement-about-helen-zille/ (accessed May 20, 2011).

[181] "Youth League."

[182] "ANC Distances Itself from ANCYL comments," *Mantashe*, April 16, 2009, http://www.politicsweb.co.za/politicsweb/view/politicsweb/en/page71654?oid=128869&sn=Detail (accessed December 9, 2010).

[183] "Helen Zille Answers Her Critics," *PoliticsWeb*, April 20, 2009, http://www.politicsweb.co.za/politicsweb/view/politicsweb/en/page71619?oid=129162&sn=Detail (accessed February 2, 2011).

[184] "ANC Party Declaration," the African National Congress, http://www.anc.org.za/ancdocs/history/conf/conference51/declaration.html (accessed February 3, 2011).

[185] Tom Lodge, *Black Politics in South Africa Since 1945* (Johannesburg: Ravan Press, 1983).

[186] Stephen Ellis and Tsepo Sechaba, *Comrades Against Apartheid: The ANC and the South African Communist Party in Exile* (London and Indiana: James Currey and Indiana University Press, 1992); Sutton Dubow, *Sutton Pocket Histories: The African National Congress* (Gloucester: Sutton Publishing, 2000).

[187] Leonard Thompson, *A History of South Africa* (New Haven and London: Yale Nota Bene and Yale University Press, 2001).

[188] Thompson, *A History*, p. 156.

[189] Dubow, *Pocket Histories*, p. 4.

[190] Thompson, *A History*, p. 156.

[191] Dubow, *Pocket Histories*, p. 14.

[192] Thompson, A *History*, p. 177 and Lodge, *Black Politics*, p. 7.

[193] Lodge, *Black Politics*, p. 7.

[194] Dubow, *Pocket Histories*, p. 15.

[195] The ANC Youth League, quoted in Lodge, *Black Politics,* p. 22.

[196] Mark Gevisser, *The Dream Deferred: Thabo Mbeki* (Johannesburg and Cape Town: Jonathan Ball Publishers, 2007): p. 37.

[197] Dubow, *Pocket Histories*, p. 33.

[198] Dubow, *Pocket Histories*, p. 77. Umkhonto we Sizwe (or MK), translated "Spear of the Nation," was the armed wing of the African National Congress which fought against the South African apartheid government using violent tactics.

[199] Gevisser, *Dream Deferred*, p. 149.

[200] Ellis and Sechaba, *Comrades*, p. 35.

[201] Ellis and Sechaba, *Comrades*, p. 34.

[202] Nicola Jager, "No 'New' ANC?" *Politikon* 36 (2009): p. 275 – 288.

[203] Jager, "No 'New' ANC?" p. 278.

[204] Gevisser, *Dream Deferred*, p. 147.

[205] Gevisser, *Dream Deferred*, p. 147.

[206] Andrew Feinstein, *After the Party: A Personal and Political Journey Inside the ANC* (Johannesburg and Cape Town: Jonathan Ball Publishers, 2007).

[207] Roger Southall, "The ANC for Sale? Money, Morality and Business in South Africa," *ROAPE* 35 (2008): p.116.

[208] Southall, "The ANC for Sale?" p.116.

[209] Anthony Butler, *Contemporary South Africa* (Hampshire and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004).

[210] Feinstein, *After the Party*, p. 20-21.

[211] Thompson, *A History*, p. 228.

[212] South African Institute of Race Relations, *Race Relations Survey,* (Johannesburg: South African Institute of Race Relations, 1983): p. 57-61.

[213] Feinstein, *After the Party*, p. 21.

[214] Jager, "No 'New' ANC?" p. 279.

[215] Butler, *Contemporary*, p. 110.

[216] Helen Zille, *State of the Province*, May 29, 2009, http://www. capegateway.gov.za/eng/your_gov/3150/speeches/2009/may/182124 (accessed April 2011).

[217] The purpose of the act is "to provide for employment equity" against the background of "pronounced disadvantages for certain categories of people," namely, "blacks, women and disabled people" (Employment Equity Act: Act 55 of 1998, http://www.saflii.org/za/legis/num_act/eea1998240.pdf, (accessed May 17, 2011): p. 23-24).

[218] *A Survey of Race Relations*, South African Institute of Race Relations (SAIRR), (Johannesburg: SAIRR, 1964): p. 31-32.

[219] Paul Gilroy, *Between Camps: Race, Ethnicity and Nationalism at the End of the Colour Line* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2000).

[220] Worden, Nigel, *The Making of Modern South Africa: Conquest, Apartheid, Democracy* 4th Ed. (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2007).

[221] Worden, *Modern South Africa*, p. 160.

[222] Worden, *Modern South Africa*, p. 160.

[223] Kaminski, Matthew, "State of Play: How South Africa Became South Africa," *World Affairs* (2010): p. 20-44.

[224] Kaminski, *State of Play*, p. 1.

[225] Kaminski, *State of Play*, p. 1.

[226] Lindiwe Mazibuko, "What Next For Zille?" *Cape Times*, January 26, 2009, http://www.iol.co.za/index.php?set_id=1&click_id=13&art_id=vn20090126015455423C 853215 (accessed February 3, 2011).

[227] Robyn Dixon, "South Africa's Ruling ANC at Brink of Split: Supporters of Former President Mbeki and Backers of Current Party Leader Zuma Trade Bitter Barbs," *Los Angeles Times*, October 4, 2008, http://articles.latimes.com/2008/oct/04/world/fg-anc4 (accessed February 4, 2011).

[228] Dixon, "South Africa's Ruling ANC at Brink of Split."

[229] Dixon, "South Africa's Ruling ANC at Brink of Split."

[230] Dixon, "South Africa's Ruling ANC at Brink of Split."

[231] Alec Russell, *Bring Me My Machine Gun: The Battle for the Soul of South Africa, from Mandela to Zuma* (New York: Perseus Books Group, 2009).

[232] "ANC Split Will Help Us Win–DA," *Independent Online*, January 31, 2009, http://www.iol.co.za/index.php?set_id=1&click_id=13&art_id=nw20090131115821776C 254135 (accessed October 20, 2010).

[233] "ANC Split Will Help Us Win – DA."

[234] "ANC Split Will Help Us Win – DA."

[235] "Zille Best Candidate for West Cape," *Independent Online*, March 2, 2009. http://www.iol.co.za/index.php?set_id=1&click_id=13&art_id=iol1235997628406W211 (accessed October 20, 2010).

[236] "Election Day Quotes," *Independent Online*, April 22, 2009, http://www.iol.co.za/index.php?set_id=1&click_id=3086&art_id=nw2009042222193263 8C156270 (accessed November 23, 2010).

[237] "DA Wins Clear Majority in West Cape," *Independent Online*, April 25, 2009, http://www.iol.co.za/index.php?set_id=1&click_id=3086&art_id=nw2009042506260886 6C943275 (accessed November 23, 2010).

[238] "Hero's Welcome for Zille," *Independent Online*, April 24, 2009, http://www.iol.co.za/index.php?set_id=1&click_id=3086&art_id=nw2009042416364739 4C126988 (accessed November 23, 2010).

[239] "Clear Majority."

CHAPTER 3: THE POWER OF SPEECH

Eugene White argues that when a situation arises that can be modified by communication, what he calls a "rhetorical urgency," speakers respond to it in hopes of inducing change in the audience. In this chapter, I explore two particular communication events in which Zille attempted to use her rhetoric to modify a particular situation. Specifically, this chapter examines two speeches given by Zille: her May 6, 2009 acceptance speech for Premier of the Western Cape and a speech delivered almost a year later on April 27, 2010 at the Constitutional Court in Johannesburg as part of the party's Freedom Day celebrations. I chose these two speeches because I am specifically interested in looking at the longitudinal development of Zille's rhetoric in order to discern the way in which her rhetoric functions over a period of time and changes as she progresses in her political campaign. I focus this chapter on speeches because they are a particularly important aspect of Zille's campaign as they reach the widest number of South Africans because they are available in a number of formats. Transcripts are available online, but also appear in local newspapers. The speech itself is broadcast multiple times on the day of the speech on TV or on the radio and though the majority of

poor South Africans have limited access to the Internet, televisions and radios are comparatively cheap and can be easily accessed in public venues such as local bars/restaurants called Shebeens.[240]

In Chapter Two I laid out the major events that have shaped South Africa's political and social present from which these rhetorical acts emerged. In the case of Zille, historical events are particularly important as they heavily influence the constraints Zille is facing and shape the kind of satisfactions she can employ. As noted in Chapter One, White defines *constraints* as "forces in a configuration that influence the way a persuader chooses rhetorical responses, if he or she wants to communicate effectively."[241] A *rhetorical response*, or *satisfaction*, then is "those things a persuader says or does in answer to impinging constraints."[242] The restrictions of constraints/satisfactions prescribe what a persuader can or cannot say or do, leaving limited realistic choices for attempted persuasion. However, White argues that these limitations can also be "seats of rhetorical possibilities," a way for rhetors to specifically tailor their response to the constraining forces.[243]

In this chapter, I contend that Zille faces four major constraints that she must work to satisfy in order to alter the controlling exigent: 1) her race, 2) her class, 3) her gender, and 4) a strong culture of identity politics. In order to craft proper satisfactions for these constraints, Zille uses her speeches to create feelings of consubstantiality with her audiences and constitute a new South African identity, which creates a space for a new non-ANC government. In the speech given in 2009, Zille focuses on creating feelings of identification and consubstantiality with her audience; Her 2010 speech

functions to ideologically alienate the ANC from its base and to set the Democratic Alliance (DA) up as a viable political alternative to the ANC.

ZILLE'S 2009 ACCEPTANCE SPEECH

One of Zille's most important speeches to date was her 2009 acceptance speech after being elected Premier of the Western Cape. Zille had just swept the Western Cape, an unprecedented win in the history of South Africa, with a large majority of votes coming from black and colored voters. Her party, the Democratic Alliance (DA), also had a strong showing in the election, producing the best results ever at the polls, scoring almost a million new votes to take its nationwide tally from 1,931,201 to just under 3,000,000, a growth of 50%. Under Zille's leadership the DA not only managed to keep the ANC below a two-thirds majority, but also significantly improved its standing in parliament, taking twenty more seats in the National Assembly as opposed to the ANC which lost thirty-three seats.[244] The DA has been the only party in the entire country to increase overall support since the 2004 elections.[245] Zille's acceptance speech then is a particularly important moment for Zille and for South Africa. Never before had the ANC lost so spectacularly, and in such numbers. For the first time South Africa had a chance to see what the country might be like under a non-ANC party, run by a white leader, who is also a woman. The realities of the constraints are such, however, that Zille faced a deeply ambivalent audience; one that struggles to overcome generations of ingrained loyalty to the ANC and is still profoundly divided over issues of race, class, and gender.

In order to provide adequate satisfactions in light of these constraints Zille employs three rhetorical strategies: she 1) fulfills the basic requirements of an epideictic speech, 2) names the key issues of her administration, and 3) creates feelings of

identification and consubstantiality with her audience. Through the fulfillment of these three expectations, Zille is able to increase the audience's receptiveness to persuasion, which in turn creates a discursive space for her rhetoric to act as a constitutive force.

First, Zille meets the audience's immediate expectations by fulfilling the basic requirements of an epideictic speech. White argues that in order to alter a provoking urgency, a persuader must take into account the ways an audience responds to the original provoking urgency and the expectations of the communication event. In this case, the original provoking urgency was Zille's acceptance of the post of Premier of the Western Cape, a communicative event that calls into being a very specific type of discourse: epideictic rhetoric.

Renato Barilli attributes the invention of epideictic oratory to the early Sophists and describes it as "less functional and immediate" than deliberative and forensic speech, "almost superfluous."[246] According to Barilli, epideictic developed after the other two because it was not as vital to the *polis* as was forensic or deliberative. Prejudices against epideictic discourses as mere "show-pieces" meant solely to reflect upon the speaker and his or her oratorical talent have persisted since the time of the Sophists. Originally, the word "epideixis" simply meant "lecture" and "denoted discourse appropriate within pedagogical or ritual contexts."[247] Hence, epideictic is traditionally seen as the rhetoric of ceremony, commemoration, declamation, and demonstration. It is also the rhetoric used at festivals, such as the Olympic games and other events (i.e., openings, closings, and anniversaries as well as at births, deaths, and marriages). Epideictic discourse fell into disfavor in antiquity as it evolved into a ritualized mode of discourse that seemed to exclusively advertise a speaker's skill without any true meaning or impact. However, as

rhetorical theory has evolved, our understanding of epideictic has changed. Celeste Condit contends that epideictic is a genre worth studying, and one that fulfills three very important functions in society; understanding and definition, sharing and creation of community, and entertainment and display.[248]

The first function of epideictic rhetoric is definition and understanding—a particularly important aspect of Zille's speech for this audience as it provides a way of knowing what the future will look like under the first non-ANC Premier. Again, this is the first time since the end of apartheid that a party other than the ANC has been in power, and audiences are uncertain what that means for them. Zille takes into account the anxieties of her audience and uses this speech as an opportunity to define expectations: those expectations she has of the community and what, in turn, the community can expect from Zille. Audience expectations are defined by Zille as "key values that . . . underpin [her] administration" and show audiences how her term in office will be guided by two core values in particular: "Firstly, a dedication to establishing and telling the truth in each situation we face. Secondly, a commitment to defining, accepting and meeting our responsibilities."[249] Zille also lays out the community's responsibilities, much like a mother to a child. After explaining the duties of government, she says, "We all recognize the fact that a government which neglects its responsibilities undermines its citizens' rights. It is equally true that citizens who shirk their responsibilities and duties undermine the rights of others, as well as their own." Zille gives three specific examples of how individuals can fulfill their civic duty, which serves the dual purpose of emphasizing citizens' responsibility and lessening her own accountability. She states, "While the state has a crucial role in changing the circumstances that give rise to these

social ills, breaking the cycle is a responsibility we share with citizens who understand that personal discipline is essential if we are to enjoy the fruits of freedom." Here Zille seeks to instill a sense of personal responsibility for the larger community's welfare—if not for the way things are, then for the way they might be. She enjoins audience members to remember the burden of freedom: "No government can enforce and impose behaviour changes on free individuals . . . [and] all citizens are equally entitled to the rights, privileges, and benefits of citizenship; and equally subject to the duties, and responsibilities of citizenship." These calls to personal responsibility do not invite immediate action, but convey "the philosophical ideas which form the basis of future judgment and action."[250]

The second function of epideictic is crucial to Zille's ability to craft a new South African identity. The ability of epideictic rhetoric to share and, literally, create community is key to Zille's future political success. In order to make a viable run for the presidency Zille needs to show audiences that despite profound historical divisions of race, class, and gender she can identify with and represent the majority of South Africans. This speech lays the groundwork for identification and consubstantiality, as the genre of epideictic allows for a unique opportunity to build community through a sharing of common values and traditions. Waldo Braden and Harold Mixon define epideictic as "a celebration of communal values and traditional beliefs" that plays a pivotal role of inspiring the realization and reinforcement of values.[251] Although epideictic rhetoric is rarely used in an effort to sway audiences to a new way of thinking, it does allow audiences to reconstitute traditional thoughts and beliefs. More than reaffirming community values, epideictic allows for a new take on values, creating new meaning for

old ideas. For example, Zille's focus on a citizen's civic responsibility to work with the government is juxtaposed with the historically understood meaning of civic responsibility, which for South Africans largely meant to undermine the government through civil disobedience. In effect, she is working to reconstruct the cultural archetype from the responsible citizen as rebel, to the responsible citizen as pro-government.

This ability to reconstitute basic values and beliefs forms the basis of the constitutive function of Zille's rhetoric. Charland argues that every rhetorical act draws on preexisting discursive positions and that by virtue of addressing an audience, recreates those positions in new and different ways. We see that Zille is using this speech to create feelings of identification with her audience, yet the collective identities that she draws on are themselves a rhetorical creation. Therefore, if a "people" only exist through the ideological discourse that constitutes them, the people then only exists as "a series of narrative ideological effects."[252] To tell a story of a collective people, or to draw on a collective's values and beliefs, is to implicitly claim the existence of a collective subject.

The last function of epideictic, display and entertainment, is largely used to support the shaping and sharing of community, but it is also an important point of contrast between Zille and the current South African President Jacob Zuma. As Zille works to shape and create community, she invokes archetypal themes of truth, justice, and cooperation as ways to better their community and country. These themes "entertain" audiences in what Condit describes as the "most humane manner."[253] Audiences are "allowed to stretch their daily experiences into meanings more grand, sweet, noble, or delightful."[254] The eloquence displayed by Zille reassures her audience of her worthiness as a leader, an assurance that the right candidate won. Audiences "take eloquence as a

sign of leadership" because to be an eloquent speaker means that a person "knows truth, recognizes and wields beauty, and manages power."[255] Zuma is a very popular president, but is not generally considered particularly adept at public address.[256] According to an article in *The Daily Mail*,

> Many are going to compare President Jacob Zuma to them [Nelson Mandela and Thabo Mbeki] and ask how he fares. The honest answer has to be not well, not well at all . . . The nation that needs a great speech from its leader is not a spoiled nation. And when it is a nation that is at such a precarious point in its existence as South Africa is at the moment, the importance of it is even greater. [257]

Though this particular failing has not impacted Zuma's career at this point, it seems likely that in this area, Zille will have a distinct advantage over Zuma during the presidential campaign.

This speech cannot be considered purely epideictic though, and certainly not part of a genre that is full of "hollow bombast and gaudy verbal baubles."[258] Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca argue that "Epideictic speeches are preparatory to action."[259] They further contend that "epideictic functions by increasing adherence to values that might later support legislative and judicial arguments."[260] This speech for Zille, though epideictic, is an important opportunity for her to alter the exigential flow. Zille has been working on the primary (or controlling) exigence of establishing the DA as an alternative to the ANC party for a number of years, and more recently, establishing herself specifically as a viable alternative to Zuma. Each time she engages the ANC as an opposition candidate or as spokesperson for her party, she attempts to alter the exigential flow.

One of the most important functions of this speech was Zille's chance to name the five key issues of her administration, which serves the dual purpose of clearly delineating

what the DA stands for, but also sets the terms under which the ANC should be judged in the coming years. The five key issues she highlights in her speech are 1) having an "open, accountable, and transparent government," 2) the HIV/AIDs epidemic, 3) drug abuse, 4) teen pregnancy, and 5) crime. These are all problems that have burdened South Africa since apartheid ended more than a decade ago. However, her use of these issues now not only emphasizes the criteria by which President Zuma and the ANC will be judged for the next four years. Doing this allows Zille to place herself in a position of rhetorical power, forcing Zuma and the ANC to meet her agenda.

These specific issues are not unique to Zille, but within the context of an epideictic speech, naming these problems implies that Zille's administration holds the key to a solution and predisposes the audience to act in particular ways under particular circumstances. Therefore the naming itself, even of common issues, has real, significant, and enduring consequences. The naming also serves as an implicit challenge to the ANC, forcing them to make visible, measurable progress in addressing these problems, something that cannot rationally be accomplished in the next four years due to the scale of the financial, social, and political crisis facing South Africa. It is unlikely that Zuma will be able to make any dramatic change within the next three to four years.

