

**From West Street to Dr Pixley KaSeme Street:
How contemporary racialised subjectivities are
(re)produced in the city of Durban**

Lyndsay Brown

**Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in the School of Psychology in the
University of KwaZulu-Natal, Pietermaritzburg**

March 2009

Abstract

From West Street to Dr Pixley kaSeme Street:¹ How contemporary racialised subjectivities are (re)p roduced in the city of Durban

This thesis is part of the larger mission to understand and challenge the ongoing reproduction of race. The focus of this particular project is on how race is perpetuated through the continuing construction of our racialised subjectivities in/through place. This idea is broadly epitomised by the idea that ‘who we are is where we are’ (Dixon and Durrheim, 2000) and the recognition that this process is highly racialised. This emphasis locates this project squarely within the social psychology of race, place and identity. To collect data that could facilitate access to racialised place-identity constructions I used a mobile methodology wherein black and white city government officials (who had grown up in Durban) took me on a walking and/or driving tour of the city of Durban talking with me about the racial transformation of this city from our childhood (in apartheid times) to the present (post-apartheid) city. These conversations were digitally recorded and transcribed for analysis. I also recorded various activities that took place during the tour and made extensive pre-tour and post-tour notes. All of this material was utilised analytically. Initially I analysed the *discursive practices* which we (the participants) engaged in as we constructed the racialised city historically and contemporaneously and reflected on the attendant subjectivities of blackness and whiteness invoked by this particular place-identity talk. When it became apparent that there was more to the production of race on the tours than that which was produced by our implaced talk my analysis

¹ In 1854/55 West Street was named after Sir Martin West who was born in England in 1804, educated at Balliol College (Oxford), a member of the British East India Company, and appointed the first Lieutenant-Governor and civilian administrator of Natal in 1845. On 28 May 2008 the eThekweni (Durban) municipality passed a resolution to rename many of the streets of Durban. West Street is now named after Dr Pixley KaSeme who was born in Inanda, Natal in 1881, educated at Jesus College (Oxford), worked as a barrister in London, was a founder member of the ANC in 1912 and President of the ANC in the 1930s.

progressed to an examination of other practices which produced race on the tours, namely, our *material/embodied interactive practices*. Through paying close analytic attention to our interaction on the tours it became evident that key practices which produced race on the tours – the spatial, discursive and embodied practices – were inextricably connected to each other in a ‘*trialectical*’ (tri-constitutional) relationship. I argue that we need to analyse this trialectical relationship further because of the ways in which it facilitates the creation of racial sticking points which obfuscate racial transformation in South Africa.

Declaration

This thesis is submitted in fulfilment of the requirement of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the School of Psychology in the University of KwaZulu-Natal, Pietermaritzburg.

This work has not previously been accepted in substance for any degree and is not being concurrently submitted in candidature for any degree.

This thesis is the result of my own investigations, except where otherwise stated. Other sources are acknowledged giving explicit references. A reference list is appended.

I hereby give consent for my thesis, if accepted, to be available for photocopying and for inter-library loan, and for the title and summary to be made available to outside organisations.

Signed

Date

Acknowledgements

I am most grateful to my supremely scholarly supervisor, Kevin Durrheim, who patiently 'brought me along' over the years to the point where I could understand what we were talking about in our long sessions together. I learnt so much from him, not least that the craft of writing is partly the clumsy attempt to find symbols for the inexplicable wordlessness of life, and that sometimes if we try hard and if the time is right, a little of what we are trying to do trickles through, and that this is enough (cf. Steinbeck, 1951). I offer my deepest thanks to you, Kevin, for your generous commitment to working with me, and for your resolute fight against racism.

My life partner and companion, Angus Stewart, has endured much throughout the writing of this thesis. Through it all, and in all our years together, he has always shown me, not the crescent, but the whole of the moon. More recently I am especially grateful to him for the many times he has put aside his own writing and his surfski to build beautiful things with our sons so that I could read and write.