Zille, however, has a much stronger opportunity to impact these issues in the short amount of time left before the presidential elections, in a way that the ANC could not possibly hope to match. Zille leads one of the wealthiest provinces in the country, with a significantly higher tax base and a considerably lower poverty rate, comparatively.[261] The Western Cape's total GDP for 2006 was R225.8 billion, making the province the third-highest contributor to the country's total GDP, at 14.7%.[262] It also has one of the fastest

growing economies in the country, growing at 5.7% in 2006.[263] The province has a

substantially lower unemployment rate than the national average—15% to the nation's

25%.[264] High-tech industries, international call centers, fashion design, advertising and

TV production are niche industries that are rapidly gaining importance and prestige.[265] In

fact, the city of Cape Town is ranked as the most entrepreneurial city in South Africa

with "Early-Stage Entrepreneurial Activity" 190% greater than South Africa's national

average.[266]

In addition, Zille's province is geographically placed in such a way that the rest of

the country acts as a buffer from the influx of illegal immigrants. South Africa is

currently facing serious immigration issues as other Africans, especially Zimbabweans,

Congolese and Mozambicans, flock to the relative success and safety of South Africa.[267]

South Africa has one of the highest GDPs in Africa, as well as one of the most stable

governments and economies, with some of the best infrastructure on the continent. The

World Bank ranks the country as an upper-middle economy, which makes the country

one of only four countries in Africa represented in this category (the others being

Botswana, Gabon, and Mauritius).[268] Clearly the ANC needs to address the same issues

as Zille, but on a much larger scale. Two of the largest cities, Johannesburg and Durban,

are outside of the Western province, and contain the largest slums in the country. Both

cities are located close to borders and have huge illegal immigrant issues, which in turn

results in housing and job shortages, a lack of sanitation capabilities, and a rise in crime

and poverty. For the ANC to make noticeable and remarkable inroads on these issues

requires a tax base that doesn't exist.[269]

This setting of the agenda in turn places voters in the position of having to judge the ANC on named and visible criteria, forcing them to go beyond identity politics. If Zille's administration is seen as having more success in fighting these problems, she creates a scenario in which voters are obligated to vote for the DA, for the betterment of the country, despite her race, class, and gender. The problem is that the majority of voters believe that the only party that can better South Africa is the ANC, because they, the voters, *are* the ANC. This is one of the biggest impediments Zille faces to becoming a viable presidential candidate. As laid out in Chapter Two, the ANC played a major role in the anti-apartheid movement during the seventies and eighties, and as a result, the majority of the black population sees themselves in the ANC. This is compounded by the near legendary figure and leader of the ANC, Nelson Mandela. People want to be a part of his party, to claim ties with this renowned figure. In order for Zille to succeed in the Presidential elections, she needs to break the culture of identity politics, and re-craft South African identity to focus on issues, rather than historical or familial allegiance.

In order to break the cycle of identity politics, Zille needs her audience to acknowledge her own position as a South African and identify with her as a fellow citizen. In order to create any sort of identification with her audience Zille must overcome the barriers of her race, class, and gender, a steep challenge because of the history of the country and the symbolic nature of white skin in a post-apartheid South Africa. James McBath and Walter Fisher argue that campaign persuasion "involves more an interest in communicating values than logical information. That is, the candidate attempts to convince the electors that they can identify with her or him because both the elector and the campaigner own the same value orientation."[270] According to McBath and

Fisher's perspective "the candidate must appear as owning a worldview corresponding with that of the voters."[271] Ultimately, "the potential elector is encouraged to vote for himself [sic]—that is, the candidate closest to his own self-image."[272] Though Zille is not officially a candidate anymore, having won her campaign for Premiership, she is positioning herself as a future presidential candidate, and in a sense, this is her kick-off speech. In working to more fully indicate how Zille identifies with black South Africans this study relies on the explanation of identification provided by Kenneth Burke.

For Burke, rhetoric is largely concerned with persuasion, and persuasion is inherently linked to identification: "A is not identified with his colleague, B. But insofar as their interests are joined, A is identified with B. Or he [sic] may identify himself with B even when their interests are not joined, if he assumes that they are, or is persuaded to believe so."[273] Burke went on to say that rhetoric "considers the ways in which individuals are at odds with one another, or become identified with groups more or less at odds with one another."[274] He noted that if people did not stand at odds with one another, divided, no need would exist for the study of a subject whose aim is to bring them together so they can become "consubstantial"[275] with each other. Focusing on the specific purpose of rhetoric, Burke stated that an individual's "act of persuasion may be for the purpose of causing the audience to identify itself with the speaker's interests; and the speaker draws on identification of interests to establish rapport between himself and his audience."[276] Creating identification is not just key to persuasion. Charland argues that is also forms the basis for constituting an audience.

As discussed in Chapter One, one of the distinguishing theoretical tenets of constitutive rhetoric is the approach to audience. Charland argues that what most

rhetorical critics consider to be the product or consequence of discourse, such as a social identity, religious faith, or sexuality, are beyond the realm of rational or even free choice. Nonetheless, they form the basis of persuasion. Consequently, while creating a sense of identification with her audience, Zille also is able to constitute a new identity for her audiences.

In order to create a sense of identification, Zille employs five tactics: she 1) addresses common narratives of dissatisfaction, specifically those of civil servants and the unemployed, which make up a majority of black South Africans, 2) invokes common apartheid narratives, referring to her history as an anti-apartheid activist and her role in the revelation of the murder of iconic anti-apartheid martyr Steven Bikko, 3) emphasizes common values held by her audience, such as government transparency, strong family ties and responsibility, 4) creates an us versus them mentality, what Burke calls the workings of antithesis, which works to unite a group in opposition to another group and 5) delivers the speech in three languages—English, Afrikaans and most importantly Xhosa. Her use of multiple languages distances her from the colonizing languages of English and Afrikaans and shows her willingness to learn native African languages.

Zille begins her speech by addressing common narratives of dissatisfaction among public servants, speaking to those citizens who inhabit jobs that are important to society, but are generally underappreciated and underpaid, such as those of "nurses, doctors, teachers, [and] police officers" who "work at the coalface of delivery."[277] She addresses the fact that the people in these industries typically "work under extremely difficult conditions, with capacity constraints, high vacancy rates and inadequate budgets." These jobs, especially in the poorer province areas, are largely held by black Africans, and by

acknowledging their struggles, and praising them for their work, Zille is trying to show that she understands her constituency. This also reassures black audiences that Zille has no intention of bulldozing local governments, a dig at Zuma and the ANC, who have a reputation of placing ANC members in any and all government roles, despite marginal competence.[278] She states: "Each sphere of government in the Western Cape has specifically assigned competences and each has a role to play in the development of our democracy. Our oversight role in various spheres will be fulfilled in the spirit of cooperation and support."

The second and third methods of identification utilized by Zille (employing archetypal anti-apartheid narratives, and emphasizing common values held by her audience) are tied tightly together as common values that are embedded in the anti-apartheid narratives. The common values found in her anti-apartheid narratives are "telling the truth," "accepting and meeting responsibilities," "an open, accountable, and transparent government," "defend[ing] the independence of institutions that exist to call us to account and to curb power abuse," and "respecting, protecting, expanding and realizing the rights enshrined in our Bill of Human Rights." These values were at the core of the anti-apartheid resistance movement, and Zille reminds her audience of her past as an active member of the Black Sash, her part in revealing the truth of Steven Bikko's murder and her work as a vocal anti-apartheid white woman within the political system.[279] Another value that Zille highlighted was personal responsibility, which again, was a common anti-apartheid narrative. She reminds her audience of the work of anti-apartheid activists by saying, "A society only progresses to the extent that a growing numbers of citizens claim their rights in order to fulfill their responsibilities," a reference

that again, reminds the audience of her past and encourages black audiences to see her as one of them—a citizen dedicated to claiming rights for all of South Africa. This also serves as a call to action and participation. By supporting these values, which Zille believes "are the bedrock on which we build our lives as individuals and as communities," individual members of the community can "become a part" of the DA, which allows audience members to "participate in the very discourse by which they would be 'persuaded.'"[280] As a result of this participation audience members are "interpellated" or constituted as subjects who participate in the discourse and then come into being as a result of discourse.

Another type of identification employed by Zille is the use of the terms *we*, *us*, and *our* instead of the traditionally used *they* in her speech. Both Burke[281] and George Cheney[282] underscore the power of these three words to act as identification tools, which, they argue, are powerful because they are subtle and often go unnoticed. In addition, the use of these words by a rhetor signals to audiences that the speaker and listener have a significant amount in common—that they are by virtue of language, the same. In this speech Zille only used the word *I* seventeen times, out of 1,985 words, and she used *we* fifty times. By using these inclusionary terms Zille creates a situation where the audience doesn't just indentify with her, but with the DA as a whole. Clearly the DA is a popular party, so even those who might disagree, or even dislike Zille personally, can instead see her as part of a "team" (a term she also uses quite a bit) that has at least some control over her actions and choices.

Zille also works to strengthen the identification she has already created with her original supporters: "Our administration will welcome those committed to effective and

efficient delivery and those who understand the distinction between the party and the state." This particular sentence serves as praise for her immediate audience, made up mainly of supporters, for their intelligence, and ability to see past racial issues—yet another dig at the ANC, which many whites see as racist.[283] This reminds both white and black voters of their identification with her and creates an "us (the DA) versus them (the ANC)" dichotomy. Burke would label these remarks as "the workings of antithesis, as when allies who would otherwise dispute among themselves join forces against a common enemy."[284] The idea of a common enemy is a symbol of the evil against which people must unite, and it distracts the people from politically inconvenient issues by relating all evils to the common rhetorical enemy. According to Burke, this is creating an antithesis. Burke contends that we are born separate individuals and divided by class or other criteria, so identification is compensation for division.[285] He sees this human need to identify with or belong to a group as providing a rich resource for those interested in joining us, or more importantly, persuading us. To promote social cohesion, antithesis makes a simple balancing statement, "*We* do this" but "*They* do that." This symmetry creates an expression of conjoined opposites, which stigmatizes the latter and encourages the former to cohere.[286] By making the ANC the "other" as well as the "evil" party by necessity, Zille forces her audience to align itself with the DA in order to be part of the community of the Western Cape as well as a member of the "good" party. However, she does this in a very subtle way that makes use of the context of the situation rather than as a blatant attack on the ANC. It can't be ignored that this is the first time since the end of apartheid that the ANC was not the ruling party, so every declarative statement made by Zille silently contrasts her government with that of the ANC. For example, Zille

proclaims, "We will govern for all the people of the Western Cape in all our rich diversity. We will be a government for all the people." The unspoken argument then is that the ANC is *not* a government for all the people.

Lastly, Zille creates a sense of identification through her use of multiple languages. Zille delivered the speech in three languages—English, Afrikaans and Xhosa, which shows her willingness to learn native African languages. This is a particularly significant tactic because of the history of language in South Africa, specifically the use of the English language to disadvantage black South Africans during apartheid. The 1976 Soweto student uprising is an important anti-apartheid narrative that symbolizes how many black South Africans feel about issues of language. During a reorganization of the Bantu Education Department of the government, the South African apartheid government decided to start enforcing a law requiring that secondary education be conducted only in Afrikaans, rather than in English or any of the native African languages. The law "was bitterly resented by both teachers and students" and many teachers themselves did not speak Afrikaans and so could not teach the students.[287] The students themselves "resented being forced to learn the language of their oppressors" and saw it as a direct attempt to cut them off from their original culture.[288] By 1976 tensions peaked and a protest march was organized in the black township of Soweto, just outside Johannesburg on June 16, 1976. Over 20,000 students turned up to the march, followed closely by the police. Conflict began almost immediately, as police fired round after round of tear-gas into the crowds, quickly escalating into actual gunfire. That day, two students, Hastings Ndlovu and Hector Pieterson, died from police gunfire; hundreds more sustained injuries during the subsequent chaos that engulfed Soweto. The shootings in Soweto sparked a massive

uprising that soon spread to more than 100 urban and rural areas throughout South Africa.[289]

English is still the language of education in South Africa, which is unsurprising, for reasons that have to do with the modalities of colonial oppression in the 19th and 20th centuries. Neville Alexander comments that it seems as though "every newly independent African state is doomed to take the same language policy by accepting in practice the primacy of the ex-colonial language."[290] Zille's willingness to not only learn but also use a native African language shows a dedication to multilingualism that appeals to her wider audience.

Zille's acceptance address was hailed as one of her best speeches and an excellent way to kick-off her term as Premier.[291] One article said that "Zille has a sharp tongue and a short fuse, and she doesn't dodge a fight . . . [this speech] is a striking example of democracy at work."[292] The speech was also posted online, and comments from *Times Live* and *Politics Web* ranged from "An exemplary speech and a challenge for the future," posted by Sikelela Ilizwe Lethu, to "it was a moving, eloquent speech from the heart from a great leader."[293] Another comment read, "This was a speech that showed us by voting DA, we are winning!" An additional poster in response to the speech said "In spite of the critics this 'girl' is a committed leader we need in the realization of the implementation of the government policies to give a better life to the people of the western cape."[294] Furthermore, one poster pointed out that "Apparently her housekeeper, Grace, had tears streaming down her face," and went on to say, "This is how leaders are meant to act - Zuma, please take notes."[295] One commenter compared Zille to Zuma, writing that this was "a long and boring speech full of rethoric [sic], please try and learn

to summarise, learn from Zuma`s speech it was short and to the point."[296] In response, posters argued that "Zuma READS his speeches, barely looks up, very boring, so short is definitely best."[297] Another poster wrote, "You need to EARN respect—so far Zuma has done little to earn my respect. It has nothing to do with skin colour. If he was White he would be equally unimpressive."[298] A third reply to this comparison reminded readers that "it [this speech] was a 'brief acceptance speech to talk about the key values that will underpin this administration.' It was not designed for those with short attention spans like yourself. Even so, people who were there were so moved they cried."[299]

The speech allowed Zille to rhetorically place herself in a space that addressed the major challenges facing her bid for presidency—her race, class, gender, and the culture of identity politics. She was able to create strong bonds of identity, as evidenced by polling numbers and a jump in voter registration for the DA, and set an agenda that Zuma and the ANC cannot possibly hope to meet on a national scale, but one that she can much more easily meet in her province. Looking at her Freedom Day speech a year later, it is obvious that her tactics have shifted to a bolder attack on the ANC, a marked contrast to the more subtle assaults in her 2009 speech.

<div align="center">FREEDOM DAY SPEECH, 2010</div>

Much like the Fourth of July for U.S. Americans, April 27 is very important holiday for South Africans. Known as Freedom Day, it is an annual celebration of South Africa's first non-racial, democratic elections and the end of apartheid. It is a holiday that represents the defeat of racial injustice and the birth of a new, Rainbow Nation. On April 27, 2010, sixteen years after the end of apartheid, Zille addressed a crowd of supporters at Constitution Hill in Johannesburg, overlooking the Constitution Court. Though this

speech is also considered an epideictic speech, it takes place in a very different setting and with very different constraints than her 2009 speech. As a result of the shift in the exigential flow, Zille needed to alter her rhetorical strategies; building on the foundation she laid in the last year of her Premiership, she included much more aggressive language when referencing the ANC, and an even more pointed focus on personal agency and responsibility, with a much more assertive call to action. These changes were a result of a growing dissatisfaction with ANC policies among poor black voters, the key demographic if she wants to make a legitimate run for the presidency. Zille knows though, that despite this increasing unhappiness, there is a history of passive-aggressive resistance in the black culture. Black voters, rather than voting for a different party, instead choose to show their displeasure with the government by protesting or striking, or, more troubling for her campaign, decide to abstain from voting entirely.[300] In this speech Zille is trying to reach those discontented and frustrated voters and urge them to act by voting for the DA. This speech also functions to create a space for a re-working of South African identity on a global scale. Whenever Zille tries to create a sense of identification with her audience, she is also working on constituting her audience, and whenever she contrasts herself and the DA with the ANC, she creates a discursive space in which audiences can begin to contemplate that new identity.

In Zille's 2009 speech she focused intently on the DA itself and her personal vision for the future. Not once in the speech did she refer to Zuma or the ANC explicitly, though implied in much of the speech was the contrast between the DA and the ANC. In her 2010 speech Zille is quick to name Zuma specifically as problematic and the ANC more broadly as corrupt and corrupting. This speech does not rely on the audience to

make enthymematic inferences; instead, Zille works to clearly lay out a syllogistic

structure for her argument.

The first stated premise is that "power corrupts and absolute power corrupts

absolutely."[301] Zille claims

> They [the ANC] think freedom is represented by the fact that they won power. The more power they get, the more free they are to do what they like. So they ask the people to give them more and more power. They pretend that this will make it easier to do more for the people. But the opposite happens. The more power the people give to a small powerful group, the more the powerful few abuse that power, to enrich themselves, and their families and their political friends (with jobs, tenders and contracts) while the people suffer . . . This is the most important lesson we have learnt since our first freedom day 16 years ago.

If the ANC has absolute power, and absolute power corrupts, then the ANC must be

corrupt. Zille points to a number of examples of the ANC's abuse of power and evidence

of their inevitable corruption—Zuma's politically motivated nominees to the Supreme

Court, other political appointments of family and close friends, charges of corruption and

fraud, and interference in criminal proceedings for "cronies" like Shabir Shaik.[302] She

also uses Zimbabwe as a warning of what's to come if the ANC's power is left

unchecked. She cautions that

> . . . [P]owerful politicians . . . are free to loot, abuse power and enrich themselves, and fail to fulfill their mandate. They put their friends in the police and courts to protect themselves. They don't tolerate opposition and put people in jail and imprison them if they protest. They take over the army and the police to protect the corrupt elite instead of putting them in jail.

> You don't have to look far to see an example of this. Zimbabwe. Right here on our doorstep. Mugabe says he wants to give the land back to the people. He gives it to himself and his generals. He has ten of the biggest farms. The land did not go to the poor. Now there is no farming and the poor are starving to death. Literally starving.

Zille's opposition to the ANC had never been contrasted so clearly and so sharply within

a public address by Zille before. Her 2009 speech relied on allusions and insinuations, but

as she worked to alter the exigential flow in 2010, it is plain that Zille began to step up

her campaign in a more aggressive manner to make the distinctions between parties more

apparent to voters.

More crucial to Zille's success is her ability to turn out voters on Election Day.

Zille's Chief of Staff Geordin Hill-Lewis commented, "Black voters would rather not

vote at all than vote for a party other than the ANC."[303] If Zille has any hope of becoming

President of South Africa she needs to reach disaffected voters and actually get them to

vote for her rather than protest the ANC through inactivity. As discussed previously, Zille

is facing a strong culture of identity politics and lifelong affiliation with the ANC, which

has resulted in a lack of voting as silent protest. There are two main underlying causes for

this: the first is that black voters do not see the ANC as a political party with an agenda

and an appetite for power. Rather, the ANC is viewed as a type of extended family—for

example, Nelson Mandela is referred to as the father of the nation, which makes his party

an extension of his family. Tribal cultures are typically seen as collectivist cultures that

emphasize family loyalty, so to act against the ANC goes against the very nature of their

cultural beliefs. Second, black South Africans are not accustomed to using official

channels to change politics. For hundreds of years the only people with the vote were

whites, so the black population had to use different tactics to influence the political

structure. The need for an alternative outlet resulted in a strong protest culture, with an

emphasis on civil disobedience and the use of strikes to affect change. When faced with

political issues it is only natural for them to turn to the traditional methods of creating

change rather than utilize the power of the vote.

In her 2010 speech, Zille is trying to instill a sense of agency in her audience in an effort to get black voters to believe that voting can have as much effect as protests while also asserting that abstaining from voting only makes the situation worse. She reminds audiences of a time when voting created the most substantial change in history, when blacks used their vote to "bring down one government and replace it with another." She prompts audiences to remember when they "called the apartheid government to account" and prompts them to recall that "a little cross made with a pencil on a ballot paper could change South Africa, and our future, forever." She cautions, though, "that this power, and our freedom, can be taken away from us by people who are threatened by it" and that ignoring the responsibility that a democratic government places on people will result in "more and more abuse, and more and more corruption." Zille also warns that if South Africa turns into a criminal state "then everyone will blame the politicians. But actually we are also to blame, because we did not use our vote in time. We complained, we toyi-toyi'd, but we did not use our power" and that "everyone has a responsibility in upholding our freedoms."[304]

Much like her 2009 speech, this call to action also serves as a way for audience members to actively participate in the dialogue that is working to shape them. Charland argues that to become a subject one must engage the discourse. However, this engagement is not entirely deliberate or conscious. When individuals enter a rhetorical situation and acknowledge or recognize the rhetorical address, they become the audience member the text calls forth. Identification and (re)identification is a continual process though. Charland reminds us,

> This rhetoric of identification is ongoing, not restricted to one hailing, but usually part of a rhetoric of socialization . . . Persons are subject from the

moment they acquire language and the capacity to speech and to be spoken to . . . Thus, one must already be part of the audience of a rhetorical situation in which persuasion could occur.[305]

 Each rhetorical act draws on preexisting discursive positions and, in addressing the

audience, recreates those positions. Zille's 2009 speech began the process of constituting

an audience, and with each speech, she continues to work on her ultimate goal of a new

South African identity that is not bound up in race and ethnicity.