There are many other people who have nurtured my young sons and showed them the world when I have been writing: most especially Alexis Azzarito and of course Khethikile Zuma, Michelle Hartley and her remarkable family, Catherine Dladla, Jabu Nyuswa, and my wonderful father, Gavin Brown, who has come into his own as a grandfather. Ngiyabonga, thank you.

My friend and fellow PhD sufferer, Xoliswa Mtose, offered me never-ending support, camaraderie and encouragement in the toughest moments of this project. Together we wrote an alternative PhD on surviving this process through humour, long phone calls and shared advice on the best possible cocktail of herbal drugs.

My siblings, Genevieve, Fiona, Tim and Nina, who make up so much of who I am, always helped me to see what had been achieved rather than what still had to be done.

My friends Fawn, Cath, Alexis, Sogen, Jayan, Kerry, Jo, Max, Brigitte, Carol-Ann, Rachel, Robynne, Margaret and Genevieve have tolerated my extended absences and offered me many forms of love and support over the last few years.

Jo Du Plessis, Fiona Brown and Angus Stewart provided a suitably obsessive proofreading service along the way. I am enormously grateful to them.

Iona Stewart and Beatrice Madziba warmly cared for me at my regular writing refuge at The Brae in the Midlands and that has made all the difference.

I would particularly like to thank the men who toured the city of Durban with me, giving me their time and their company.

A dedication

I would like to dedicate this thesis to my sons, Stirling and Orlando, who were just born when this project began and who are now nearly five.

I am choosing to write this book to my sons. They are little boys now and they will never know what they came from through me, unless I tell them. It is not written for them to read now but when they are grown and the pains and joys have tousled them a little. And if the book is addressed to them it is for a good reason. I want them to know how it was, I want to tell them directly, and perhaps by speaking directly to them I shall speak directly to other people. One can go off into fanciness if one writes to a huge nebulous group, but I think it will be necessary to speak very straight and clearly and simply if I address my book to my two little boys who will be men before they read my book. They have no background in the world of literature; they don't know the great stories of the world as we do. And so I will tell them one of the greatest, perhaps the greatest story of all – the story of good and evil, of strength and weakness, of love and hate, of beauty and ugliness. I shall try to demonstrate to them how these doubles are inseparable – how neither can exist without the other and how out of their groupings creativeness is born (Steinbeck, 1951, p. 14).

An inventory²

At the risk of over-extending my beginnings, I would like to note a muddle of memories that troubled me throughout the reading and writing of this thesis. In recording these memories I acknowledge, of course, that a memory is “a memory now of a memory a bit earlier of a memory before that of a memory way back when” (Julian Barnes, *England, my England*, 1998, p 3).

The wordlessness

I was born in 1967 in the whites-only Greys Hospital in Pietermaritzburg and attended the whites-only primary schools of Scottsville and Athlone. Most Sundays, as the eldest child, I accompanied my father when he took one of our ‘maids’, Anna/Elsie to the outskirts of Edendale (the ‘location’ where ‘all blacks who worked in Pietermaritzburg lived’) because ‘white men are not allowed to travel alone with black women’ (who told me this?). On the long journey to the edges of her ‘location’, I sat upfront with my Dad while Anna/Elsie sat silently in the back of the car. Anna and Elsie (what were their surnames? where are they now?) worked as ‘live-in maids’ which meant that during the week and some weekends they stayed together in a *khaya* (a single room) behind our kitchen, behind the rows of washing lines. We knew that our parents didn’t like us to spend time in the ‘girls’ khaya’ but our parents weren’t home all that much so my sisters and I often went to visit Anna or Elsie if one of them was ‘off’. Their *khaya* was small and close (were there windows?) and smelt overpowering (was it the paraffin from their ‘primus stove’?). The walls were rough and slightly singed. The green lino-ed surface of the skinny-legged table was partially covered with sheets of old newspapers. Their beds were raised with newspaper-covered bricks placed under each leg, the mattresses tightly covered in brightly coloured crocheted blankets. Through a warped bathroom door jammed half open came the constant sound of dripping water. I could just see a rusty brown showerhead hanging over the toilet without a seat. When I was a teenager I moved with my family from Pietermaritzburg to the whites-only suburb of Westville in Durban where I attended the whites-only school of Westville Girls High. Here talking about politics and non-Christian religions was outlawed and we regularly had bomb drills