In addition to inciting voters to action, Zille paints a very partisan and power-

hungry picture of the ANC, and Zuma in particular. She states, "The real problem is that

the powerful politicians of the ruling party, starting with President Zuma, are not

accountable." She lays out a laundry list of Zuma's offences, very public ones that have

been hotly contested in the media:

He has undermined the constitution to make sure he does not have to go to court and answer to over 700 counts of corruption against him. He abuses power to protect his friends . . . from the law, while persecuting his political opponents. His family starts all sorts of companies that then abuse their position to get rich on state contracts. President Zuma himself does not declare his assets to Parliament until he is forced to do so by the DA. He is undermining the independence of the prosecuting authority and the courts for his political purposes. Some people are now more equal than others depending on their political connections. He supports a system in which the ANC uses the people's money to make themselves rich.

Zille ends by saying "if the voters allow them to do this, it is our fault. Let us remember

this lesson on this freedom day. In a democracy, people get the government they

deserve." This list of problems is Zille's way of politicizing the ANC and showing

audiences that although Zuma is black, and a leader of Mandela's party, he is not a loving

father figure who has the country's best interests at heart. Instead she argues that Zuma is

nothing more than a greedy politician. She specifically compares Zuma with the

President of Zimbabwe, Robert Mugabe, as an example. Again, she is trying to use

Zimbabwe as a portrait of the future if voters do not act now to stop the ANC: "The people of Zimbabwe must take some of the responsibility . . . because they did not use the power of their vote early enough. They used it when it was too late." This is a particularly effective comparison, because South Africa has suffered much of the burden brought about by Mugabe's policies. Refugees are flooding into South Africa and are seen as competition for food, jobs and housing.[306]

By politicizing the ANC Zille is hoping to begin to dispel the culture of identity politics. The ANC, of course, plays strongly on people's sense of identification with the party. They see themselves "not so much as a political party as the embodiment of the nation," and the traditional two-thirds majority win in elections is a confirmation of that status.[307] Zuma frequently refers to the ANC as "the parliament of the people," as if the decisions of the leaders were more important than those of the elected national assembly.[308] By disturbing this culture of identity politics, Zille is also hoping to make room for a new kind of identity. As Charland notes audiences are always "already constituted with an identity and within an ideology." [309] Zille must acknowledge these historically and socially created identities and then reconstitute them if she hopes to create a new identity for South Africans.

The list of Zuma's failures and scandals serves another important role in disrupting the ANC's power. Leading up to this year's municipal election Zuma, a lay pastor, warned voters at an election rally of the party faithful in the Eastern Cape Province on February 5, 2011, "When you vote for the ANC, you are choosing to go to heaven. When you don't vote for the ANC, you should know that you are choosing that man who carries a fork . . . who cooks people."[310] In a country where more than 80% of

the people describe themselves as Christians and two-thirds believe that the *Bible*, as the word of God, should be understood literally, President Jacob Zuma's warning has serious impact.[311] Zuma went on to say "When you are carrying an ANC membership card, you are blessed. When you get up there, there are different cards used, but when you have an ANC card, you will be let through to go to heaven."[312] Zille tries to counter this religious rhetoric with a type of civil religion, largely by referencing the 1996 Constitution, a document that has taken on almost biblical importance in the eyes of many South Africans. Throughout the speech she tells voters "We supported a Constitution to guarantee our freedoms and rights," and "we must celebrate and protect the Constitution." She urges that South Africans, no matter the party, "must pledge to do everything that is needed to protect the Constitution that guards our freedom. It cannot do so unless we guard it. As the saying goes: the price of freedom is constant vigilance." Also, in an attempt to create a sense of agency, Zille reminds her audience, "The constitutional court is the symbol of the power of ordinary people. It is the institution that upholds the Constitution, that defends our rights, freedoms and opportunities and that stands between us and power abuse. We, in turn, must protect the Constitution. We can do that by using our power to vote out people who abuse the Constitution." Zille is again creating an *us* vs *them* mentality, though this one is very different from the dichotomy she created in her 2009 speech. Rather than the DA versus the ANC, Zille is trying to create a scenario in which it is the ANC versus the Constitution. This forces voters to think more critically about their choices in the election. To vote against the Constitution very well might be even worse than voting against the ANC; both are legacies of Mandela and are considered cornerstones of the country, but Zille is banking on the hope that the

Constitution, even more so than the ANC, is seen as the embodiment of the true South Africa.

The speech was not given much media coverage, most likely because at this point in Zille's political career few people would be surprised by her remarks. However, looking at the comments section on various newspaper websites, reactions seemed to be mixed.[313] One poster commented that the DA was just as corrupt, but that the party lacked the media attention to bring their crimes to light: "Granted the ANC have their issues, terrible terrible injustices but the DA is also guilty of their own ethical misdemeanours they just have not come to light because the DA lacks media enemies." The same poster, Zibusisozethu Sithole, continued, "I might not be voting for the ANC in the next elections but I sure as hell am not voting DA." On the other end of the spectrum, another poster, Steve van Niekerk, wrote, "What a pity ANC supporters think like sheep. Once they realise how to use their freedom to vote SA will become a true democracy and realise its true potential."[314] Though reactions to the speech differed greatly, most posters agreed that the elections were race-controlled, and while Zille might not be the answer, the posters also seemed to agree that South Africans needed to vote on policy and not color.

Unsurprisingly, there are certain similarities between the speeches, notably thematic similarities. In both speeches Zille is attempting to point out very specific issues on which the voters should judge both the DA and the ANC. She emphasizes issues that she is better able to address than Zuma, or has already had a chance to address in both her time as Mayor of Cape Town and in the last year of her Premiership. For example, corruption is mentioned a number of times in both speeches, along with a need for

transparent government. Zuma is well known for disbanding South Africa's anti-corruption unit, the Scorpions, whereas Zille is notorious for her diatribes against Zuma's "distorted views of accountability," even going so far as to say, "Zuma personifies corruption."[315] Zille's focus on this particular subject is an interesting choice, however, one that might not pay off in the end. Although most South Africans believe strongly in the idea of democracy, most of the population holds an extremely deferential view of political authority, according to a recent study of 19 democratic countries on the continent carried out by Robert Mattes of the University of Cape Town.[316] South Africa scored particularly poorly on questions relating to accountability. Barely one in three citizens thought that members of Parliament (MP) should hold the president to account. Fewer than 40% agreed that "the government is like an employee; the people should be the bosses," most preferring the view that "people are like children; the government should take care of them like a parent."[317] Only 10% thought that voters should hold MPs to account, whereas as many as four out of ten believed that presidents should be able to "decide everything."[318]

Zille is facing an uphill battle as she works towards the 2015 presidential elections. The medium of the speech is particularly important, as this is the most expedient avenue by which to reach a national audience. In both her 2009 and 2010 speeches she attemptedto create a sense of consubstantiality with her audience, set herself up as a viable and legitimate alternative to the ANC, showcase the strengths of the DA (both moral and political) as opposed to the ANC, and articulate her policy agenda. Although Zille's message remained consistent in both speeches, her language changed significantly. Having laid the groundwork in her 2009 speech, Zille's rhetorical style took

on a much more aggressive edge in 2010, utilizing particular examples that point to Zuma and the ANC's corruption and mismanagement.

These speeches mark obvious and significant attempts to alter the exigential flow. The speeches also function as a tool to begin interpellating audience members. However, because of the mixed races and ethnicities of the audience, the constitutive power of the speeches is limited. In order to continue to constitute a new South African identity for voters Zille uses contrasting media formats to reach specific audiences and make nuanced and targeted arguments. In the next chapter I explore how Zille appeals to diverse constituencies through radio interviews and social media.

Notes

[240] Originally, Shebeens were operated illegally, selling homebrewed and home-distilled alcohol and providing locals with a place to meet and discuss political and social issues. The Shebeens were frequently raided and shut down by police but reopened in different locations. Shebeens were important places for black South African that united communities and provided a relatively safe place for meetings, especially for political activists during apartheid. Shebeens also provided a space for music and dancing, allowing patrons to express themselves culturally. Currently, Shebeens are legal in South Africa and have become an integral part of South African urban culture and are still considered an important part of today's social scene. In contemporary South Africa, they serve a function similar to juke joints for African Americans in the rural south. They represent a sense of community, identity, and belonging.

[241] Eugene E. White, *The Context of Human Discourse: A Configurational Criticism of Rhetoric* (Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press, 1992): p. 37.

[242] White, *Context of Human Discourse*, p. 35.

[243] White, *Context of Human Discourse*, p. 38.

[244] "General Elections in the Republic of South Africa," *2009 Election Results*, http://electionresources.org/za/ (accessed October 7, 2010).

[245] "General Elections in the Republic of South Africa."

[246] Renato Barilli, *Rhetoric*, trans. Giuliana Menozzi (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1989).

[247] Barilli, *Rhetoric*, p. 4.

[248] Celeste Condit, "The Functions of Epideictic," *Communication Quarterly* 33 (1985): p. 284- 299.

[249] All quotations from Zille's *Acceptance Speech* can be found at "Acceptance Speech," May 6, 2009, http://www.capegateway.gov.za/eng/pubs/speeches/ 2009/May/180650 (accessed October 8, 2010).

[250] Cynthia Miecznikowski Sheard, "The Public Value of Epideictic Rhetoric," *College English*, 58, (1996): p. 765-794.

[251] Waldo W. Braden and Harold Mixon, "Epideictic Speaking in the Post-Civil War South and the Southern Experience," *Southern Communication Journal* 54 (1988): p. 40-57.

[252] White, *Context of Human Discourse*, p. 139.

[253] Condit, "The Functions of Epideictic," p. 290.

[254] Condit, "The Functions of Epideictic," p. 290.

[255] Condit, "The Functions of Epideictic," p. 291.

[256] Stephen Grootes, "Missing: The Sublime Art of Speech-Writing and Oratory," *The Daily Maverick*, February 14, 2011, http://www.thedailymaverick.co.za/article/2011-02-14-missing-the-sublime-art-of-speechwriting-and-oratory, (accessed March 2011).

[257] Grootes, "Missing."

[258] Condit, "The Functions of Epideictic," p. 285-286.

[259] Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca in Condit, "The Functions of Epideictic," p. 285-286.

[260] Condit, "The Functions of Epideictic," p. 285-286.

[261] "Fast Facts: April–May 2007, Provincial Profile, Western Cape," *South African Institute of Race Relations*, (Cape Town, South African Institute of Race Relations, 2007): p. 20.

[262] "Investing in the Western Cape," *South Africa Information*, http://www.southafrica.info/business/investing/opportunities/wcape.htm (accessed March 5, 2011).

[263] *South Africa Information.*

[264] *South Africa Information.*

[265] *South Africa Information.*

[266] "Cape Town Outshines Rest of SA in Entrepreneurship," *Newsline*, University of Cape-Town, School of Business, http://www.gsb.uct.ac.za/newsletter/ v2/Story.asp?intArticleID=278 (accessed March 2011).

[267] Jonathan Crush and Wade Pendleton, "South African Migration Project 30: Regionalizing Xenophobia? Citizen Attitudes to Immigration and refugee policy in Southern Africa," *Institute for Democracy in South Africa*, http://www. idasa.org.za/gbOutputFiles.asp?WriteContent=Y&RID=2108 (accessed March 5, 2011).

[268] "South Africa," *World Bank*, http://data.worldbank.org/country/south-africa, (accessed March 5, 2011).

[269] Though these numbers are high compared with the rest of Africa, about a quarter of the population in South Africa is unemployed and lives on less than US $1.25 a day.

[270] Jeffrey A. Nelson, "The Republican Rhetoric of Identification With Gay and Lesbian Voters in the 2000 Presidential Campaign." *Atlantic Journal of Communication* 17 (2009): p. 53-71.

[271] James McBath and Walter Fisher, "Persuasion in Presidential Campaign Communication," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 55 (1969): p. 17–25.

[272] McBath and Fisher, "Persuasion," p. 18.

[273] Kenneth Burke, *A Rhetoric of Motives* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969), p. 20.

[274] Burke, *Motives*, p. 22.

[275] Burke, *Motives*, p. 21.

[276] Burke, *Motives*, p. 46.

[277] All quotations from Zille's *Acceptance Speech* can be found at "Acceptance Speech," May 6, 2009, http://www.capegateway.gov.za/eng/pubs/speeches/ 2009/May/180650 (accessed October 8, 2010). Coalface is a South African slang term that means at the forefront, front line.

[278] "Zuma: Nobody Owes Anybody in the Alliance," *Independent Online*, May 1, 2010, http://www.iol.co.za/index.php?set_id=1&click_id=13&art_id=nw 20100501164049270C975810 (accessed March 5, 2010).

[279] Alec Russell, *Bring Me My Machine Gun: The Battle for the Soul of South Africa, from Mandela to Zuma* (New York : Perseus Books Group, 2009).

[280] Maurice Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric: The Case of the *Peuple Quebecois*," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 73 (May 1987): p. 133.

[281] Kenneth Burke, *Dramatism and Development* (Barre, MA: Clark University Press, 1972).

[282] George Cheney, "The Rhetoric of Identification and the Study of Organizational Communication." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 69 (1983): p. 143–158.

[283] "Affirmative Action is Fair Discrimination," African National Congress Website, http://www.anc.org.za/show.php?doc=ancdocs/pubs/umrabulo/umrabulo30/art14.html (accessed March 9, 2011); "Canada SA refugee ruling 'racist,'" *BBC News*, September 2, 2009, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/8233004.stm (accessed March 10, 2011); "FF Plus: ANC the racist ones," *News24*, January 9, 2009, http://www.news24.com/SouthAfrica/Politics/FF-Plus-ANC-the-racist-ones-20090901 (accessed March 10, 2011); "S. African ANC: No Singing of 'Polarizing' Songs," *ABC News*, April 7, 2010, http://abcnews.go.com/International/wireStory?id=10305914 (accessed March 10, 2011).

[284] Burke, *Dramatism*, p. 28.

[285] Burke, *Dramatism*, p. 28.

[286] Kenneth Burke, "The Rhetoric of Hitler's Battle," *The Southern Review* 5 (1939): p. 1-21.

[287] Mark Mathabane, *Kaffir Boy: An Autobiography--The True Story of a Black Youth's Coming of Age in Apartheid South Africa* (New York: Free Press, 1998).

[288] Mathabane, *Kaffir*, p. 20.

[289] "Overcoming Apartheid: Soweto Student Uprising," Michigan State University, http://overcomingapartheid.msu.edu/sidebar.php?id=5 (accessed March 5, 2011).

[290] Neville Alexander, *English Unassailable but Unattainable: The Dilemma of Language Policy in South African Education*. Paper presented at the Biennial Conference of the International Federation for the Teaching of English (University of Warwick, England, UK, July 7-10, 1999).

[291] "Applause as Zille secures premiership." *Independent Online*, May 6, 2009 http://www.iol.co.za/index.php?set_id=1&click_id=3086&art_id=nw200905061240459 76C370668 (accessed April 21, 2011); "Zille's First 100 Days," *Independent Online*, August 15, 2009, http://www.iol.co.za/news/politics/zille-s-first-100-days-1.455129 (accessed April 21, 2011).

[292] "White Women Shakes Up Black-Led S. Africa's Politics," *Cult of the Dead Fish: A Political Blog*, May 10, 2009, 2011, http://cultofthedeadfish.blogspot.com/2009/06/white-woman-shakes-up-black-led-safrica.html, (accessed May 17, 2011).

[293] "Helen Zille's Speech On Election As Western Cape Premier," *Politics Web*, May 10, 2009, http://www.politicsweb.co.za/politicsweb/view/politicsweb/en/page71619?oid=127838&sn=Detail (accessed May 17, 2011).

[294] "Helen Zille's First Address as Western Cape Premier—Full Text," *Times Live*, accessed May 17, 2011, http://blogs.timeslive.co.za/hartley/2009/05/09/helen-zilles-first-address-as-western-cape-premier-full text/#comments (accessed May 17, 2011).

[295] "Zille's Speech."

[296] "Zille's Speech."

[297] "Zille's Speech."

[298] "Zille's Speech."

[299] "Zille's Speech."

[300] Geordin Hill-Lewis (Chief of Staff, Helen Zille), interview by Emily S. Sauter, January 23, 2011.

[301] All quotes from Zille's *Freedom Day Speech* can be found at "Freedom Day Speech," April 27, 2010, http://www.polity.org.za/article/da-zille-speech-by-the-leader-of-the-democratic-alliance-on-freedom-day-celebrations-johannesburg-27042010-2010-04-27 (accessed April 8, 2011).

[302] Shaik was put on trial for fraud and corruption at the Durban High Court on October 11, 2004. During the course of the trial, Shaik admitted that he falsified his qualifications and business achievements. He was found guilty on two counts of corruption and one count of fraud, with Judge Squires stating in his 165-page verdict that there was "overwhelming" evidence of a corrupt relationship between Shaik and Zuma. The fraud charge related to testimony that Shaik held a meeting with his financial manager, where it was agreed that false journal entries be made in order to alter Nkobi Holdings' financial statements. The second corruption charge relates to alleged attempts to solicit a bribe to Zuma from Thomson CSF. As a consequence of the ruling, Zuma was dismissed from his post as deputy president by Thabo Mbeki.

[303] Geordin Hill-Lewis (Chief of Staff, Helen Zille), interview by Emily S. Sauter, January 23, 2011.

[304] Toyi-toyi is a dance originally from Zimbabwe that has long been used in political protests in South Africa. The dance could begin as the stomping of feet and spontaneous chanting during protests that could include political slogans or songs, either improvised or previously created. During apartheid toyi-toyi, took on a military and style became commonplace in massive street demonstrations. After apartheid ended, people have used the toyi-toyi to express their grievances against current government policies. Use of the dance has become very popular during recent service delivery protests and among trade unions.

[305] Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric," p. 138-147

[306] Andrew Meldrum, "Refugees Flood from Zimbabwe: Flow of Desperate Migrants into South Africa Intensifies as Inflation and Shortages Worsen," *The Guardian: The Observer*, Sunday July 1, 2007, http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2007/jul/01/zimbabwe.southafrica (accessed April 2, 2011).

[307] "Democracy in South Africa: A Step Backwards," *The Economist*, Middle East & Africa Section, February 10, 2011, http://www.economist.com/node/18119187 (accessed February 29, 2011).

[308] *"Democracy in South Africa."*

[309] Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric," p. 134.

[310] *"Democracy in South Africa."*

[311] *"Democracy in South Africa."*

[312] *"Democracy in South Africa."*

[313] These comments do not, of course, comprise a representative sample of the public, since the majority of Internet users in South Africa are white, colored, Indian or Asian, with a very small representation of blacks. However, they do illustrate the ways in which racial divisions influenced reactions to the speech.

[314] "You Can End Corruption in SA, Says Zille," *Mail and Guardian Online*, April 28, 2010, http://mg.co.za/article/2010-04-28-you-can-end-corruption-in-sa-zille-tells-voters (accessed April 2, 2011).

[315] "ANC wants to mask corruption: Zille Claims," *Times Live*, September 18, 2010, http://www.timeslive.co.za/local/article665243.ece/ANC-wants-to-mask-corruption—Zille (accessed April 3, 2011).

[316] Robert Mattes, "South Africa: Democracy Without the People?" *Journal of Democracy* 13 (2002): p. 22-36.

[317] Mattes, *People?* p. 23.

[318] Mattes, *People?* p. 23.

CHAPTER 4: CONSTITUTING AUDINECES: BLACK VERSUS WHITE

One of the biggest challenges facing Zille in her run for the presidency is the strong culture of identity politics in South Africa. As discussed in previous chapters, South Africans are still deeply divided along racial and ethnic lines as a result of apartheid, and that legacy can be seen in current voting trends. The ANC continues to struggle to get votes from the non-black population, especially whites, while parties like the DA have virtually no support from black voters. In order to make a legitimate run for the presidency, Zille needs to reach out to black voters without alienating her white base. To accomplish this goal, Zille is trying to position herself as the next phase in South African politics, a leader of a party, and hopefully a country, where race is no longer a motivating factor in election, but rather where the focus is on a politician's and party's policies. However, to create this new South Africa, one that focuses on policy and not race, Zille needs to rearticulate the identity of South Africans both for blacks and whites.