² “The starting-point of critical elaboration is the consciousness of what one really is, and is ‘knowing thyself’ as a product of the historical process to date, which has deposited in you an infinity of traces, without leaving an inventory...therefore it is imperative at the outset to compile such an inventory” (Gramsci, quoted by Said, 1978, p. 25).

which necessitated us hiding under our desks with our hands over our heads in case our school was attacked by nameless (black?) terrorists. When I was in matric, a black girl called Molly was enrolled at our school. As the only black pupil, she became the object of many a gaze. She was rumoured to be a Zulu princess, which presumably explained her power to break the segregationary rules of the time. Soon after Molly's arrival, I went off to the Durban campus of the University of Natal where I learnt about Marxism and planned obsolescence from David Ginsberg, and apartheid city planning from Hilton Watts, the triple oppression of black South African women from Fatima Meer, and about the 'real' 'state of the nation' through seminars on colonialism of a special type and racial capitalism by student activists in Nusas and Sansco. And then the wordlessness began to acquire a language.

Table of contents

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Introduction: ‘The ghosts of racism’	1
Post-racialism?	4
Seeking analytic frames to ‘pin race down’	7
The process of this thesis (an overview).....	13
The product of this thesis – and the research questions	17
CHAPTER 2: PLACE AND IDENTITY	19
Part A: Theorising place and identity	19
Introduction.....	19
The nature of the connection between place and identity	23
A more social notion of place-identity	27
The impact of the co-constitutionality of place-identity on racial subjectivity.....	32
Memory, nostalgia, place and identity construction.....	32
Part B: A (partial) genealogy of the construction of a racialised place-identity in Durban	35
Introduction.....	36
The Municipal beer halls and the Durban system of segregation	36
The ‘native’ problem	36
Possible solutions to the “‘native’ problem”	37
The Durban System of Segregation	42
Resistance to the municipal beer hall monopoly	45
The ‘perfect’ apartheid city.....	47
Conclusion.....	48
CHAPTER 3: A DISCURSIVE APPROACH TO THE STUDY OF RACE AND RACISM	49
Introduction.....	49
‘New racism’ and the discursive response	51
Discursive psychology and the study of racialised subjectivity	55
Conclusion.....	58
CHAPTER 4: METHODOLOGY.....	60
Introduction.....	60
Setting	60
Sampling	62
The (iterative) selection of ‘tour guides’	62
Sampling criteria	62
The sampling process.....	66
Developing an ontologically and epistemologically aligned interviewing methodology.....	68
An interviewing methodology: interactive interviewing	70
Mobile interviewing	74
Features of this mobile data collection process	75
Being alongside each other.....	75
Moving through a constantly disruptive space	77
Situated talk	78
Line of inquiry.....	81
(Partially) Participant-led	82
Relationality	84
Summary	86

Conclusion: how do mobile inter-active interviews support this particular research project?	86
Transcribing.....	87
'Data' analysis	88
Discursive psychological analysis	88
Analysis of spatio-embodied practices	90
CHAPTER 5: THE (WHITE) DISCURSIVE CONSTRUCTION OF PLACE-IDENTITY.....	91
Introduction.....	91
Topophilic stories of a 'free' white childhood city.....	94
Building place-belonginess through regularity and routine	94
Constructions of the city now	97
Obstructed by street traders	97
Dirty, dangerous and in disrepair	102
A 'third world' non-European space	105
Lacking quality goods and services	108
An 'intriguing' Otherness.....	110
A not-white space	112
The construction of whiteness through discourses about the city then and now.....	113
The (white) historical playground city	113
The ugly African city	114
Conclusion: whiteness as loss of (white) place	115
CHAPTER 6: THE (BLACK) DISCURSIVE CONSTRUCTION OF PLACE-IDENTITY.....	118
Introduction.....	118
Discursive constructions of a segregated childhood in apartheid Durban	124
Exclusion from place.....	124
A racial hierarchy of place.....	127
Discursive constructions of the 'transformed' city.....	128
The continuing segregation of privatised (white) spaces	129
A black and Other-African city.....	132
Conclusion: The discursive construction of blackness through the continued segregation of cityspaces	139
CHAPTER 7: THE ENACTMENT OF RACE THROUGH SPATIO-EMBODIED PRACTICES (AND DISCOURSE)	140
Introduction.....	140
Materiality: what is outside talk and text?.....	141
The articulation between space, embodiment – and discourse	148
The discursive and spatio-embodied practices of racially familiar spaces.....	149
The discursive and spatio-embodied routines of racial 'recognition'	156
The discursive and spatio-embodied fear of blackness and black space	159
The discursive and spatio-embodied celebration of whiteness and 'white space'	162
Conclusion.....	164
CHAPTER 8: AN END POINT FOR NOW	166