Zille's attempt to articulate a South African identity that privileges policy over race is a daunting task, one that ironically requires Zille to continue to acknowledge race in order to reach and persuade different audiences. Apartheid not only impacted the

country socially and politically but economically as well. Whites continue to be the economic power in the country, while the majority of the black population resides in abject poverty. This economic division means that the different races have very different access to forms of communication—a fact that Zille uses to her advantage. Because each population holds differing reasons for their reservations about a race-free South Africa, Zille needs to make different arguments to persuade these various audiences that a race-free country is both possible and desirable. In the process of persuading these audiences though, Zille must be careful not to alienate one or the other. One way for her to navigate this issue is to use specific communication channels to target diverse constituent groups. After reviewing the research on media use in the South African context, I examine the arguments Zille crafts for both white and black audiences, assessing both Zille's Facebook page and interviews broadcast on the radio. As of August 2010, an estimated 10.8% of South Africans had access to the Internet, and out of that population 6.5% are Facebook users.[319] As of April 4, 2011 there were 3,904,420 active Facebook users in South Africa.[320] In a country of almost 50,000,000 where only 10% of the population even has access to the Internet, Facebook clearly plays a limited role in politics. However, Facebook functions as an ideal channel for Zille to play to her base—whites, coloreds and Asians.[321] These ethnicities comprise the wealthiest strata of South African society and as a result are more likely to have regular access to the Internet.[322]

Conversely, according to the African Media Development Initiative: South Africa, "Radio is the undisputed mass medium in South Africa," and almost 88% of South African homes contain a radio.[323] That same study noted that more than 92% of South Africans listen to the radio, and that African language radio stations dominate regional

listening figures, with four of the five top stations broadcasting in languages other than English.[324] Because of the financial limitations that curb access to media formats such as television or Internet, it is clear that radio plays an important role in politics in South Africa, where almost 88% of the (almost exclusively black) population lives on or below the "upper-bound" poverty line (R593 per capita per month or $88 USD).[325]

With every rhetorical event, Zille is making some impact on the exigential flow. The different mediums for communication, however, allow for a different impact. Zille's Facebook page works on an everyday level—users can visit her page at any time and see different updates, notes or pictures. Since the radio interviews are static and unchanging, they function differently than Facebook, simply because of the nature of the communicative event. The purpose of this chapter is to explorehow Zille uses these two different communication channels in her attempt to constitute her disparate audiences into a new people. Following Michael C. McGee and Louis Althusser, Maurice Charland argues that who a "people" are in any context is "open to rhetorical revision."[326] He further contends that "audiences are constituted as subjects through a process of identification . . . [which] occurs through a series of ideological effects arising from the narrative structure of constitutive rhetoric."[327] Audiences are therefore seen as embodied and are active participants in the rhetoric that is attempting to persuade them.

In Chapter One, I explained how Charland developed his theory of constitutive rhetoric through his analysis of the sovereignty claims made by Quebec in its bid for Independence from Canada. The discourse he examined sought to convince a specific population to vote for seccession, a population that first had to recognize themselves as the rhetorically framed "Quebecois." In a similar fashion, Zille is attempting to engage

audience members as a new community in South African democracy, a people who can transcend race, ethnicity and identity politics to make a new non-racialized government, an identity that would encourage them to vote for the DA. Charland's theory posits three ideological effects that guide my understanding of how Zille's rhetoric attempts to accomplish her goals: 1) the process of constituting a collective subject through narrative that fosters an identification superseding divisive individual, class or ethnic interests; 2) the positing of a transhistorical subjects; and 3) the illusion of freedom and agency of the narrative's protagonist.

In this chapter, I contend that Zille uses Facebook and radio as channels through which to address white and black audiences, presenting similar arguments in different communicative formats in hopes of constituting a new, unified, post-racial audience. These formats also allow Zille to co-create discourse with her audience in ways that allow them to actively participate in the dialogue that seeks to persuade them. I begin first with an analysis of Facebook and then examine the arguments made in two radio interviews given by Zille.

FACEBOOK AND THE WHITE AUDIENCE

The use of participatory media in political campaigns has rapidly grown worldwide and is transforming the way we encounter politics today. Politicians running for seats in Parliament, in presidential elections, and even local city councils, are increasingly using online media to disseminate information to potential voters and, using participatory websites such as Facebook, building dynamic online communities. As Andrew Chadwick points out, "the issue is no longer *whether* politics is online, but *in what form and with what consequences*."[328] Politicians like Zille recognize that social

media are tools to not just build a community, but literally to *create* a community, one that only comes into being through rhetoric. In this section I argue that Zille uses Facebook as a powerful constitutive force for non-black audiences.

Facebook is a relatively new political tool. Launched in 2004 as "The Facebook," founder Mark Zuckerberg designed the site be used as an interactive tool to link college students together on the Harvard University campus. The website soon expanded beyond Ivy League schools and by December of 2004 had already reached one million members. Membership has since been opened to anyone with an e-mail address and members can affiliate themselves with an ever-increasing number of networks – from academic institutions to cities to employers. In September 2006 the site actively invited political candidates for U.S. Senate and House of Representatives to participate in the site and created special interactive pages for campaigns. Since then politicians worldwide have created Facebook pages in an effort to reach potential voters.

Enabling identity expression, community building, and political participation, social networking sites are structured around niche audiences, although their appeal frequently evolves beyond a specific target market. Facebook at present consists of 500 million active users, handles 600 million searches and more than 30 billion page views a month.[329] This particular online social network application allows users to create their profiles, display pictures, accumulate and connect to friends and view each other's profiles. Currently, Facebook is ranked as the seventh most popular website on the Internet.[330] Facebook traditionally has been considered a site that focuses primarily on creating and performing individual identities, but it also increasingly helps shape how audiences think of national identity. Users can create or join groups such as "Proud South

Africa" or "Politics of South Africa," and co-create what it means to be South African.[331]

Users can also "like" a politician's Facebook page and participate with that community to build social norms, values and beliefs. For Zille, then, Facebook is a tool that is ideally suited for reframing both her white audience's individual identity as well as their sense of national identity.

What makes Facebook such an ideal tool is the ability to combine text with visual images to create feelings of consubstantiality with Zille's audience as well as the site's capacity as an interactive medium that allows users to co-create the discourse with Zille. In addition, Facebook allows Zille to present her message in what Rob Howard calls the "vernacular mode," which facilitates a dialogic form of communication with users.[332] Using Facebook, Zille employs four rhetorical strategies to constitute her audience: She 1) uses the interactive nature of Facebook to encourage users to participate in the narrative of her Facebook page, 2) utilizes the visual capabilities of Facebook to create a narrative that fosters an identification that transcends race, class and gender barriers, 3) positions her audience as transhistorical, and 4) provides a means of understanding how the narrative of her Facebook page connects to social action.

The overarching narrative Zille is trying to create is that of a non-racialized South Africa in which audience members are positioned as powerful agents who must overcome issues of race, class, and gender if South Africa is to continue as a free country. She creates this narrative through her status updates, picture posts, and a notes/discussion page. For example, on July 24, 2010, Zille posted a status update that read:

> South Africans are increasingly choosing to reject the politics of race.
> Culture, language, race and religion shape our identity. But more and
> more, South Africans are realizing that making a different political choice
> is not a threat to their identity. Each of us can confidently be who we are

only if we secure that right for everyone else. Each time we stand up for another's rights, we defend our own.

On September 9, 2010, Zille posted two updates wishing a happy Eid Mubarak to the Muslims of South Africa, and a "blessed Rosh Hashanah" to the Jewish people of South Africa In each post she also stated her wishes for a united South Africa: "The diversity you bring to the many cultures of South Africa is what makes us 'the rainbow nation of the world,'" "May it unite all Muslims, and South Africans at large." On November 5, 2010 she posted a special note wishing "all Hindu South Africans a heartfelt and happy Diwali . . . This Diwali is an acknowledgement of both yours and South Africa's journey from darkness to light over the last 150 years." On December 25, 2010, she posted a Merry Christmas update. These posts reinforce Zille's narrative of a united South Africa, where citizens celebrate difference, but do not vote based on difference.

The narrative Zille is creating is not new, but is consistent with her vision for South Africa that she presents in almost every speech, interview, or advertisement. What is significant about *this* narrative is that Facebook offers users a chance to participate in building that narrative. One of the most common ways Zille's Facebook page does this is through the "call to action" status update post. Status updates are one of the most immediate ways for Zille to reach her Facebook audience. Once she updates her status it is visible to everyone who visits the page, and shows up on the newsfeeds of her "friends." Though statuses are limited to 420 characters, the site allows for an unlimited number of updates.

An example of a post that calls for user participation is a question that Zille posed to users on October 17, 2009:

How would you respond if you learnt that the SA Government had been infiltrated by an organization that had never been elected, and whose aims were to eliminate private property, nationalize the mines and food, and abolish parliament? What if you learnt that this group had inserted ministers in government to drive policy objectives that have brought disaster everywhere in the world where they have been implemented?

The post received almost 400 answers that ranged from "Very shocking and scary! Please tell us it is not the truth?" to "If we could have proof of what amounts to a conspiracy theory, I would be intrigued to learn how we intended to reverse the situation." A number of posters asked Zille to provide steps to solve this problem, while others asked for evidence of these accusations. In response, other users posted links to news articles as evidence of Zille's claims, or advised members to register and vote for the DA. From this post we can see how Zille uses Facebook to get members to participate in the very dialogue that creates them and urges them to vote for the DA.

Another example of community participation can be seen when Zille posted a note on March 13, 2009 asking supporters to change their profile pictures to that of the DA logo to show support for DA policies and candidates:

This coming Saturday, 14 March, is DA T-shirt Day, in which DA volunteers and members will be coming together at various venues across the country to campaign for the DA in their DA t-shirts . . . if you cannot make it to an event your area, you can still get involved in this initiative right here on Facebook, by updating your profile picture with the DA logo.

In another post, Zille created a series of posts over four days (April 6-9, 2010) that pointed to Zuma as an example of the problems of corruption facing South Africa:

Dropping the charges against Zuma is irrational and unlawful. The DA is now finalizing its plan to take the matter further through the legal system.

This morning, on behalf of the DA, I filed an application in the North Gauteng High Court for a judicial review of the decision by the National Director of Public Prosecutions to withdraw corruption charges against Jacob Zuma.

Zuma is not innocent, and the DA is going to fight this with everything we have.

Take a look at our final push website: www.helpstopzuma.co.za - donate to our legal challenge fund, sign our petition, or become a volunteer

These posts serve two important functions. First they appeal to the common South African identity as "defenders of democracy," and second they create a tangible call to action for supporters. As Zille's Chief of Staff Geordin Hill-Lewis noted, "People see themselves as rebels, as Freedom Fighters. They want to participate in the defense of democracy in South Africa."[333] Painting a picture of Zuma and the ANC as corrupt and racist inspires Zille's audience to become supporters of the DA, and to become part of her collective ideological vision. The last post—a call to action—serves as an invitation for audiences to actively work to maintain the consistency of the narrative. If audiences see themselves in the narrative Zille is creating, then when she offers them a chance for action either for the DA or against the ANC they can participate in a way that reaffirms the narrative and their place in it. This participation is a key element in constituting an audience. As stated earlier, Charland considers that persuasion and audiences are not two separate concepts, but allows for audience members to "participate in the very discourse by which they would be 'persuaded.'"[334]

Another way for users to participate in a more substantial manner in the co-creation of Zille's narrative is by participating on her notes and discussion page. The notes section of a Facebook page functions as a pseudo blog for members. Instead of being limited to the 420 characters of a status update, members can write as much as they want in the notes section, which also has a comment function for viewers. In this section Zille spends a considerable amount of time fleshing out the arguments found in her status

updates, such as those related to the need for transparent government, the issue of crime, and the problem of HIV/AIDs. Again, these are not new arguments for the audience, but Facebook offers a rare chance for audience members to read and comment on Zille's arguments—making the process more active and collaborative than, for example, listening to a speech. A note that was posted on April 20, 2011 titled "You can choose a party that cares about you" had 549 "likes" and almost 300 comments.[335] In an earlier note titled "By-election victories: DA grows, ANC in decline" posted May 27, 2010 there was 1,460 "likes" and almost 400 comments.

The discussion page also has an important participatory function. In this section, members are largely unsupervised and able to create a discussion in which any Facebook user can participate.[336] The discussion page has almost 600 discussion threads started, with as few as a single reply, to as many as 113 replies. This section of Facebook is particularly well suited to Howard's idea of the vernacular. He writes, "When . . . content is marked by cues of noninstitutionalism, it dialectically invokes the vernacular."[337] However, he notes that "all such content flows are made possible by institutional power," and that as a result, "any such vernacular communication is the result of a hybrid agency."[338] A Facebook page created by a political agent, particularly one such one as Zille, who is the official opposition to the ANC, is clearly an institutional outlet. However, the freedom for users to interact with, change, and create the discourse found on her Facebook page reifies the notion of Facebook as a noninstitutional entity. Therefore, this division embodies Howard's hybrid understanding of the term "vernacular."

The term "vernacular" is a widely contested term in communication studies, though two distinct conceptions of this word inform Howard's use of the word: the "subaltern vernacular" and the "common vernacular."[339] The subaltern view of the vernacular emphasizes a community of agents who are alternate to *institutions*, while the common view of the vernacular identifies the community as alternate to institutionally empowered *speaking situations*.[340] Both perspectives conceive the vernacular as "an agency alternate to dominant power," and both assume a strict division between the vernacular and institutional.[341] However, participatory media like Facebook have an ability to channel complex and even conflicting intentions into single network locations.

These new forms of Internet media are dominated by an emphasis on audience participation. This makes them unlike old media, which offers little opportunity for interactivity. Participatory media shifts the emphasis from the consumption of "monologic discourse" often associated with old media like television and newspapers, to the "interactive, modular, and coproduced discourse associated with face-to-face communication."[342] In this media environment, single online texts emerge from multiple voices. Howard contends, "A Website like FaceBook.com [sic] or MySpace.com creates hundreds of thousands of hybridized texts that incorporate both vernacular and institutional content and agencies."[343]

As of April 2011, Zille had 165 notes, and the discussion page had 505 discussion threads. Here, vernacularity emerges when users take Zille's official, institutional position on certain topics posted in a seemingly noninstitutional location and comment on it.[344] Many of the users enact the identity that Zille is creating for them, that of DA supporters, but are frequently challenged by non-supporters, both ANC members and

members of other smaller parties. Users have the ability to either comment directly on a posted note, or create a discussion post themselves. In the posts users generally refer back to the original post by Zille through direct quotations or paraphrasing. Within that feedback, users who don't support Zille create vernacularity by inserting subversive political statements that are cued as vernacular because they pop out at the audience as alternate from the very text to which they are referring.

On the opposite end of the spectrum there are those members who express support for the institution from the position of the noninstitutional. For example on July 10, 2009, Zille posted a note on her Facebook page titled "Scrapping the Provinces Threatens our Democracy." In the note, Zille discusses the debate on the future of the Provinces, stating, "The ANC seems to be considering three options for the future of the provinces: 1) Turning provinces into administrative arms of central government. 2) Reducing the number of provinces through mergers. 3) Scrapping the provincial sphere of government altogether." The post received 87 comments and 195 "likes." In the discussion section, a post also was created by a user titled "The Republic of the Western Cape?" where viewers discussed the possibility of separating the Western Cape from the rest of the country. The overwhelming majority of responses to the discussion post supported this position:

> The majority here would definitely choose this is given a chance. Our people are fed up with the ANC.

> I am 100% in favor of Cape Independence!!! . . . and so is EVERYONE I know.

> it would be "heaven on earth" to read about all the shit going on in the country and think: "Oh wait a minute, that does not really apply to me, 'cause I live in a different country/republic, with a different/better leader, and different/better laws!" Imagine that. I can dream can't I?

In these responses, the participants use cues to their vernacular position to perform a noninstitutional identity. These cues emerge both in various stated identities such as "the majority," "our people," "everyone I know" and in the informality cultivated by the use of multiple punctuation marks, and lower case spelling at the beginning of sentences.

While these users agree with the institutional in part—that the Provinces should continue to have power—they make it clear that their agreement with this position is their choice, and most importantly, outside the bounds of the institution. Expressing support for the institution from the position of the noninstitutional, these assertions of what Howard terms "alterity," from the institutional "still renders their intentionality alternate."[345]

As a result of these assertions of alterity, the expression emerges as hybrid. Structurally, the vernacular voice must "construct the institutional as previous so that it can dialectically assert its alterity."[346] In the case at hand, the priority of the institutional is literal in the sense that Zille first created the site at which the vernacular voice was later able to speak. At the level of "discursive structure," the vernacular imagines the institutional as prior in the sense that it is "noninstitutional." Keeping in mind, in order to be "noninstitutional," an institution must first exist from which to express distinction. In this sense then, the institutional contributes to "the creation of the agency that enables the expression of an alternate intentionality."[347]

The second rhetorical strategy Zille utilizes to build a constituency is the use of the visual capabilities of Facebook to create a narrative that fosters an identification that transcends race, class and gender barriers. This functions on two levels: 1) through the pictures she posts directly onto her Facebook page in the albums section, and 2) by

visually linking her page with users' pages through comments posted by users and updates pictured on users' newsfeeds.

The images posted to Zille's photo album serve as a type of visual ideograph, a way to cue the audience to the broader ideology suggested by the visual image. Andrew Mendelson writes that with regard to visual imagery, the communicative functions of unifying an audience and values transmission are explained in terms of the connotative rather than denotative meaning of the image.[348] In mass media, visual images function across time, as a body of messages sometimes referred to as "iconology," a linguistic system in which meaning is made in patterns.[349] Such patterns are not pre-set, but rather are co-created with and by "audience-participants." As Meg Spratt, April Peterson and Taso Lagos explain, the creation of an "iconic" image cannot be predetermined but involves "encoding" (message construction) and "decoding" (message consumption) by a producer and consumer alike.[350] Accordingly, images must then create cultural frames and provide significant ways for audiences to perceive and understand their surroundings, values and history.[351]

Robert Hariman and John Lucaites add to this discussion a working definition of the iconic photograph, developed in connection with their study of the Rosenthal Iwo Jima photo.[352] They argue that iconic photographs do the following: reflect social knowledge and dominant ideologies; shape understanding of specific events and periods; influence potential action by modeling relationships between civic actors; provide figural resources for subsequent communicative action; and provide resources for thought and feeling necessary to constitute people as citizens and motivate their identification with and participation in specific forms of collective life.[353] Hariman and Lucaites argue that

iconic photos have "achieved a social status beyond their mere visual representation of fact, to symbolize historic American themes."[354] When this happens, visual images have the potential to elicit shared emotional reactions, and at times, even the impetus to political action on the part of the audience.[355]

Zille's Facebook photos cannot be considered iconic images, but they do mirror iconic images, prompting an emotional reaction from the audience through the mechanism of association. For example, in one photo album posted by Zille, she is seen physically linking arms with two of her supporters, an older black man and a middle-aged colored woman, in a show of solidarity (see figure 1).[356] This picture elicits two strong emotional reactions: a feeling of identification with the iconic image and legacy of Nelson Mandela (see figure 2), and a link to a national identification as an freedom fighter, specifically an anti-apartheid protestor.

Figure 1

As discussed in Chapter Three, Nelson Mandela is a national hero to black South Africans—commonly referred to as the Father of the Nation. This image holds true for many white South Africans as well, and Mandela's notion of a "Rainbow Nation" is a key part of the South African identity for both blacks and whites. The term "Rainbow Nation" was actually first coined by Archbishop Desmond Tutu to describe post-apartheid South Africa after South Africa's first fully democratic election in 1994. The phrase was then elaborated upon by President Nelson Mandela in his first

month of office, when he proclaimed: "Each of us is as intimately attached to the soil of this beautiful country as are the famous jacaranda trees of Pretoria and the mimosa trees of the bushveld—a rainbow nation at peace with itself and the world."[357]

The term is also a nod to indigenous cultures; the rainbow is often associated with hope and a bright future in Xhosa and Zulu culture, the two largest tribes in South Africa. While the phrase has served to discursively create a national identity with which multiple ethnicities can associate, it also functions as a broad-based guide to national policy. It is important to

Figure 2

understand that neither Mbeki or Zuma continued this vision of South Africa as a Rainbow Nation. Thabo Mbeki's notion of a unified South Africa was more focused on South Africans as Africans. In his most famous speech "I am an African," Mbeki called for an identity based not on color, but on location, that is, the African continent.[358] Jacob Zuma has not yet managed to articulate a unique South African identity; instead, he has focused on his particular ethnicity as a Zulu. Zille's return to this notion of a Rainbow Nation therefore grants her a link with the past and with the legendary figure of Nelson Mandela.