APPENDICES	174
Appendix 1: Digital voice recorder	174
Appendix 2: Ethical considerations summarised	175
Appendix 3: Transcription codes.....	179
Appendix 4: Email with Mandla	180
Appendix 5: Informed consent letter [on letterhead]	181
Appendix 6: Detailed routes and dates of tours	183
Appendix 7: Street names	185
REFERENCES	186

Chapter 1: Introduction

At the heart of the ways in which race matters lies the issue of identity. (Alexander and Knowles, 2005, p. 2)

Identity, let us be clear about it, is a 'hotly contested concept'. Whenever you hear that word, you can be sure there is a battle going on. (Bauman, 2004, p. 77)

Introduction: 'The ghosts of racism'

From mid-May 2008 until the end of June 2008, a period of about six weeks, groups of South Africans killed, maimed and evicted their neighbours if they were 'foreigners'³ from other parts of Africa (Pillay, 2008, p.12; HSRC, 2008). Xenophobic attacks are not unknown in South Africa but they have been isolated and random. On 12 May 2008 when South Africans living in Alexandra 'Township' in Johannesburg attacked migrants from Mozambique, Malawi and Zimbabwe, also living in Alexandra (Pillay, 2008; HSRC, 2008), an orchestrated massacre akin to a pogrom was ignited. Within days these attacks by 'locals' on foreigners were emulated across the country. In Durban a Nigerian-owned tavern in Umbilo Road was burnt down and armed men attacked the foreign patrons. Foreigners living in informal settlements around Durban, in Cato Manor, Cato Crest and Chatsworth, were assaulted, some fatally (Independent online, 21 May 2008 and 20 May 2008). The state mobilised the police and army. Gradually the attacks waned and the damage was assessed. Police spokesperson, Sally de Beer, reported that during this campaign of violence 62 people were killed, thousands were injured and hundreds of thousands were displaced to hastily constructed 'refugee camps', church buildings and similar places all over the country (The Times, 30 June 2008). Many of the foreigners chose to return to the countries of their origin (HSRC, 2008).

Politicians and the media offered numerous explanations for these acts of cruelty by South Africans against other Africans: poverty and scarce resources, disaffection with the government for inadequate service delivery, competition for jobs, an apartheid-induced culture of intolerance and violence, foreigners undercutting locals

³ Unless otherwise specified, for the purposes of brevity, foreigners in this thesis will refer specifically to black foreigners from other parts of Africa than South Africa.

with lower wage expectations (and hence undermining union wage agreement victories), foreigners charging less than locals for products and services in the informal economy, a (white)⁴ ‘third force’, and, an unofficial but widespread resistance to the presence of foreigners in South Africa. African National Congress (ANC) President at the time, Jacob Zuma, held a public meeting with residents of Gugulethu informal settlement near Springs on Gauteng’s East Rand, one of the areas hardest hit by xenophobia-related attacks. In a press conference after this meeting, Zuma concluded that the cause of the problems was poverty and poor service delivery, and that the government had to “acknowledge that its failure to improve the lives of the poverty stricken communities exacerbated most of the indiscriminate attacks on residents who lived in informal settlements” (SABC News, 22 June 2008).

However, in a controversial public speech, Allan Boesak, founder of the United Democratic Front⁵ in 1983 and ANC leader in subsequent years, attributed these xenophobic attacks to race (and its ‘cousin’, ethnicity):

When one strays from the narrow path of non-racialism, one inexorably moves into the camp of ethnic nationalism. Or one is pulled in. When this happens, we lose sight of what is happening to all of us, because we see only what happens to us in our own little camp – to those who look like us, think like us, talk like us. We then begin to believe that the evil that strikes is targeting us and us alone, that the pain of betrayal is ours alone. We then begin to fear when there is nothing to fear. That is why, before we know it, we begin to accuse and slander, to maim and kill in a xenophobic frenzy so utterly strange to the deepest heart of our people ... even the ANC has succumbed to the subtle, but pernicious temptations of ethnic thinking, has

⁴ The four racial categories in this thesis follow those constructed under apartheid: Black (which referred to people of African descent), White (people of European descent), Coloured (people with combined ‘Black’ and ‘White’ descent or of Malaysian origin) and Indian (people of Asian descent). Under colonialism and apartheid, the word ‘native’ was often used to refer to Black or African people. In contemporary parlance African is often used interchangeably with Black and it refers to people of African descent; this is particularly the case where other ‘blacks’ are also being interpellated, e.g. where I/we are talking about Indian and African relating, often the term ‘African’ is used rather than black because here black can be seen to be referring to both Indians and Africans. Sometimes Black is used inclusively as a ‘political’ category in South Africa which includes Africans, Indians and Coloureds, that is, those who were discriminated against under apartheid. I do not “endorse or entrench the use” or the “rights, powers or attitudes that were once invested in racial definition, ownership or occupation of land” (Hindson and O’Leary, 2003, p. 5). I use these racial categories because they continue to determine many of our linguistic and material experiences in South Africa, and because people “behave as if [racial] categories are real” (Day, 2006, p. 574)

⁵ The UDF was a broad body of anti-apartheid organisations established partly in response to the banning of the ANC.

brought back the language of ethnicity into the speech of the movement and has, as government, brought back the hated system of racial categorization. That is why today, everywhere we look, it takes but the merest provocation for the ghosts of racism to rise and haunt us, because we have buried them in graves too shallow and too close to home. (Boesak, July 2008)

Boesak's analysis of these attacks on foreigners is that they were driven by race and that the ANC-led government is partially responsible for keeping race issues alive by continuing to use race categories in official policies and programmes. His views are a direct challenge to the dominant explanation for the attacks: that foreigners were 'scapegoated' primarily because they are considered to be 'income thieves' in the formal and informal economy. This popular explanation for the attacks should naturally lead us to the question: What about others who could be construed to be income thieves? Why were only foreign blacks attacked? Why not university graduates or women or people from the black middle class, all of whom benefit from black economic empowerment initiatives or affirmative action and employment equity opportunities? Even the newly wealthy black business magnates could be considered income thieves. And of course whites, given their historical advantages and despite affirmative action and employment equity, continue to enjoy (racially) disproportionate occupational and financial privilege (cf. Neocosmos, 2008, p.1). I would like to suggest that the choice made by poor black South Africans to attack (black) foreigners was, as Boesak proposed, a consequence of race and racial categorising. The continuing effects of apartheid's symbolic and material acts of violence provided a foundation which allowed those at the bottom of the racial pile in South Africa to use foreigners as convenient scapegoats for their fury. They could 'do unto others as has been done unto them', as Pastor Boesak might have added. In attacking black foreigners, South Africans who were poor and black could utilise the accreditation that racial discriminatory practices have to symbolically and materially construct a place for others in the racial hierarchy such that they were no longer quite at the bottom of the (racialised) pile. This is a central discussion area later in this thesis.

What is the relevance of this analysis for choices we make about to study race? Should we advocate that race be abandoned because it is so damaging to hold onto, even in the face of the need for racial redress? There are powerful 'progressive' arguments in the academy advocating for the theoretical rejection of race. These

were a key consideration for me when beginning to define a research project which was to fall broadly within the confines of anti-racist research work in South Africa.

Post-racialism?