This particular picture was taken on Saturday, September 18, when Zille, Patricia de Lille, DA Youth Leader Makashule Gana and DA Member of Parliament and former journalist, Sej Motau, led a protest march against the Protection of Information Bill and

the ANC's proposed Media Appeals Tribunal. The four leaders delivered speeches

outside the Constitutional Court in Johannesburg to a large audience of supporters.

Protest is a common form of political discourse in South Africa and provides a link

between past and present identities. During the anti-apartheid movement one of the few

ways white citizens felt they could be involved in the anti-apartheid movement, besides

Figure 3

through their vote, was through participation in

protest marches. This was especially for white

women, who had limited access to official

channels of political power to create change.

As a result, the picture of Zille protesting

triggers an emotional response from viewers

that links them with iconic images from the

anti-apartheid movement, such as the black and white photo of a the protest in Soweto

during the student uprising of 1976 (see figure 3). Ancestry then is presented here as

almost as a material link between one group and another. According to Charland, the

rhetorical appeal of "ancestry" is that time "is collapsed as narrative identifications"

occur and a "collective agent" emerges that "transcends the limitations of individuality at

any historical moment and transcends the death of individuals across history."[359]

Zille's album also functions as a way to visually represent what the future would

look like under DA management—an important function in a society that has only seen a

racist and destructive white government. For example, in a picture posted on March 27,

2011, from the DA Campaign and Manifesto launch (see figure 4), Zille is seen

surrounded by a crowd of largely black men, with the notable exception of one older

white man with his back to the camera, smiling and reaching out. Even the security

guard, seen with arms outstretched holding back the mass of supporters, is smiling and

happy to be at the rally. In turn, the audience seems almost joyful, waving, and proudly

wearing the signature blue DA shirts. Zille is centered in the photo, clearly the hero come

to reunite the country. Notice, too, Zille's right hand, clasped with that of a black

audience member. The viewer cannot see who this man is; indeed, beyond the fact that he

(or she) is black, the identity of the individual audience member does not matter. Zille,

front and center, is reaching out and holding hands with her black constituency,

signifying that she is willing to reach out to her black constituents and work together with

them. This photo is Zille's ideology at work, a snapshot of the future of South Africa.

Though it is a fragmentary representation of the event, the power of this photo serves

both to show audiences Zille's willingness to work with the black population, and

illustrate the multi-racial future of South Africa under Zille. White audiences see Zille

 smiling and reaching out, working eagerly with her black constituents, creating a sense of identification with Zille, showing that whites can work

Figure 4

successfully with their black counterparts. As discussed in Chapter 2, white South

African identity is heavily rooted in racial superiority, class, and a fear of black

dominance. To give up one's status as "white" is to lose the privilege and power that comes with that racial designation. Zille needs to show her audience that is possible for whites and blacks to work together without one of the other marginalized or othered.

The visuality of Facebook also allows users to connect themselves to Zille through pictures on their newsfeed and profile pages. When a user comments on any part of Zille's page—with a note or a status update—or creates a discussion topic, they also create a visual link between themselves and Zille. When a user does almost anything on Facebook, the activity is posted both on their friends' newsfeeds, as well as on their own profile page. Generally, when a user comments on something the comment, along with the original post, is shown, producing a visual connection between comment and commentator (see figure 5). By linking themselves visually to Zille and the DA, Facebook users acknowledge the role played by Zille in their identity. Early research on online identity construction focused on anonymous sites and found that users of such sites tended to play-act at being someone else or act out their underlying negative impulses in the online world. However, on non-anonymous sites such as Facebook users try and project a "real self," or an "idealized self" that more accurately represents their identity in the real world than on anonymous sites. Research has shown that one of the ways users create this identity is through pictures.[360] The visual self—projected via the inclusion of large numbers of photographs—is termed the "self as social actor."[361] It is as if the user is saying, "Watch me and know me by my friends." By "showing without telling," Facebook users seek to make certain implicit identity claims aimed at generating desired impressions on their viewers. It is important to note that users do have the option of deleting or "hiding" this visual link to their activity on Zille's Facebook page, so if that

visual image is left for a user it seems to imply that Zille and the DA play a strong role in how the user sees herself or himself.

Figure 5

The third rhetorical strategy Zille employs to constitute her audience is to position her audience as transhistorical through pictures as well as through status updates and notes. Historical narratives provide a framework for audiences to identify collectively with their past and with each other (and perhaps more significantly with the rhetor) in the present. Zille is careful to mark historical anniversaries with an update remembering the event and linking it with the present:

> Fifty years ago today 69 people were killed at Sharpeville, and a few days later, 20 people were killed in Langa, for protesting against apartheid's pass laws. They paid the ultimate price in the struggle for liberty, equality and dignity. They will not be forgotten. As we celebrate Human Rights Day, we should reflect on the very real threats to our human rights and what we must do to counteract these threats.
>
> Tomorrow, we mark the twentieth anniversary of the release of Nelson Mandela from prison. Let us be mindful of the fragility of the covenant he bequeathed us. Without his leadership, we would not have a Constitution today. More importantly, let us remember that, unless we all commit

> ourselves to honouring Mandela's true legacy, we may not have a
> Constitution tomorrow
>
> Our Day of Reconciliation reminds us how far we have come as a nation.
> It symbolizes the advances we have made towards ending discrimination
> and it offers us an opportunity to reflect upon, and celebrate, the
> remarkable work of many South Africans in building a united society for
> all. We must still continue to foster tolerance and compassion.

This type of narrative is one that interprets the actions of an individual with respect to a

"collective agent."[362] Charland explains,

> It is within the formal structure of a narrative history that it is possible to
> conceive of a set of individuals as if they were but one. Thus, the
> "struggles" and "ordeals" of settlers, as a set of individual acts and
> experiences, become identified with "community," a term that here masks
> or negates tensions and differences between any members of society.[363]

This histories of a people create a sense of what Burke calls "consubstantiality," a state

where audience members feel "substantially one" with the rhetor.[364] This process results

in a collapsing of time as narrative identification occurs—a concrete link for audience

members that connects the past with the present.

In a note posted on November 19, 2010, titled "Truth is the First Casualty," Zille

blogs about the service delivery protests occurring throughout the country, especially in

the Western Cape. However, she contends that these protests are carefully orchestrated

media events that the ANC Youth League is directing in order to unseat the DA. She

writes:

> In the ANC-dominated wards of Cape Town, there is yet another
> dimension at play because the ANC is determined to do whatever it takes to
> unseat the DA-led coalition in the City. Their agenda is to create the
> illusion of spontaneous community anger at lack of service delivery, to
> reinforce their lie that the DA does not care about the poor.

What is important about this post is the implication that the media is in "in bed" with the

ANC and the ANC Youth League. This has strong resonance with many South Africans

who remember the censorship forced on the media during apartheid. During the apartheid era, newspapers had to apply for registration if they published more than eleven times a year.[365] The government also enforced regulations controlling what newspapers could or could not publish, especially relating to articles and comment on activities against the apartheid system. Newspapers were, for instance, not allowed to quote banned organizations or their spokesperson, or report on conditions inside prisons or on the activities of the security forces.[366] At the height of the anti-apartheid struggle in the 1980s, when two states of emergency were declared, censorship regulations were tightened even further. Newspapers were barred from reporting on any demonstrations or activity against the apartheid government or any of its laws. The threat of closure forced newspaper editors to apply a self-censorship policy, while other papers printed blank pages or whole paragraphs blacked out as a sign of protest.[367] Not only does this post serve as a tie to the past then, but creates feelings of fear that the ANC is following in the footsteps on the apartheid era National Party, and worse, the fear that the ANC will eventually turn South Africa into the next Zimbabwe.[368]

This fear is only heightened by the current controversy surrounding the government funding of the country's largest media outlet, the South African Broadcasting Corporation (SABC). Starting in 2005 several independently minded news editors from both radio and television left in the SABC in succession, leaving their posts free for the ANC to appointment militantly-loyal party comrades in their place. As noted by Max du Preez, a columnist for the Independent newspaper syndicate, "Under Mbeki's watch, the former Umkhonto we Sizwe commissar took over the news division of the SABC and started running it like an old-style liberation movement's propaganda tool."[369] In 2007, at

the 52nd National Conference of the ANC, a new board for the SABC was "unilaterally

approved," spurring accusations that the ANC was interfering in the Broadcasting Act of

1999 and biasing the press in unhealthy ways.[370] An unexpected consequence of this

situation was that a number of alienated journalists and editors moved back into the print

media and proved to be an adversarial sector of the press that has continued to make

claims of an impending government take-over of the media.

In another note posted on November 1, 2010 titled "A Very South African

Identity Crisis," Zille speaks directly to her audience about the way the past has

complicated the future. Specifically she refers to the end of apartheid, when the majority

of South Africans happily identified with Nelson Mandela and the ANC. Zille writes,

"They [ANC supporters] are nostalgic for 'the moral high ground'—a place the ANC

once claimed exclusively as its own. And so they look for ways to regain that comfort,

without breaking ties with the ANC." She continues, saying, "They believe that the ANC

can be rescued from itself; they blame individuals in government for the ANC's failures

but remain 'loyal cadres' of the movement . . . at heart they remain loyal to what they

believe the ANC once was and what, they trust, it can still become." Though the ANC

has struggled to retain minority voters such as whites, Indians, coloreds and Asians, the

party is still seen as a legacy of Mandela from which the country is loathe to part. Zille

speaks to this reluctance when she writes:

> I know how this feels because I was once caught in this identity crisis
> myself. I have long since given up the illusion that the ANC can be
> rescued from itself. The ANC's dominant ideology of racial nationalism
> and political patronage is now so entrenched that it cannot be reversed by
> well-meaning individuals trying to resurrect the values of Nelson Mandela.

This struggle over what the national identity of South Africa should be speaks to all

segments of the population, and in some ways, even more so for white South Africans.

Much like being black in America, the issue of race in many cases also seems to parallel

issues of national identity, that is who belongs and who doesn't. In the case of white

Afrikaner South Africans this issue is complicated even more by the fact that the

Afrikaner people have no homeland besides South Africa and consider themselves as

native as any black African.

The last rhetorical strategy I discuss is the ability of Zille's Facebook to provide a

means of understanding how the narrative created on her Facebook page connects to

social action, in this instance reconstituting audiences as DA supporters. In a sense,

Zille's Facebook page functions as a sophisticated advertisement for audiences.

Advertising discourse constitutes viewers as "deficient in some quality, attribute, or value

such as happiness or liberty, a deficiency constructed as happily remedied through the

consumption of material objects."[371] In terms of Charland's third ideological effect—the

illusion of freedom and agency of the narrative's protagonist—ad narratives construct

subjects as motivated by lack, sent into the world as "acquisitive agents."[372] Though

Zille's Facebook page is not a "political ad" in the traditional sense, Zille is clearly

"selling" herself based on the lack of true democracy in South Africa; the solution to this

lack, it follows, is to vote for Zille and the DA. The ideological and rhetorical work to

transform viewers into subjects takes place at two different levels, what Sarah Rein terms

"the cognitive and the emotional."[373] I posit that Zille's Facebook page creates a

compelling narrative that provides strong possibilities for identification through the use

of multi-layered arguments that position South Africa as "lacking" and viewers as

powerful agents who can create change.

There are three major arguments found on Zille's Facebook page that work both as avenues for identification and a way to show South Africa as lacking: 1) delivery of services for all, 2) a focus on personal agency and responsibility, and 3) the DA as the practical and moral superior to the ANC. Even within this minority audience of whites, Indians, coloreds, and Asians, Zille knows there are significant identity issues. For example, within the Indian population there is a deep divide between Muslim Indians and Hindu Indians; for colored citizens, many are torn between their differing ethnicities, much like multi-racial people in the United States. As a result Zille must work to provide multiple ways for these distinctive populations to identity with the DA.

In February 1995, the South African government launched Operation Masakhane ("let's build together"). According to Jay Naidoo, the Cabinet Minister responsible for the ANC's Reconstruction and Development Program, the main aim of Masakhane was to facilitate "the restructuring of governance institutions so as to put the country on a path of sustainable development."[374] A key component of Operation Masakhane was urging residents to pay for services such as water, electricity, sewerage, and refuse collection. At the height of apartheid many citizens took up the ANC's call to make the country ungovernable. A central tactic for advancing ungovernability was withholding payment to unelected and unrepresentative black local authorities—those blacks put in place by the white government to control black homelands.[375] As a result, millions of residents simply stopped paying bills for rates and services in what was called a "rates boycott."[376] When the first democratic elections took place in 1994, however, the "crisis of legitimacy" ended.[377] With a popularly elected government in place, municipalities expected people to pay. David McDonald and John Pape argue that "at the time,

Masakhane seemed like an inevitable step in the transition to democracy."[378] But by 1997

Jeremy Cronon, a leading ANC and South African Communist Party (SACP) stalwart,

admitted that the message had simply become one of "black communities must pay

up."[379] Leading figures like Archbishop Desmond Tutu and civic leader Moses Mayekiso

were drafted for publicity campaigns. Yet, despite the millions of rands spent on the

campaign the financial yields were minimal. In some cases, payment rates for municipal

services actually declined.[380] The result is that there are large populations, mostly black,

who have no access to basic services like clean running water, electricity, and garbage

disposal. For whites and other minorities this is seen as a stumbling block to true

democracy, and is also seen as an unfair financial burden on a very specific audience—

the wealthier white population. In order for poor black communities to begin paying for

these services, they must first have access to them. For example, residents of these

townships struggle to finish school because they have no light in the evenings, which

makes finishing homework almost impossible. Similarly, some residents have trouble

finding a job because they don't have enough water in which to bathe or wash their

clothes. However, these services are not free, so they are paid for by the government,

which then taxes the only group that can and will pay for them—the financial and racial

minority.

    A focus on personal agency and responsibility is an argument that has the potential

to strike a chord with many white South Africans. In many ways white South Africans

live in a country with a culture that is very similar to western cultures like the United

States or the United Kingdom. They tend to hold values like individualism and

independence in high esteem, and see Zille's focus on those traits as integral to their

identities. This focus on agency largely takes the form of voting as the ultimate act to change South Africa.

In addition, this focus on personal agency and responsibility provides the solution to her narrative of lack. For example, Zille posted a number of notes and status updates as the municipal elections, scheduled for March 8, 2011, drew near:

> Help us change South Africa. Register to vote in the upcoming Local Government Elections. This weekend is your last chance to register. Call 0861 CALL DA (2255 32) if you have any questions (March 3, 2011)

> Your vote is your power to effect change in South Africa. To vote you must be registered. This weekend, 5 and 6 March, is the last opportunity to register. Call 0861 CALL DA (2255 32) for any queries (March 2, 2011)

> In a democracy, people get the government they deserve. It starts with registering to vote in elections. This weekend, 5-6 February, the Independent Electoral Commission (IEC) is holding its first voter registration weekend, ahead of this year's local government elections (February 4, 2011)

> Help us fix local government by becoming a DA candidate for the 2011 Local Government Elections. Nominations close on 8 October 2010 (September 4, 2010)

As discussed in Chapter Three, passive resistance among black voters is a serious problem for Zille, but it is an issue that has started to become more and more of a problem with white voters as they become disillusioned with the monolithic ANC and their domination of politics in South Africa. Zille needs to continue to remind her constituency that their vote is the most powerful tool they have to change the country, and that the only way to defeat the ANC, and return South Africa to a true democracy, is to vote for Zille and the DA.

The last major argument found on Zille's Facebook page is the claim that Zille and the DA are practically and morally superior to the ANC. In the practical sense, Zille

claims that the DA has done more for the Western Cape in the few months she has been

Premier, than the ANC has done for the country in the last seventeen years. On May 9,

2010 she posted a note titled "Zuma's Presidency One Year On," in which she examines

the progress, or lack thereof, of Zuma's administration. For example, she states that

"Jacob Zuma has revealed himself to have a poor grasp of policy. He is puzzled about the

reasons for the outcry every time he says that the ANC is more important than the

Constitution. He consistently refuses to engage in policy debates with leaders of

opposition parties, because he is out of his depth." She also argues that "When he [Zuma]

assumed office, he promised to create 500,000 jobs by the end of his first year in office.

In fact, over 500,000 jobs have been lost in his first twelve months in office." She

concludes by writing that "after a year in office, Zuma is out of his depth. He is paralysed

by his own populism, he has failed to provide moral leadership and he has placed his own

loyalists in control of key levers of power, to enrich and protect each other, and

particularly himself."

In terms of morality Zille argues that Zuma not only does not lead the life of a

leader, but actively sets a bad example for South Africans. In one status update posted on

May 10, 2010 she writes:

> A leader should lead by example. He should be above reproach in his
> political and social conduct. This is where Zuma falls particularly short. It
> is increasingly obvious that the culture of corruption which has escalated in
> the ANC under his tenure is directly attributable to his conduct. He has
> undermined the independence of the criminal justice system to get off
> corruption charges and to place himself and his closest allies above the law.

In another post she lambasts Zuma for his hypocrisy and double standard when it comes

to safe sexual practices and the lack of government action in dealing with the HIV/AIDs

epidemic:

And then there was the revelation that Zuma fathered a child out of wedlock just as he was admonishing those who have unprotected sex with multiple partners. In doing so, he undermined, at a stroke, his own government's efforts to fight the pandemic. I don't believe that his recent public announcement of his HIV-negative status has helped in the fight against AIDS either. On the contrary, he has now sent out the message that risky sexual behaviour can be consequence-free. Many impressionable young people will rationalise: if the President can get away with it, why can't I?

Zille has posted numerous status updates and notes discussing the issue of crime and corruption in South Africa as well as Zuma's tendency to "play the race card" when faced with tough issues. On May 16, 2010 she posted this status update:

Whatever goes wrong, the ANC blame apartheid and play the race card. When they cannot deliver, they say it's because the constitution was designed to protect whites. Real, progressive change is what the DA must bring about where we govern. The more we succeed, the more we will show SA that their choice for the future is not a choice between race groups, nor a choice between the ANC and apartheid.

These three arguments run throughout Zille's Facebook page and serve the dual purpose of creating a compelling narrative that provides strong possibilities for identification through the use of multi-layered arguments. As well, these arguments act as a type of advertisement that showcases South Africa's deficiencies as a result of Zuma's presidency and positions the audience as powerful agents who can create change by voting for Zille and the DA.

Facebook is a unique way for Zille to access her white audience. As previously discussed, in a country of almost 50,000,000 where only 10% of the population even has access to the Internet, Facebook clearly plays a limited role in national politics. However, Facebook functions as an ideal channel for Zille to play to her base—whites, colored and Asians—and use her rhetoric as constitutive force to reshape what it means to be South Africans for this particular population.[381] What makes Facebook an ideal format

for her rhetoric to function constitutively is 1) the ability to combine text with visual images to create feelings of consubstantiality with her audience, and 2) the site's capacity as an interactive medium that allows users to co-create the discourse with the Zille. In addition, Facebook also allows Zille to present her message in what Ron Howard calls the "vernacular mode," which facilitates a dialogic form of communication with users. However, looking at Zille's radio address it is clear that while many of the arguments presented are the same as those on Zille's Facebook page, there are certain arguments that are emphasized for the black audience that are not for her white audience.

RADIO AND THE BLACK AUDIENCE

As previously noted, the particular media format of Facebook, while ideal for Zille's non-black audience, does little to help Zille reconstitute her black audience. In order to access this all-important audience, Zille turns to the radio. Cheap, portable, and requiring no literacy, radio has long been the most accessed form of media in South Africa, reaching beyond urban centers deep into the poorest and most remote rural areas.[382] There is one radio set for every five South Africans: an estimated 10 million radios (and listeners many times that number) in a population of almost 50 million.[383] Radio services are broadcast in all 11 official languages, as well as in German, Hindi, Portuguese and the San Bushman languages of !Xu and Khwe.[384] Clearly, radio commands vast listenership across the country, with community stations catering to specific target audiences and national stations drawing in people from across the nation.