Boesak's observation takes us directly into a core dilemma of race work: is it prudent in the fight against race to ignore race because this might ensure that race (and racism) dies a natural death through lack of attention, or are we more likely to destabilise race by turning a bright spotlight onto it in order to expose its ugly mechanisms? If we consider Boesak's point about the negative effects of the continued use of racial categorising systems, then we can question the value of examining social problems through racial lenses and begin to favour abandoning race and shifting to a 'post-racial' policy or analytic framework. The post-racial arguments are compellingly persuasive, arguing against 'race thinking' on the grounds that the recognition of race allows it 'reality', and hence power and validity. One of the early theorists of this position, Miles (1982), maintains that "race is an ideological construct whose use for social scientific analysis serves only to reinforce its legitimacy", arguing instead for "a focus on the racialisation of class relationships" (in Mason, 1994, p. 846). Another of the significant post-race thinkers, Appiah (1992), believes that working 'with race' propagates the "myth of an African world" (p. 73) constructing a common destiny for people who live in Africa "not because they shared a common ecology, nor because they had a common historical experience or faced a common threat from imperial Europe, but because they belonged to this one race" (Appiah, 1992, p. 5). In his view, blacks have in common that "they are perceived – both by themselves and by others – as belonging together in the same race, and this common race is used as a basis for discriminating against them" (1992, p. 17). For Appiah, "[t]here are no races: there is nothing in the world that can do all that we ask race to do for us" (1992, p. 45). He argues therefore that we should not engage with race talk (cf. (Bonilla-Silver and Forman, 2000) or race writing since

'[r]ace' disables us because it proposes as a basis for common action the illusion that black (and white and yellow) people are fundamentally allied by nature and, thus, without effort, it leaves us unprepared, therefore, unable, to handle the 'intra-racial' conflicts that arise from the very different situations of black (and white and yellow) people in different parts of the economy and the world. (Appiah, 1992, p. 176)

For Appiah, the use of 'race' "plays into the hands of the very exploiters whose shackles we are trying to escape" because race is "central to the way in which the

objective interests of the worst-off are distorted” (Appiah, 1992, p. 179). More recently, Gilroy (2000) is critical of what he regards as the destructive essentialism hidden in the work of many race theorists, even, and especially, those social constructionist writers who act in practice as if race is biologically real and that we are we a society of races. Mare´(2003), writing from this perspective in South Africa, is also concerned that race thinking forecloses perspectives on social reality and in so doing not only perpetuates the existence of ‘apartheid’ races but also facilitates further power imbalanced racist practices in society, such as xenophobia.

There are a number of difficulties with post-racialism, many of them epitomised in Boesak’s intervention (above), or more accurately, in the fact that his intervention – his analysis of race as a driving force behind the xenophobic attacks – was so atypical of the public outcry about these incidents. The general lack of recognition of the destructive role of racial politics in the xenophobic attacks illustrates how successfully race-as-analysis has ‘gone underground’ in South Africa. Perhaps this is because the racial practices (of black and white, public and private, social and individual) are so familiar and naturalised in our world, structured by colonialism and apartheid, that we fail to notice race being done (in much the same way that, as the Chinese proverb goes, a fish does not notice the water it swims in). In this context “[w]hen race is so self-evident that it becomes ‘unspoken’, it becomes a text that can be arbitrarily read or not read at all” (Vargas, 2008, p. 949). Perhaps race is particularly elusive in certain forms, for example, when racialised acts are committed by black South Africans who, as historical victims of racial practices, are not expected to act in racially discriminatory ways. There are undoubtedly other interpretations for the current ‘blindness’ to certain acts of race and racism, but however we interpret them we need to recognise that this blindness to problematic racial practices is an indicator that we cannot simply abandon race and move on, leaving these practices to ferment and mutate. Racial formations are chameleon-like in their ability to adapt and reproduce (Hepburn, 2003, p. 188). This ‘ability’ strongly predicts the continued existence of unspoken symbolic and material reflections of race that undermine our prospects for a ‘deracialised’ or even a ‘positively differentiated’ country in which racial diversity is recognised and valued.