Political call-in talk shows are a relatively new type of radio show in most of Africa. It is a phenomenon that had not been witnessed before on a continent where government officials had dominated the airwaves with top-down information, usually in

the form of monologues and official pronouncements. In several African countries,

opposition politicians and civil society activists now have an opportunity to compete with

government leaders to get their message across, in part because of the availability of

political talk radio, and the recent accessibility of cell phones.[385] In addition, and perhaps

more importantly, the public has an opportunity to call in and express their concerns and

views, challenge official power, let off steam, listen and learn about political

developments and the opinions of other citizens and talk directly with politicians. Most

political communication studies pay attention to the media's role as a major source of

information for a majority of people.[386] Indeed, information is central to representative

democracy because citizens can only make meaningful choices of their leaders if they

have accurate information about their stand on issues, the interests they represent, and

their record in government. However, the media, particularly interactive forms such as

talk shows, are more than just "information vessels."[387] They can be forums of

participation in their own right. As Erik Bucy and Kimberly Gregson argue, "interactive

political experiences that occur in cyberspace, via cable channels and over the airwaves

are deemed every bit as 'real,' useful and important as their non-mediated corollaries."[388]

    For this chapter, I focused my analysis on two specific radio interviews that Zille

participated in that are emblematic of her larger radio strategy. The first interview,

conducted by Redi Direko, was broadcast on March 26, 2010 on the show *Talk Radio

702* and later was re-broadcast on 567 Cape Talk. The second interview was broadcast in

January 31, 2011 on the radio station SAfm, a station owned by the South African

Broadcasting Corporation (SABC). The host of *Morning Talk*, Siki Mgabadeli conducted

the interview, and posted it on YouTube February 1, 2011. Both of these stations are

historic radio stations in South Africa, whose presence datesback to the 1930s. SAfm is a national radio station that was first known as Radio South Africa. Prior to that it was called the English Service.[389] It was launched as the "A" service when the SABC was established by an Act of Parliament in 1936 and was the Corporation's very first radio station. The "B" service (broadcast in Afrikaans) was launched a year later in 1937. Currently the SABC has 16 radio stations, only two of which broadcast in English, and SAfm is the leading talk radio station.[390] Radio 702 is currently a commercial FM radio station based in Johannesburg, but has an important history as an anti-apartheid radio station. Founded in 1980 as a young adult music station, it moved to a talk radio format in 1988 where it was one of only two independent sources of broadcast news during the apartheid era. Because the transmitters for the station were located in the nominally independent homeland of Bophuthatswana, the South African government could not impose restrictions on the content aired or influence the editorial and news content. This relative freedom of speech provided an important platform for opponents of the apartheid administration, and the station is recognized as having contributed to the peaceful transition of South Africa to a democratic society.[391] The station has won many awards for excellence, and is partially owned by Mineworkers Investment Company, a black economic empowerment company.[392]

Because Zille is calling for a new national identity for South Africans, her rhetoric functions as a constitutive force that is trying to call into being this new South Africa, a truly non-racial government with a people who vote on policy rather than race. Zille's radio interviews function as constitutive moments because they offer a number of arguments that South Africans today are a people oppressed by the ANC and would be

better off under a DA-run government. The format of the call-in talk show also allows voters a direct chance to talk with Zille, and in an even more immediate and intimate, though limited, way than Facebook, co-create the discourse that persuades them. The identity of a new non-racial South Africa offers an "ultimate identification permitting an overcoming or going beyond of divisive individual or class interests and concerns."[393] The arguments that she offers form the basis for this re-articulation of identity and take the form of a narrative in which the "new" South Africans who were identified with the anti-apartheid movement fought for the right to vote. Charland argues that "narratives 'make real' coherent subjects. They constitute subjects as they present a particular textual position . . . as the locus for action and experience . . . Consequently, narratives offer a world in which human agency is possible and acts can be meaningful."[394] The arguments that make up Zille's narrative are threefold: 1) People are free and powerful agents who can affect change through their vote, 2) the ANC is a racial nationalist party and the DA espouses an "Open Opportunity Society for All" policy, and 3) the role of the opposition party is to serve as the institutional embodiment of the people.

Zille's argument that the people are free and powerful agents who can affect change through their vote is a major theme of her campaign. As discussed in Chapter Three, the boycotting of elections is a serious issue facing the DA. An even more pressing problem is the active call to boycott elections from various organizations throughout South Africa. For example, a group called "Nope!" claims to "refuse the logic of election politics because [they] refuse to accept that a small cross on a ballot can ever constitute democracy."[395] This movement of actively boycotting elections in a post-apartheid democracy was founded during the 2004 elections, when the Landless People's

Movement (LPM) initiated the "No Land! No Vote!" campaign to express a vote of no confidence in the range of political parties on offer in the elections. The group Abahlali Base Mjondolo (ABM), literally translated as "people living in shacks," joined the boycott during the 2006 local elections and changed the campaign slogan to "No Land! No House! No Vote!"[396] The campaign is now organized under the banner of the Poor People's Alliance, an alliance that comprises, among others, LPM, ABM Durban, ABM Western Cape, Sikhula Sonke and the Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign (WCAEC). Recently, the Anti-Privatization Forum (APF), a "War on Want" partner based in Johannesburg, also opted to boycott the forthcoming elections.[397] The results of this ideology are startling. In 1999, the second national election since the end of apartheid, 89.3% of the population voted.[398] In contrast, in 2009 only 77.9% of the population voted.[399] In 10 years voter turnout has gone down by more than 10%.

In an effort to counteract this movement Zille must convince voters that the only way to express their displeasure with the ruling group and effect change is to vote. In the 2010 interview on *Talk Radio 702* Zille repeatedly says, "Voters hold the power," and "Voters get the government they deserve—they get to decide who leads them and who speaks for them." She references the Western Cape as an example of the people's power, saying, "People in the Western Cape saw the effects of ANC rule and made a different decision, which is their right and their choice." Zille went on to point out that "According to the National Department, Capetonians, across the board, 90 percent of them, have access to sanitation which is far higher than any other metro." In her 2011 interview she refers to an unspecified government study that showed that "more poor people get services, free services, where the DA governs." In her 2010 interview she reminds voters

that "you can decide your future in a democracy . . . you have the power," in an effort to instill a sense of agency in her voters. Also in her 2010 radio interview, Zille talks about her recent visit to the township of Alexandra in the Guateng Province, just outside of Johannesburg. During her visit there she said "people kept asking me for help—to get basic services—but I can't. I haven't been voted into power, but I tell them that they have the power to vote a government into power that will fulfill their mandate."[400] The idea that voters have power is clearly an important one for Zille, and one she needs to keep repeating, especially in the face of a recent declaration by Zuma urging South Africans not to "throw away their vote" by voting for the DA. He also goes on to that if they do not vote for the ANC then their vote is a "silent vote," and one not worth anything.[401] More weight was brought to bear on this statement by the presence of Winnie Madikizela-Mandela at Zuma's side as a supporter, former wife to Nelson Mandela, and considered a hero in her own right by many.

This call to action mimics the strategies Zille employs in her speeches and on her Facebook page, serving as a way for audience members to actively participate in the dialogue that is working to shape them. Although Charland argues that becoming a subject requires engagement with the discourse that is working to create them, this engagement need not be entirely deliberate or conscious. When individuals enter a rhetorical situation and acknowledge or recognize the rhetorical address, they become the audience member the text calls forth. Charland reminds us, "One must already be part of the audience of a rhetorical situation in which persuasion could occur."[402]

Each rhetorical act draws on preexisting discursive positions and, in addressing the audience, recreates those positions. Zille is calling on an audience that believes in

political action—or inaction—but is trying to reconstitute her audience's understanding of what political participation means. This also speaks to a deeply held, deeply ideological understanding of politics and the role people play in politics. South Africa has a very Western style of government, and a very Western way of thinking about political participation. The problem with this way of thinking is that South Africa is *not* a Western country, at least not completely. There are certainly elements of society that are Western, both as a result of colonialism and from the continued presence of German/Dutch and English descendants who tend to dominate the intellectual spheres in South Africa. However, the overwhelming majority of South Africans are rooted in patriarchal, tribal ways of thinking. As noted in Chapter Three, most South Africans have an extremely deferential view of political authority.[403] Barely one in three citizens thinks that members of Parliament (MP) should hold the president to account. Fewer than 40% believe that "the government is like an employee; the people should be the bosses," most preferring the view that "people are like children; the government should take care of them like a parent."[404] Only 10% think that voters should hold MPs to account, whereas as many as four out of ten citizens believe that presidents should be able to "decide everything."[405] There is a serious divide in how the intellectuals of the country view the political process and the people's role, and how the people think of the political process and their role in it. Zille is clearly attempting to bridge that gap through her rhetoric, to transfer the Western intellectual understanding of democracy to the people of South Africa. In her 2011 interview she states, "My message to the people has always been you have the power, you can decide your future in a democracy, and I think that is a realization that has to get into the hearts and minds of every voter in South Africa."

The second major argument that forms the basis for Zille's constitutive rhetoric is the argument that the ANC is a racial nationalist party and the DA espouses an "Open Opportunity Society for All" policy. This is an important theme in her campaign, one that can be seen in her speeches, on her Facebook page, and perhaps even more importantly, in her radio interviews. Much like Zille's 2010 speech, discussed in Chapter Three, these two radio interviews serve the important function of ideologically alienating the ANC from its base, and setting the DA up as a viable political alternative to the ANC, not an easy task to accomplish when the majority of the country still considers the ANC the party that freed them from the tyranny of apartheid. In her 2010 interview she states that the DA "is not simply based on opposition to the ANC, it is based on an alternative vision for South Africa. Those are the clear choices, and that is the idea that we put forward." It is important that South Africans see the DA not just as reactionary, but as visionary, and substantially different than the ANC. She goes on in that interview to say that the DA's "Open Opportunity Society for All" is a "new idea that has certainly seized the public imagination. We won an election in the Western Cape on that very clear idea, and got a million more votes." Here Zille is trying to very clearly differentiate herself and her party from the ANC, and show black voters that the DA is a party that can win elections, and win black support.

In order to become a viable alternative to the ANC, Zille must show that her party cares as much about black South Africans as the ANC does. Ultimately, what this means is that Zille must convince audiences that she is invested in helping the poor, which make up the majority of the country. One of the main accusations against Zille is that she is a racist and only looks out for the interests of her non-black base. For example, ANC

Youth League (ANCLY) President Julius Malema called Zille "a racist little girl," addressing the comments to a crowd of thousands of tripartite alliance supporters at Workers Day celebrations at the Thomas Shabalala stadium at Lindelani, north of Durban.[406] In response to the claims that Zille is racist and only interested in helping herself and her supporters the DA published a new "no frills" handbook that Zille claims will put a stop to "excessive spending."[407] For example, one provision in the handbook states that, "a Cabinet member may not have a business interest in any entity conducting business with the provincial government."[408] The handbook also states that "partners or other business associates of the Cabinet member; may not have a business interest in any entity conducting business with the provincial government."[409] The most important aspect of this book, in terms of Zille's claim that the DA will proved an open and transparent government, is the contrast with the national ministerial handbook that until recently was considered "a classified document" and kept from public consumption.[410] In her 2010 interview she states "We represent an open opportunity society for all, that means being clear where people's money goes, how we spend the taxes we collect." She continues, saying that the ANC is a "closed, crony society for comrades" and that the ANC is "only interested in the ANC, not the people." The ANC has had a number of public scandals involving instances of "cronyism" such as the appointment and subsequent dismissal of Shabir Shaik, which Zille mentioned in her 2010 Freedom Day Speech.[411]

The "toilet sagas" is an important issue that Zille discusses in both of her radio interviews in response to claims that she is a racist. The toilet saga is a debate over some open-air toilets that the DA provided in the Makhaza area of Khayelitsha. In 2007, the

DA-controlled Cape Town metro council began building a toilet for each household in

Makhaza, on the condition that "residents enclosed the toilets themselves so the council

would have money for more toilets."[412] Residents enclosed 1,265 of the toilets, but 51

were left open.[413] In response to complaints, the council erected corrugated iron walls

around the toilets. However, the ANCYL demanded that concrete walls be placed around

the toilets and in 2010 destroyed the iron enclosures and threatened to make the city of

Cape Town ungovernable. In response, the city council removed the open-air toilets, but

the ANCYL has continued to make accusations that the toilets are just one example of

Zille's racism. On May 2, 2011, speaking at an ANC election manifesto rally at a rally in

Polokwane, Limpopo, Malema claimed that Zille built open-air toilets because she "hated

black people."[414] He said that "the open toilets saga is a symbol that Zille hates and

dishonours Blacks and African people," and then went on to ask the audience, "Who built

open toilets for Coloureds? It is not the ANC, it is the DA in Western Cape."[415] Zille used

the radio interviews as a stage to dispute the allegations, claiming that this incident was

merely a media circus, and that since then ANCLY has "developed a keen interest in

ensuring the toilets remained open." In the 2011 radio interview, Siki Mgabadeli asked

Zille, "What do you say to people who [raise the toilet issue] as proof that the DA doesn't

care about poor people or black people?" Zille replies that "The DA cares passionately

about poor people, in fact in every single survey, it shows that the DA cares more about

poor people than every other party."

It is important to note that while Zille would frequently refer to "the poor" in

these interviews, she rarely referred to blacks or Africans. Though it is clear that the

black population makes up the overwhelming majority of the poor in South Africa, the

144

language of "the poor" versus "the blacks" allows Zille to focus on economic and social

divisions, as opposed to racial ones. If Zille is going to run on the narrative that the DA is

a non-racial party, then this linguistic distinction, though small, is an important one.

The third argument that Zille makes is that the role of the opposition party is in

actuality the institutional embodiment of the role of the people. During the 2010

interview Redi Dreko makes a point that in the majority of African politics the opposition

party is more often than not facing the party that originally liberated the country. She

goes on to say, "that comes with a formidable brand. Is that a problem [for the DA]?"

The truth is that while South Africa has achieved a certain level of formal democracy in

that regular elections are held and the Constitution is unaltered, the persistence of South

Africa's racial voting patterns means that minorities are marginalized and that, in effect,

the ruling party is no longer accountable to the electorate. The persistence of racial

divisions also enables the ruling party to delegitimize the opposition as racist or

"defenders of white privilege," a strategy that only serves to further entrench racial

divisions.[416] In response to Redi Dreko question Zille replies

> The ANC like to build on that brand [as liberators] but the truth is, the
> constitution is not the ANC's constitution. It was a negotiated constitution
> and the moment of our liberation was the adoption of that constitution, not
> a military victory . . . today the ANC has become the party that is attacking
> and undermining and hollowing out the constitution . . . they still like to
> pretend they are the party of the liberation, but what they are is a small elite
> plutocracy masquerading as a party of liberation . . . the big challenge on
> our continent is why it takes voters so long to see a so-called liberation
> party for what it actually is. And what is our role in presenting that
> alternative and making voters understand what has happened to the party
> that they thought was the liberation party before it destroys the real
> substance of our liberation, which is the freedoms in our constitution.

In an article by Mangosuthu Buthelezi, he claims that "on the whole, in common

with other African democracies, SA lacks a tradition of developing issue-based

campaigns that define many western democracies and bring a new life into their stale political environments."[417] He argues that this is partly because of the confrontational undertones that infuse oppositional politics, which means "that the role of the opposition has too often been stigmatised in Africa's democratic discourse, characterised as it is by consensus and a respect for (state) authority."[418] Unfortunately, it is almost impossible for opposition parties like the DA to not be considered confrontational. Governments get to set the agenda, announce targets, unveil programs and are largely free to manage the news coverage of government business. Being in opposition, by contrast, usually means being reactionary, as Buthelezi puts it, "to respond to events rather than being weather makers."[419] This puts Zille in an untenable position. Too often the DA's participation in policy debates is impeded by the "unrelenting ruling party's spin doctors' parody that the opposition is, at best, an annoying interference; at worst unpatriotic, as the government rolls out its meritorious programmes."[420] Seizing the initiative often means waiting for the government to stumble or by exposing some scandal or irregularity. Opposition MPs usually make names for themselves as "exposers" rather than as opinion makers. For example, Democratic Alliance member David Maynier made a name for himself over the arms procurement scandal in 2010, in which he claimed that substantial amounts of conventional arms were being exported to the repressive governments of Syria, Libya and Yemen under ANC rule, despite the preamble to the legislation regulating conventional arms sales, which states that South Africa "will not trade in conventional arms with states engaged in repression, aggression and terrorism."[421]

In order for Zille to make an effective bid for the presidency, she must clarify for voters what, exactly, is the role of an opposition party in a democracy. She argues in her

2010 interview that the role of the DA as opposition is threefold: "We have to provide a very clear alternative, an alternative vision, which we do all the time, we have to hold the government to account and we have to ask questions and expose corruption where we see it." Many would argue, and I believe Zille is arguing, that these criteria are also the responsibility of the people in a democracy. Christian Welzel and Ronald Inglehart contend that there is a new understanding of the driving force behind democratization, what they call "liberal" democracy. The more common conception of democracy is termed "electoral" democracy. The definition of electoral democracy "hinges on suffrage and considers any regime that holds competitive, free, fair, and regular elections to be a democracy."[422] In this scenario, elite agreement is key and "mass preferences matter little."[423] Advocates of this position argue that certain requisites of democracy such as social mobilization are unimportant. However, Welzel and Inglehart contend that liberal democracy, as opposed to electoral democracy, is based on mass voice in self-governance.[424]

During the "third wave" of democratization, which began in 1974 and peaked in the late 1980s and early 1990s, electoral democracy spread rapidly across large parts of the world.[425] The popular pressures for democratization, which gripped many African countries towards the end of the 1980s, took place within this context, along with the end of the Cold War. The collapse of the Soviet Union undermined a crucial basis on which many regimes in Africa rested, namely the almost unconditional propping up of unrepresentative and unaccountable African governments by the Cold War rivals as part of their strategy for maximizing their global advantages.[426] As a result, many African

nations were susceptible to the ideas of electoral democracy as it gave the people the illusion of agency, but in actuality allowed the elite of the country to remain in power. South Africa continues to bear both the stamp of the Cold War in the continued tripartite alliance with the South African Communist Party, as well as the results of the collapse of the Soviet Union in the mindset of electoral democracy. Zille must reconfigure how South Africans think of democracy, to persuade them that not only are their voices a powerful agent when choosing a government, but that they are, in essence, the government itself. Zille must first convince voters of their more active role in the democracy and then create bonds of identification with her audience by showing the DA as the institutional embodiment of the role of the people. If she can convince voters of this, then when she attacks the ANC for whatever reason, she will be seen as a representative of the people and not as "an annoying interference [or] unpatriotic."[427]

The radio interviews also allow voters the chance to call in and talk directly with Zille, thereby allowing listeners to actively participate in the very democracy Zille is trying to create. The 2001 census states that 98% of non-black South African homes own a cell phone and that 31% of black South African homes own a telephone or cell phone, and that 57% have access to a nearby phone.[428] Combined with the type of radio stations on which the interviews were being broadcast, the interviews provided a unique space for Zille to interact with her black constituents on a national scale. Since radio is such a dominant form of communication for black South Africans it stands to reason that the majority of the call-ins would have been by black South Africans—though of course it is impossible to know the ethnicity of the caller based on voice alone—which allows Zille to directly address concerns held by the "typical" black voter. Her ability to address these

concerns on such a widely available format is an important way for Zille to continue to build consubstantiality with her audience as well as to prove to voters that the DA "cares deeply about poor people."

Unsurprisingly, there are a number of similarities between the arguments Zille makes on Facebook and the arguments presented in the radio interviews. In both cases Zille emphasizes personal responsibility and agency—though the motivating factors behind the arguments change when addressing different racial groups. For black audiences, this emphasis is about turning out voters on Election Day and overcoming apathy and active boycotting. For white voters, the focus on personal responsibility is an implicit promise that the DA believes that black South Africans should contribute equally to the country, an especially important point when thinking about the financial and economic burden the white population bears. Another common theme is that the DA is both practically and morally superior to the ANC—therefore planting the notion of the DA as a viable alternative to the ANC and Zille as a legitimate presidential candidate. This is an especially crucial argument for black audiences, since most white, or non-black minorities, already support the DA. Black voters must overcome their traditional deferential way of thinking about politics and politicians, so Zille must constitute a black audience that votes based on policy and results, and not on identity politics or along racial lines.

Both of these particular formats allow Zille to reach specific audiences and make targeted arguments to those audiences. Facebook is a space that is accessed almost exclusively by the white population, and is a place for supporters and dissenters alike to engage in conversation, with each other as well as with Zille. Specifically Zille uses the

149

interactive nature of Facebook to encourage users to participate in the narrative of her Facebook page, utilize the visual capabilities of Facebook to create a narrative that fosters an identification that transcends race, class and gender barriers, positions her audience as transhistorical, and provides a means of understanding how the narrative of her Facebook page connects to social action. On the other hand, radio is a format that is easily available for black voters, and provides a chance for Zille to focus on those issues that are most salient to that population, specifically discussing the problems of Zille's whiteness and social-economic status in a majority poor black country, the lack of agency displayed by black voters and the role of an opposition party in a country under the government of a liberator party.

In order to overcome barriers of race, class, and gender Zille employs a rhetoric of non-racialism and tries to position herself as the "next phase" in South African politics. In order to accomplish this Zille must use her rhetoric to rearticulate what it means to be South African. Navigating the post-colonial forces in a post-apartheid country is a difficult task that is fraught with tension. Zille must convince both black and white audiences that working together is the only way the whole country can be successful and move towards a true democracy. Perhaps more importantly, she must convince audiences that this coming together can only happen under DA leadership. As South Africans struggle to discover a national identity they must decide what it is that makes them South African and through her rhetoric, whether a speech, a radio interview, or a Facebook post, Zille is trying to shape South Africa into a country that is post-colonial, post-apartheid, and post-racial.

Notes

[319] Internet World Statistics, *Usage and Population Statistics: Africa,* http://www.internetworldstats.com/africa.htm (accessed April 27, 2011).

[320] Active users are defined as those users who have returned to the site within the last 30 days.

[321] Hennie Kotze, "A Consummation Devoutly to be Wished? The Democratic Alliance and its Potential Constituencies," in *Opposition and Democracy in South Africa,* Roger Southall, Ed., (London: Frank Cass Publishers, 2001): p. 117-134.

[322] Kotze, "Democratic Alliance," p. 120.

[323] African Media Development Initiative, "African Media Development Initiative: South Africa Context," December 26, 2006, http://www.bbc.co.uk/worldservice/ trust/researchlearning/story/2006/12/061206_amdi_southafrica.shtml (accessed April 28, 2011).

[324] African Media Development Initiative.

[325] Paula Armstrong, Bongisa Lekezwa and Krige Siebrits, "Poverty in South Africa: A Profile Based on Recent Household Surveys," Stellenbosch Economic Working Papers, University of Stellenbosch, Department of Economics, Cape Town, South Africa, April 2008, http://ideas.repec.org/p/sza/wpaper/wpapers52.html (accessed February 20, 2011).

[326] Maurice Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric: The Case of the *Peuple Quebecois,*" *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 73 (May 1987): p. 136.

[327] Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric," p. 228.

[328] Andrew Chadwick, *Internet Politics: States, Citizens and New Communication Technologies* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006): p. 1.

[329] "2010 Traffic Rankings: Facebook," Alexa Internet, Inc. http://www.alexa.com/data/details/traffic_details?url=facebook.com/ (accessed March 21, 2011).

[330] Alexa Internet, Inc., "2010 Traffic Rankings."

[331] These Facebook groups can be accessed by searching for the group titles.

[332] Rob Howard, "The Vernacular Web of Participatory Media," *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 25 (200): p. 490 – 513.

[333] Geordin Hill-Lewis (Chief of Staff, Helen Zille), interview by Emily S. Sauter, January 23, 2011.

[334] Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric," p. 133.

[335] Users are able to share their approval for a post by clicking a "like" icon in the shape of a thumbs up button. It should be noted though, that there is no "dislike" for members to show disapproval.

[336] I would like to note that members do have the ability to report inappropriate behavior to the official moderators of Facebook, who in turn can delete any post from Facebook. In addition, staff members who have the power to delete posts also monitor Zille's Facebook page for inappropriate posts.

[337] Howard, *Vernacular,* p. 494.

[338] Howard, *Vernacular,* p. 494.

[339] Howard, *Vernacular,* p. 494. See also, Lisa Flores and Marouf Hasian, "Returning to Aztla´ n and La Raza: Political Communication and the Vernacular

Construction of Chicano/a Nationalism." In Alberto Gonzalez and Dolores Tanno (Eds.), *Politics, Communication, and Culture* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1997); Ranajit Guha, *Subaltern Studies I: Writings on South Asian History and Society* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1982); Gerard Hauser, *Vernacular Voices: The Rhetoric of Publics and Public Spheres* (Columbia, SC: The University of South Carolina Press, 1999); Rob Howard, "A Theory of Vernacular Rhetoric: The Case of the 'Sinner's Prayer' Online," *Folklore* 3 (2005): p. 172-188; Margaret Lantis, "Vernacular Culture*,"* *American Anthropologist* 2(1960): p. 202-216; Kent Ono and John Sloop, "The Critique of Vernacular Discourse," *Communication Monographs*, 62 (1995): p. 19-46.

[340] Howard, *Vernacular,* p. 494.

[341] Howard, *Vernacular,* p. 495.

[342] Howard, *Vernacular,* p. 501.

[343] Howard, *Vernacular,* p. 501.

[344] I say "seemingly noninstitutional" because though Facebook is not an institutionally controlled website, Zille's page is institutionally controlled in that her Facebook staff has the power to delete any comment for any reason. Though the use of that power must be judicious or they risk upsetting the illusion of freedom that Facebook creates as a noninstitutional space.

[345] Howard, *Vernacular,* p. 505.

[346] Howard, *Vernacular,* p. 505.

[347] Howard, *Vernacular,* p. 505.

[348] Andrew Mendelson, "Slice-of-Life Moments as Visual 'Truth': Norman Rockwell, Feature Photography, and American Values in Pictorial Journalism," *Journalism History* 29 (2005): p. 168.

[349] Mendelson attributes the term "iconology" and its working definition to William J. Thomas Mitchell as laid out in his book *Iconology: Image, Text, and Ideology*.

[350] Meg Spratt, April Peterson and Taso Lagos, "Of Photographs and Flags: Uses and Perceptions of an Iconic Image Before and After September 11, 2001," *Popular Communication: The International Journal of Media and Culture* 3 (2005): p. 120.

[351] Spratt, Peterson and Lagos, "Of Photographs," p. 120.

[352] Robert Hariman and John Lucaites, "Performing Civic Identity: The Iconic Photograph of the Flag Raising on Iwo Jima," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 88 (2002): p. 366.

[353] Hariman and Lucaites, "Iconic," p. 366.

[354] Hariman and Lucaites, "Iconic," p. 366.

[355] Spratt, Peterson and Lagos, "Of Photographs," p. 120.

[356] In the South African, context, the term "Colored" (also known as *Bruinmense*, *Kleurlinge* or *Bruin Afrikaners* in Afrikaans) refers or referred to an ethnic group of mixed-race people who possess some sub-Saharan African ancestry, but not enough to be considered black under the law of South Africa. They are mixed race and often possess substantial ancestry from Europe, Indonesia, Madagascar, Malaya, Mozambique, and Southern Africa.

[357] Kathryn A. Manzo, *Creating Boundaries: The Politics of Race and Nation*, (London: Boulder, 1996): p. 71.

[358] Thabo Mbeki, "I am an African," (speech given on the occasion of the adoption by the Constitutional Assembly of The Republic of South Africa Constitution Bill 1996, May 8, 1996).

[359] Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric," 140.

[360] Shanyang Zhao, Sherri Grasmuck, and Jason Martin, "Identity Construction on Facebook: Digital Empowerment in Anchored Relationships," *Computers in Human Behavior* 24 (2008): p. 1825.

[361] Zhao, Grasmuck, and Martin, "Identity Construction," p. 1825.

[362] Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric," 140.

[363] Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric," 140.

[364] Kenneth Burke, *A Rhetoric of Motives* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969), p. 2.

[365] Clive Barnett, "The Limits of Media Democratization in South Africa: Politics, Privatization and Regulation," *Media, Culture, and Society* 21 (1999): p. 649-671.

[366] Barnett, "Media Democratization," p. 650.

[367] Barnett, "Media Democratization," p. 650.

[368] In many ways, Zimbabwe has a similar history to South Africa. According to the CIA world Factbook, updated April 28, 2011, Zimbabwe gained independence from the British held South Africa in 1923. In 1961 a Constitution that favored the white minority was put in place. After a number of violent protests and international sanctions, Zimbabwe claimed complete independence in 1980. The nation's first prime minister was Robert Mugabe, has been the country's only ruler and has continued to dominate the political system. In 2000 he began a land distribution campaign that caused a mass exodus of white farmers, crippled the economy, and led to a widespread shortage of basic commodities. In order to stay in power Mugabe has used violence and intimidation to silence the opposition, and any opposition supporters.

[369] Max Du Preez, "Zuma May be the Broom that Sweeps Clean," *Daily News,* December 27, 2007, http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1G1-172834492.html (accessed April 17, 2011).

[370] Keyan G. Tomaselli and Ruth E. Teer-Tomaselli, "Exogenous and Endogenous Democracy: South African Politics and Media," *The International Journal of Press/Politics* 13(2008): p. 171-180.

[371] Sarah R. Stein, "The '1984' Macintosh Ad: Cinematic Icons and Constitutive Rhetoric in the Launch of a New Machine," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 88 (2002): p. 169-192.

[372] Stein, "1984," p. 6.

[373] Stein, "1984," p. 6.

[374] Jay Naidoo, Speech given on Masakhane, September 2, 1997, http:// www. pwv.gov.za/ docs/sp/1997/sp970902.html (accessed April 19, 2011).

[375] David A. McDonald & John Pape, *Cost Recovery and the Crisis of Service Delivery in South Africa* (Pretoria: Zed Press, 2007).

[376] McDonald and Pape, *Crisis of Service*, p. 1-2.

[377] McDonald and Pape, *Crisis of Service*, p. 1-2.

[378] McDonald and Pape, *Crisis of Service*, p. 3.

[379] McDonald and Pape, *Crisis of Service*, p. 3.

[380] McDonald and Pape, *Crisis of Service*, p. 4.

[381] Kotze, "Democratic Alliance," p. 120.

[382] "Radio in South Africa," *Media Club South Africa*, http://www.mediaclub southafrica.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=118:radio-in-south-africa&catid=36:media_bg (accessed April 29, 2011).

[383] "Radio in South Africa."

[384] The official languages are Afrikaans, English, Ndebele, Northern Sotho, Sotho, Swazi, Tswana, Tsonga, Venda, Xhosa and Zulu. Fewer than one percent of South Africans speak a first language other than the eleven listed above, though most South Africans can speak more than one language. Prior to 1994, South Africa had only two official languages, English and Afrikaans.

[385] Peter G. Mwesige, "The Democratic Functions and Dysfunctions of Political Talk Radio: The Case of Uganda," *Journal of African Media Studies* 2 (2009): p. 221-245.

[386] See Delli Carpini and Scott Keeter, *What Americans Know About Politics and Why It Matters* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1996); Pippa Norris, *A Virtuous Circle: Political Communications in Post-Industrial Societies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

[387] Mwesige, "Functions," p. 222.

[388] Erik Bucy and Kimberly Gregson, "Media Participation: A Legitimizing Mechanism of Mass Democracy," *New Media & Society* 3 (2001): p. 369.

[389] South African Broadcasting Corporation, http://www.safm.co.za/portal/site/safm/ (accessed May 1, 2011).

[390] The channels are 5FM, Metro FM, Radio 2000, Radio Sonder Grense, Ukhozi FM, Umhlobo Wenene FM, Thobela FM, Lesedi FM, Motsweding FM, Phalaphala FM, Munghana Lonene FM, Ligwalagwala FM, Ikwekwezi FM, Lotus FM and Chanel Africa.

[391] 702 Talk Radio, http://www.702.co.za/index.asp (accessed May 1, 2011).

[392] Some recent awards won by the station are "Station of the Year" in May 2007 and "Africa Radio Awards," in August 2008 and "Radio of the Year" at the inaugural MTN Radio Awards held in Johannesburg, South Africa, April 2011.

[393] Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric," p. 139.

[394] Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric," p. 139.

[395] "Nope!, Your Vote Doesn't Make A Difference," *Polity.org.za*, http://www.polity.org.za/article/nope-your-vote-doesnt-make-a-difference-2009-03-31 (accessed May 2, 2011).

[396] "Grassroots Movements Plan to Boycott South African Poll," *Ekklesia: A New Way of Thinking*, http://www.ekklesia.co.uk/node/9282 (accessed May 2, 2011).

[397] *Ekklesia,* "Grassroots Movements."

[398] "Republic of South Africa General Election Results Lookup," *Election Resources on the Internet*, http://electionresources.org/za/provinces.php?election=1999&province=ZA (accessed May 3, 2011).

[399] "Election Results."

[400] The mandate Zille is referring to is the rights laid out in the Constitution that states that every citizen has the right to basic amenities such as adequate housing and running water.

[401] "Zuma: Don't Throw Away Your Vote," *Mail and Guardian Online*, http://mg.co.za/article/2011-04-27-zuma-dont-throw-away-your-vote (accessed May 3, 2011).

[402] Charland, "Constitutive Rhetoric," p. 138-147.

[403] Robert Mattes, "South Africa: Democracy Without the People?" *Journal of Democracy* 13 (2002): p. 22-36.

[404] Mattes, *People?* p. 23.

[405] Mattes, *People?* p. 23.

[406] "Malema: Helen Zille a 'racist little girl,'" *Mail and Guardian Online*, http://mg.co.za/article/2009-05-01-malema-helen-zille-a-racist-little-girl (accessed May 3, 2011).

[407] "Zille Publishes New Handbook," *Cape Times*, http://www.capetimes.co.za/zille-publishes-new-handbook-1.1064099 (accessed May 3, 2011).

[408] "Handbook."

[409] "No-Frills."

[410] "No-Frills."

[411] Schabir Shaik is a South African businessman who rose to prominence due to his close association with Jacob Zuma during his time as Deputy President. On June 2, 2005, he was found guilty of corruption and fraud, which also led to the dismissal of Zuma two weeks later from his position as Deputy President.

[412] "Zille Hates Blacks—Malema," *Cape Times*, http://www.capetimes.co.za/zille-hates-blacks-malema-1.1051172 (accessed May 3, 2011).

[413] "Zille Hates Blacks."

[414] "Zille Hates Blacks."

[415] "Zille Hates Blacks."

[416] Hermann Giliomee, James Myburgh, and Lawrence Schlemmer, "Dominant Party Rule, Opposition Parties and Minorities in South Africa," *Democratization* 8 (2001): p. 161-182.

[417] Mangosuthu Buthelezi, "Long Slog to Power for South African Opposition Parties," *Business Day*, http://www.businessday.co.za/articles/Content.aspx?id=79629 (accessed May 4, 2011).

[418] Buthelezi, "Long Slog."

[419] Buthelezi, "Long Slog."

[420] Buthelezi, "Long Slog."

[421] David Maynier, "DA: Statement by David Maynier, Democratic Alliance Shadow Minister of Defence and Military Veterans, On Arms Deals with Libya, Syria and Yemen," *Polity.or.za*, http://www.polity.org.za/article/da-statement-by-david-maynier-democratic-alliance-shadow-minister-of-defence-and-military-veterans-on-arms-deals-with-libya-syria-and-yemen-10042011-2011-04-10 (accessed May 4, 2011).

[422] Christian Welzel and Ronald Inglehart, "The Role of Ordinary People in Democratization," *Journal of Democracy* 19 (2008): p. 126.

[423] Welzel and Inglehart, "Ordinary People," p. 126.

[424] The liberal notion of democracy, which considers a wide set of civil and political rights to be an integral part of democracy, is proposed by Robert A. Dahl in *Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971).

[425] Welzel and Inglehart, "Ordinary People," p. 130.

[426] Welzel and Inglehart, "Ordinary People," p. 131.

[427] Buthelezi, "Long Slog."

[428] "South Africa Census 2001: Key Results," *Statistics South Africa: Census 20001*, http://www.statssa.gov.za/census01/html/Key%20results_files/Key%20results.pdf (accessed May 5, 2011).

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

Helen Zille faces many challenges as a politician acting in a post-colonial context. South Africa has come a long ways since the dark days of apartheid, but despite the hard work that has been done to erase the effects of years of racial law, the stark divisions between black and white show that apartheid cannot be easily forgotten. The broad goal of this thesis, laid out in Chapter One, was to understand how Zille's rhetoric functioned to overcome barriers of race, class, and gender as she works towards the 2014 presidential elections. These barriers are largely in place as a result of apartheid.

EFFECTS OF APARTHEID

As discussed in Chapter Two, apartheid is still very much a part of the culture of South Africa and continues to have long-lasting effects on the country—social, political and economic. It's been more than a decade since the end of apartheid and people are free to go where they want and associate with whom they desire, but South Africa remains a highly divided society along racial lines. For example, though the country is under majority black rule, business and commerce continue to remain largely in the hands of the white population, despite affirmative action programs meant to speed up the process of redress for the many inequalities in South African society and economy.

One of the largest disparities between the races is financial. In a study conducted by the Department of Earning and Spending in South Africa released by Statistics South Africa researchers found that "African-headed households were, on average, the poorest in monetary terms, while white-headed households were, on average, the most affluent."[429] The study went on to find that "In all provinces, African-headed households had the lowest average annual incomes, followed by coloured-headed households which had the second lowest average annual incomes. White-headed households had the highest incomes across the board."[430] Research has shown that the economic impact has had a crippling effect on the black population in the seventeen years since Mandela was elected. Based on a poverty line of R322-R593, per capita per month, 86% of all black households live in some of the poorest conditions in the world.[431] By most measures, the poorest provinces are those encompassing the most populous former homeland areas, namely KwaZulu-Natal, Limpopo Province, and Eastern Cape. Unemployment is at an all time high at 23.5%, with the majority of the unemployed being black Africans.[432] These startling statistics demonstrate that in order for South Africa to become a true democracy, the black population of the country must be lifted out of this devastating poverty. Evelyne Huber, Dietrich Rueschemeyer and John Stephens conducted an extensive comparative analysis of third world countries and the success of democracy and found that "the level of economic development is causally related to the development of political democracy."[433] They argue that "the underlying connection . . . is that capitalist development transforms the class structure, enlarging the working and middle class and facilitating their self-organization, thus making it more difficult for elites to exclude them politically."[434]

Financial constraints are not the only legacy of apartheid. Black South Africans are still not allowed in certain places, both physical and psychical. Some night clubs are designated for members only—in one case, only seamen were supposed to belong.[435] A typical bank in downtown Durban will have blacks as cleaners and security guards and coloreds may be found at the reception desk, while whites and Indians are behind the bullet-proof teller glass.[436] More significantly, behind the tellers, in the executive offices, whites occupy nine out of ten desks and the remainder will have an Indian behind it.[437] Generations of apartheid law have left deep scars in social attitudes as well. Even as South Africans talk about and try to assume their new freedoms, old presumptions, stereotypes and prejudices continue to block their path. For example, many whites still expect the old deference they became accustomed to during apartheid. They do not expect others to talk back to them and away from the corridors of political power, "uppity" blacks are still punished through social or financial means. These conditions remain due mainly to the great economic power that whites continue to wield.

Politically speaking, South Africa seems to continue to be mired in ethnic and racial politics. Though the majority of parties in South Africa espouse a non-racial policy, looking at the polling numbers, it is clear that whites tend to vote for white politicians and blacks vote for black politicians. Since the end of apartheid, South Africans have voted in four national elections. During these elections, race has overwhelmingly predicted voting behavior for both white and African voters (who together comprise nearly 90% of the voting age population)—so much so that many have described South African elections as a "racial census."[438] Karen Ferree contends that "parties' racial credentials are a central factor driving the racial census pattern in South Africa."[439]

Addressing a Johannesburg conference on Equality Courts in late June, the deputy minister of Justice and Constitutional Development, Johnny de Lange told the gathering that "Equal opportunity alone is not enough to address the apartheid-inflicted legacy . . . we must change the mindset of our people."[440] In order to overcome the barriers of race, class, and gender Zille employs a rhetoric of non-racialism and tries to position herself as the "next phase" in South African politics. In order to accomplish this Zille must use her rhetoric to rearticulate what it means to be South African.