In addition, adopting a post-racial framework in a context where there are such visible manifestations of race in South Africa would be reckless and inhumane (cf. Boateng, 2008, p.11). This would entail washing one’s hands of the conflict between the powerful and the powerless, which, as Paulo Freire points out, “means to side

with the powerful, not to be neutral” (in Alexander, 2004, p. 657). The overt racialisation of our society is painfully evident in the symbolic and material racial violence of the desperate poverty that continues to structure the lives of the majority of black people in South Africa, and in the litany of crude, verbal and physical racially charged incidents that continue to emerge in the public domain every few weeks. A recent example of the latter happened during a rugby match between Australia and South Africa which was played at Ellis Park Rugby Stadium in Johannesburg in September 2008. Notably it was a game dominated by spectacular try scoring by one of the team’s few black players, Jongi Nokwe. A black woman spectator, Ziningi Shibambo, reported that when she was returning to her seat at half time, three white Afrikaans-speaking men pushed her against a wall, tapped her roughly on her forehead and said to her, “You bloody *kaffirs*, you took over the only exclusively white sport in South Africa. You have also taken away our fathers’ land” (The Times, 3 September 2008, p. 1). I argue that ignoring symbolic and material displays of the racial structures of our sociality such as this one, through adopting a post-racial position, would create more space for them, entrenching them further, and it would also significantly conceal the need for redress (Steyn, 2001). So, perhaps, bizarrely, the post-racial position constructs racists of the post-racialists: it is only the powerful and the elite (black and white) who can take this post-racial position. The poor who are black know that they are poor because they are black. Goldberg (1993) challenges the feasibility of regarding race as irrelevant by arguing that “we have come, if often only silently, to conceive of social subjects foremost in racial terms” (p. 1). Certainly this has been US-Presidential candidate Barack Obama’s experience in his ongoing fight to get to the Oval Office. Earlier in his campaign he and his team attempted to establish Obama as not black or bi-racial but as a kind of hybrid ‘everyman’. This approach is epitomised by his comment on public radio that “[t]here has always been some tension between speaking in universal terms and speaking in very race-specific terms about the plight of the African-American community. By virtue of my background [a white mother from Kansas, a black father from Kenya], I am more likely to speak in universal terms” (in Walters, 2007, p. 14). In an earlier speech he proposed that “there’s not a black America and a white America and a Latino America and Asian America – there’s the United States of America” (Obama, 2004 in Walters, 2007, p. 17). However, every move that Obama has made has been racialised by the press and others, and diverse commentators have continually judged him as either “too black” or “not black enough” to be US President (Obama, 2008; Walters, 2007). More recently, as his fight has proved more successful, his promoters have surrendered to ‘race’ and begun to embrace Obama’s African-

American-ness, labelling his campaign partially as an effort to get the first African-American into the White House. Certainly Goldberg's (1993) comment that "all is race" seems salient when considering the campaign struggles that Obama has encountered with, *inter alia*, the media, the Conservatives, black leaders, and Hillary Clinton's spin-doctors.

Given the complexity of race, its ability to transmogrify and its destructive material power, the polarisation of the race debate into 'all or nothing' positions is obstructive. We need to resist the dual temptation, as Omi and Winant (1995) point out, "to think of race as an *essence*, as something fixed, concrete, and objective [and] ... to imagine race as a mere *illusion*, purely ideological construct which some ideal nonracist social order would eliminate" (p. 123, emphasis in original). We need to recognise that race is both constructed and material. This, of course, serves to further the opacity of race, making it that much more indefinable and intangible, and therefore more difficult to 'pin down' for analysis and challenge.