OVERCOMING BARRIERS

I employed a number of theoretical perspectives in order to understand the ways in which Zille's rhetoric functions to overcome the legacy of apartheid and the barriers created by her race, class, and gender. One theoretical lens I utilized was a post-colonial framework, which contextualizes Zille's rhetorical acts. This perspective helps us understand the ways in which colonial discourses shaped South African political culture and maintained a hegemonic influence even after the establishment of an independent South African republic. How South Africans understand themselves is heavily influenced by their experience as post-colonial subjects, and in order to understand the constraints facing Zille, scholars need to acknowledge the affects of post-colonialism on the audience. This understanding is key when analyzing how Zille uses constitutive rhetoric to try and create a "new" South African audience, one not constrained by race, class and gender.[441] I used the theory of exigential flow because it creates a space for a broader view of Zille's rhetorical situation, as opposed to an analysis of one rhetorical situation in a given context, which is particularly useful in light of South Africa's long and multifaceted history. Lastly, constitutive rhetoric explains the ways in which Zille's

rhetoric attempts to constitute a new South African identity. The post-colonial framework, when combined with White's theory of exigential flow and Charland's constitutive rhetoric, allows for a complex and multi-varied understanding of Zille's rhetorical strategies.

For this study, I analyzed a series of rhetorical objects that provided a more global understanding of Zille's rhetorical strategies. The texts chosen illuminate the multiple avenues of persuasion open to political candidates, and the time frame is long enough to include the changes in Zille's rhetorical strategies as they evolved over time.

The study focused on three rhetorical forms and five specific texts; two speeches delivered by Zille on May 6, 2009 and April 27, 2010, Zille's Facebook page, and 2 radio interviews given by Zille on March 10, 2010 and January 1, 2011. The first speech was delivered on May 6, 2009, as Zille officially accepted the post of Premier of the Western Cape and laid out her agenda for the coming term. The second speech was given at the Constitutional Court in Johannesburg on April 27, 2010, part of the party's Freedom Day celebrations. The Facebook analysis assesses Zille's page from its creation to March 26, 2011. The radio interviews were both given on "black" radio stations and focus on the political policies of the DA.[442]

There were three major rhetorical strategies that Zille employed when trying to persuade audiences to vote for the DA: First, Zille tried to create a very specific agenda that favors the DA and plays to their strengths. Second, she used various communication formats to build feelings of identification with her audiences, and third, she worked to interpellate audiences into a new South African identity.

The agenda that Zille is building is an agenda that the ANC generally shares. Any politician that runs for office in South Africa must address issues of poverty, education, service delivery, crime, HIV/AIDs, drug abuse, and government transparency. The reason that Zille focuses so much of her rhetoric around these issues is twofold: first, it allows her to clearly delineate what the DA stands for, as well as set the terms under which the ANC should be judged in the coming years. Second, setting this agenda is a way of creating a reliable success story since Zille and the DA can make a bigger impact on these issues in the Western Cape than the ANC can make on a national scale. This setting of the agenda in turn places voters in the position of having to judge the ANC on named and visible criteria, forcing them to go beyond identity politics. If Zille's administration is seen as having more success in fighting these problems, she creates a scenario in which voters are obligated to vote for the DA, for the betterment of the country, despite her race, class, and gender.

Perhaps the most important function of Zille's rhetoric is the ability for it to create feelings of identification with her audience. One of the largest barriers that Zille is facing is that she is not like the majority of her constituency; she is white, affluent, educated, and female, whereas the population is majority black, uneducated, poor, and living in a strongly patriarchal society. The ANC's make-up is not any more a reflection of the population than the DA, except in one important way—the ANC is almost exclusively black. There is an extremely strong culture of identity politics in South Africa that Zille must overcome to make a viable bid for the presidency. The majority of voters believe that the only party that can better South Africa is the ANC, because they, the voters, *are* the ANC. As laid out in Chapter Two, the ANC played a major role in the anti-apartheid

movement during the seventies and eighties, and as a result, the majority of the black population sees themselves in the ANC, which is compounded by the near legendary figure and leader of the ANC, Nelson Mandela. In order to break the cycle of identity politics, Zille needs her audience to acknowledge her own position as a South African and identify with her as a fellow citizen. In order to create a sense of consubstantiality with her audience Zille refers heavily to the history of South Africa, focusing especially on her role as an anti-apartheid activist and the reasons the country fought to end apartheid—freedom and non-racial democracy. Using the Burkean strategy of antithesis, Zille also works to create a distinction between the DA and the ANC on both practical and moral grounds, uniting one group in opposition to another group. By making the ANC the "other" as well as the "evil" party, Zille forces her audience to align itself with the DA in order to be part of the community of the Western Cape as well as a member of the "good" party.

Identification lays the groundwork for Zille's rhetoric to function as a constitutive force. Zille is trying to position herself as the next phase in South African politics, a leader of a party, and hopefully a country, where race is no longer a motivating factor in an election, but rather where the focus is on a politician's and party's policies. However, to create this new South Africa, one that focuses on policy and not race, Zille needs to rearticulate the identity of South Africans both for blacks and whites. However, Zille is aware that in trying to create a non-racial South Africa, she must acknowledge the realities of racial division in the country and use them to her benefit. Because each population holds differing reasons for their reservations about a race-free South Africa, Zille needs to make different arguments to persuade these various audiences that a race-

free country is both possible and desirable. However, in the process of persuading these audiences, Zille must be careful not to alienate one or the other. One way for her to navigate this issue is to use specific communication systems that cater to different audiences—Facebook and radio.

These particular formats allow Zille to reach specific audiences and make targeted arguments to those audiences. Zille uses the interactive nature of Facebook to encourage users (the majority of whom are white) to participate in the narrative she creates on her Facebook page. She utilizes the visual capabilities of Facebook to create a narrative that fosters an identification that transcends race, class and gender barriers; she positions her audience as transhistorical; she provides a means of understanding how the narrative of her Facebook page connects to social action. On the other hand, radio is a format that is easily accessible to black voters, and provides a chance for Zille to focus on those issues that are most salient to that population. She addresses the challenges posed by her own whiteness and social-economic status in a majority poor black country; she confronts the lack of agency displayed by black voters and she emphasizes the role of an opposition party in a country under the government of a liberator party.

As a white politician acting outside of the ANC Zille must work harder than the average oppositional party member to gain credibility and votes. In the devastating wake of apartheid Zille needs to convince voters that despite her race, class, and gender, she identifies with and can work for her black constituency, that she understands the situation of the average South African—poor, black, and uneducated. In order to create feelings of consubstantiality with her audience Zille uses her speeches as a tool to appeal to her audiences on a national level, and then utilizes various avenues of communication, like

Facebook and radio, to specifically address certain racial populations within the country. Overall, Zille's rhetoric, whether a speech or a Facebook post, works on two levels— altering the exigential flow and creating a new South African identity that allows for a truly non-racial government.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

This study, like any, has limitations. There are three in particular that I would like to address. First, this study set out to try and gain a more global understanding of Zille's rhetoric. To that effect I chose to study messages delivered via different media spaced out over a period of time. However, I was restricted to those texts that were presented in or translated into English. Zille speaks three languages and campaigns frequently in all of them, though English is the dominant language of politics. I was also restricted to a smaller number of texts due to the time and space constraints of a master's thesis. Second, I was restricted in text selection based on the availability of texts online or through personal contacts. One challenge facing scholars who produce international scholarship is that researchers are frequently limited in their ability to access data based purely on geography. Especially in developing or third world nations, access to the Internet is restricted either by financial constraints or official government constraints. As a result, scholars have a limited ability to access information, whether it is a speech, or polling number or basic population statistics. Lastly, I would like to address the challenges produced by cultural difference and the risk of possible ethnocentrism. Intercultural communication can be fraught with misunderstandings and incorrect assumptions as a result of differences in culture and ideology. Though I spent time in South Africa and consulted with a number of South Africans throughout this project, as a

U.S. American I am constrained by my own cultural perspectives. It is possible that certain meanings and nuances of particular words were lost due to my background, or that certain inferences were made based on my ideological interpretation of a text. Partly as a result of these limitations, I hope to continue this work in the future and I believe that this thesis will serve as an excellent springboard for future research.

There are still many aspects to Zille's rhetoric that I would like to explore. One particular campaign phenomena that I believe has a great impact on Zille's black audiences are text messages. As discussed in Chapter Four, the 2001 South African census stated that 98% of non-black South African homes own a cell phone, 31% of black South African homes own a telephone or cell phone, and 57% have access to a nearby phone.[443] The availability of cell phones has resulted in a unique cell phone culture, one that is distinct from the cell phone culture in U.S. America. In South Africa, cell phones are more widely used (regardless of economic status) than in the U.S, largely because of the easy availability of phones and popularity of buy-as-you-go minutes. As a result, advertisers and politicians have invested in widespread cell phone campaigns, sending out texts for deals or rallies. Another interesting avenue of research would be Zille's recently released television ads. On March 30, 2011, Zille released a series of six new advertisements for the DA in the lead-up to the 2011 municipal elections held on May 28. Television was not a format I was able to explore, and I would be interested to see how TV functions as a campaign tool in South Africa.

In Chapter One I laid out three goals for this thesis: First, I hoped to gain a deeper understanding of how women in developing nations impact and shape the political landscape through their rhetorical effort by examining the situation of a specific figure

like Zille. Second, this work examined how constitutive rhetoric functions in South Africa's complex political landscape. Third, and perhaps most significantly for me, this project responded to the need for more scholarship that examines rhetoric in non-U.S. contexts.[444] I believe that one of the driving reasons behind the comparative lack of international scholarship in the discipline of Communication Studies, especially international feminist scholarship, is the many difficulties encountered when conducting this type of research. I would like to conclude my thesis with a discussion of the difficulties I and other U.S. American scholars face when trying to study international communication phenomena.

DIFFICULTIES IN INTERNATIONAL FEMINIST SCHOLARSHIP

Bess Truman once said, "A women's place in public is to sit beside her husband, be silent and be sure her hat is on straight."[445] It can be safely said that many of Truman's 20th and 21st century counterparts have not only ignored that advice, but instead have actively worked to prove Truman wrong. Unfortunately, many of those women's hard work has been lost, due in large part to the patriarchal system that disciplines or ignores strong women. Dale Spender, in her book *Women of Ideas: And What Men Have Done To Them*, writes "I have come to accept that a patriarchal society depends in large measure on the experience and values of males being perceived as the *only* valid frame of reference for society."[446] She contends that women, though equally as intelligent as men, are "nonexistent, invisible, unreal from the outset" and that "fundamental to patriarchy is the invisibility of women, the unreal nature of women's experience, the absence of women as a force to be reckoned with."[447] When confronted with a woman who resists

the role assigned her by the patriarchal society, the system actively works to disregard, discount, suppress and erase her, effectively make her "disappear."

Feminists have worked hard over the years to "rediscover" women of ideas. Unfortunately, as Marsha Houston points out, "The prevailing voices in feminist theory in the United States have been those of white middle-class women, economically privileged members of the dominant culture. Thus, while one intention of feminist theory is to articulate the common condition of women, its frequent outcome has been to conflate the condition of white middle-class women with the condition of all women."[448] Houston argues, "Feminist theory, particularly feminist communication theory, has not yet adequately accounted for the different worldviews, different life-chances, and differential treatment of women from non-dominant U.S. social groups."[449] So only a limited set of women of ideas has been "rediscovered." Feminists in the field of communication studies seem to have taken up the challenge that Houston issued almost 20 years ago, and have tried to account for the stresses of race and class faced by women in the US in their work, but in doing so have often ignored an important population of women, that is, much of the attention of feminist scholars has been almost exclusively focused on U.S. American women.[450] My personal hope is that this thesis will add to, at least a little, the expanding conversation of scholars who are exploring the rhetoric of women politicians acting outside the U.S. American context.

Talking about differences is never easy, and many choose to keep silent rather than engage topics that are outside our comfort zones. Houston writes, "We can choose to keep silent, not to engage in conversations about difference, or we can choose to approach such conversations, in our personal lives and in our research and writing,

sensitively, thoughtfully, and respectfully."[451] What holds many scholars back from truly exploring and understanding other groups of women is the feeling that they *cannot* write about them. I know that when I chose this particular topic to write about I kept asking myself, "Can I write about this woman in a responsible manner? Am I causing more harm than good?"

Ultimately, what I decided was that I *can* write about others, I just need to find a way to do it that is sensitive, thoughtful and respectful, and the way I accomplish that, I believe, is through a feminist lens. Houston writes, "Communication theorists have emphasized the advantages of making culture the central organizing concept for the study of human communication" and notes that feminist communication theorists "have also delineated the advantages of placing women's ethnic cultures at the center of the analysis of communication by and about women."[452] Making women's ethnic culture the central organizing concept for feminist theory and research means thinking of women as "enculturated to a gendered communication ideal *within* specific ethnic groups," that is, learning how they should communicate as women in the *context* of a particular ethnic cultural experience.

Understanding ethnic and cultural experiences is the only way to truly understand any particular communication phenomena—a fact that Houston believes has two advantages for feminist communication scholars. The first advantage is that it allows scholars to examine the "mutual (non-dominant) differences" among women, that is, to view every ethnic and cultural group of women as different from every other, with no one group's experiences as more essential to defining the "common condition" of women and women's communication than any other's.[453] The second advantage is that by placing

women's ethnic cultures at the center of our analysis of women's communication we can uncover the diversity of experiences *within* cultural groups. This approach then, can help us begin to understand the complex relationships between oppression and privilege that define many women's lives. For example, white Afrikaner women are burdened by sexism, but privileged by their race; middle-class colored women are burdened by racism and sexism but privileged by their economic status.

Houston contends that "scholars tend to reduce complex social phenomena to their simplest terms in order to study them . . . [by] treating social groups that are internally diverse as if they are homogenous."[454] The job of the feminist scholar then is to understand that there are important differences among subgroups of women *within* ethnic cultural groups that affect communication events. Studying the subgroups of women within ethnic cultures will eliminate the misperception that the women of a non-dominant group are an undifferentiated mass, with the same life-styles, communication values, styles, patterns, skills etc. Through our theorizing and research and education, white feminists are empowered to speak about, and sometimes to speak for, groups of women who have no direct access to the public forums of our conferences, journals, and books, many of whom are not only different but also less socially powerful than us because of their race or socio-economic class. As a feminist communication scholar, I hope to develop research questions and methods of inquiry that allow the perspectives of women from non-dominant groups to guide my interpretations of their communication and to inspire other feminist theorists to do the same.

Maria Lugones advises feminists who want to speak intelligently about women who are different from them to "follow" those women into *their* world, not just through

reading and clinical, scientific observation, but by physically and emotionally investing themselves in their research.[455] Feminist research on women's communication differences must be grounded in *direct*, not vicarious, relationships with women who are marginalized. As Houston so eloquently puts it, "we must *earn* the right to speak about them, by learning who they are as they communicate in their own ethnic cultural contexts, their world, not simply in ours."[456] As feminist communication scholars, we must allow the experiences of women different from us—our mutual experiences of one another—to reshape our theories and redirect our research. I was inspired to write this particular thesis in large part because of my past history with South Africa. When I was sixteen I spent a year living in Durban, immersing myself in the culture of Kwa-Zulu Natal. In January of 2011, I was privileged to return to South Africa and spend a month researching for this thesis, conducting formal personal interviews with scholars like Drs. Ruth Teer-Tomaselli and Keyan Tomaselli, two leading scholars in South African media at the University of Durban, Kwa-Zulu Natal. I was also able to spend time with Helen Zille's Chief of Staff Geordin Hill-Lewis and learned a lot about the DA's philosophy, as well as Zille's personal hopes for the future.

Houston gives feminist scholars a number of questions that they must ask themselves before beginning their research—questions that have been particularly relevant to me personally, and to this thesis. I would like to end with these questions, as they are never fully answered, and must be asked with every research project, book, article and lecture:

> What historic and socio-cultural features have shaped the communication
> of subgroups of women within cultures? How do *they* define themselves
> and their communication? To what extent do they identify with their
> ethnic culture as opposed to their socio-economic class? What specific

features, skills, styles, or patterns do they consider salient to their definitions of themselves as communicators? How are these features manifest in the various contexts of their communicative lives? How is their communication perceived, constrained, enabled, or otherwise influenced by others outside their subgroup, for example, by the men of their ethnic culture, by women from other classes within their culture, or by the men or women of other ethnic cultures?[457]

Notes

[429] "Effects of Apartheid Policy Persist Survey," *Polity.org.za*, November 2, 2002, http://www.polity.org.za/article/effects-of-apartheid-policies-persist-survey-2002-11-13, (accessed May 9, 2010).

[430] "Effects of Apartheid."

[431] Paula Armstrong, Bongisa Lekezwa and Krige Siebrits, "Poverty in South Africa: A Profile Based on Recent Household Surveys," Stellenbosch Economic Working Papers, University of Stellenbosch, Department of Economics, Cape Town, South Africa, April 2008, http://ideas.repec.org/p/sza/wpaper/wpapers52.html (accessed May 8, 2010).

[432] Rob M. Stewart, "South Africa Unemployment Hits 25.2%" *The Wall Street Journal*, May 4, 2010, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703 86670457522399386587422.html (accessed March 23, 2011).

[433] Evelyne Huber, Dietrich Rueschemeyer and John Stephens, "The Impact of Economic Development on Democracy," *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 7 (1993): p. 83-84

[434] Huber, Rueschemeyer and Stephens, "Economic Development," p. 83-84

[435] "South African Equality Courts: Redress For Generations of Racism and Discrimination," *Mail and Guardian*, http://www.imdiversity.com/ villages/global/Global_News_Headlines/Archives/EqualityCourts.asp (accessed May 8, 2011).

[436] "Equality Courts."

[437] "Equality Courts."

[438] Karen E. Ferree, "Explaining South Africa's Racial Census," *The Journal of Politics* 68 (2006): p. 803–815.

[439] Ferre, "Racial Census," p. 814.

[440] "Equality Courts."

[441] There are some similarities between social movement theory and Charland, however, since I am not studying a social movement, per se, but am instead examining how one rhetorician (who does not fit the general criteria of a "social movement leader") works to constitute a particular South African identity, Charland provides a unique framework from which to study Zille that social movement theory does not.

[442] Helen Zille, *Overcoming the political paradox of our times,* Weekly e-Newsletter, May 28, 2010, accessed November 25, 2010.

[443] "South Africa Census 2001: Key Results," *Statistics South Africa: Census 20001*, http://www.statssa.gov.za/census01/html/Key%20results_files/ Key%20results.pdf (accessed May 5, 2011).

[444] Chandra Mohanty, Ann Russo, and Lourdes Torres, *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991); Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, "Can the Subaltern Speak?" in *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. Eds. Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1988) p. 271-313.

[445] *The Presidential Companion: Readings on the First Ladies.* Ed. Robert P. Watson and Anthony J. Eksterowicz (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2003): p. xvi.

[446] Dale Spender, *Women of Ideas: And What Men Have Done To Them* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd, 1982): p. 5.

[447] Spender, *Women of Ideas*, p. p. 11.

[448] Marsha Houston, *"*The Politics of Difference: Race, Class and Women's Communication," in *Women Making Meaning: New Feminist Directions in Communication.* Ed. Lana F. Rakow, (New York: Routledge, 1992): p. 45-46.

[449] Houston, *Difference*, p. 46.

[450] For example of current research in International communication see William B. Gudykunst and Bella Moody (eds.), *Handbook of International and Intercultural Communication,* 2nd ed., (London: Sage Publications, 2002).

[451] Houston, *Difference*, p. 47.

[452] Houston, *Difference*, p. 53.

[453] Houston, *Difference*, p. 53.

[454] Houston, *Difference*, p. 54.

[455] Maria Lugones and Elizabeth Spelman, "Have We Got A Theory For You! Feminist Theory, Cultural Imperialism and the Demand for 'The Woman's Voice'" *Women's Studies International Forum* 6 (1983): p. 573-581.

[456] Houston, *Difference*, p. 55.

[457] Houston, *Difference*, p. 53-54.

Education is the most powerful weapon which you can use to change the world.

--Nelson Mandela