Seeking analytic frames to 'pin race down'

This then is where my research on race began: I recognised the critical relevance of doing empirical work on race in present day South Africa but it was not clear to me, more precisely, what research focus could make a useful contribution to anti-racist academic work given the impervious longevity and complexity of race. One of my starting points was the recognition that, as Henriques (1984) points out, "Racism reproduces itself not only mechanically at an economic and social level but also through the power relations between white and black people and the subjectivities which these produce and reproduce in both" (p. 89). As a social psychologist influenced by social constructionism and committed to understanding "how individuals are constituted through the social domain" (Henriques, Hollway, Urwin, Venn and Walkerdine, 1984a, p. 17), I gravitated towards a consideration of the construction (and deconstruction) of racialised subjectivities. Social constructionism is an anti-realist ontology which proposes that "many of the categories that we have come to consider 'natural' and hence 'immutable' can be more accurately (and more usefully) viewed as the product of processes which are embedded in human actions and choices" (Jackson and Penrose, 1993, pp. 2-3). So, for example, in psychology the radical impact of this ontology can be noted in the constructionist challenge to the traditional, realist framing of identity as something objectively fixed and enduring in our psyche or cognitive structure or both, which is more or less fully formed by the

time we reach adulthood and is the stable basis for all of our self-perception, behaviours, thoughts, feelings and relationships. The constructionists, by contrast, have argued that identity is 'subject to' the situations and conversations and activities that we engage in, a thesis which produces a notion of 'subjectivity' as provisional and often contradictory, as multiple and 'contextually' contingent (Henriques et al., 1984; Hall, 1996; Hepburn, 2003, Alexander and Knowles, 2005). This does not imply that we do not have relatively enduring aspects of our subjectivity but that this "continuity comes from ... the sedimentation of discursive practices over time" as we construct our identity from available narratives (Wetherell and Potter, 1992, p. 78-79). My research project, then, as part of the broader process of the interrogation of race, is an attempt to provide a detailed *analysis of everyday racialised practices in order to contribute towards the understanding of the practices through which we construct black and white subjectivities*. The study of the impact of *practices* routinely entails, in the current social science academy, a focus on the constitutive power and contextual basis of *discursive practices* (cf. De Fina, Shiffrin and Bamberg, 2006, p. 22). Shotter, for example, argued that "we constitute both ourselves and our worlds in our conversational activity" (Shotter, 1993, p. vi, in Kvale, 1996, p. 37, see also Potter, 1998). Since the 1980s the analysis of the constitutive power of racial discourses has been one of the most productive academic responses to the 'race problem', as it has allowed (critical discursive) analysts to identify the political effects of 'race talk', highlighting the subtle ways in which everyday citizens are constructed as racialised subjects, and how we 'do' race everyday in what we say, how we say it and to whom we say it. Practices therefore constitute who we are, and determine what we do.

Despite the immense value of understanding the ways in which discursive practices construct race (these are reviewed in Chapter 3), there are a number of valid concerns about this epistemological and methodological choice. Recently academics working within the 'materialist' movement/turn have challenged the dominance of the discursive analysis of social formations such as race on the basis that formulating race as a discursive construction alone appears to elude, avoid and conceal the material ramifications of this construction. The general argument here is that racial segregation, racial discrimination in relation to resources and opportunities, and racial violence, for example, cannot be treated solely as discursive constructions and as (theoretically) 'not real'. Academics with this materialist orientation conducting race research argue that, in addition to focusing on other practices such discursive practices, we have to take into account non-discursive material racial practices. For example, in Dixon and Durrheim (2004) and Durrheim and Dixon's beach

(re)segregation research (2005a, 2005b), they point to a number of the non-discursive practices of white beachgoers attempting to avoid close contact with black beachgoers, including arriving at the beach before (most) black beachgoers arrived, physically moving away from blacks on the beach, and leaving before (most) blacks arrived to enjoy the beach. My 'data' was collected through recording conversations with participants while we walked/drove through Durban and talked about the racial transformation of the city. In the process of walking/driving and talking, it became obvious that, in addition to the discursive constructions of racialised subjectivities occurring in our talk, there was also racialised engaging between us (and with others we engaged along the way). This was sometimes directly and indirectly 'recorded' in our conversations, but not always. This lack of discursive base for our interaction happened, for example, in the ways that we circumvented or hypervigilantly hurried through areas of town which are known to be 'black' and poor, such as Point Road and Albert Park. There are many other examples recorded in Chapter 7. These instances of the embodiment of race represented for me valuable and under-researched access to the practices involved in the construction of racialised subjectivities. Consequently, I developed a *joint interest in analysing the discursive and material, or embodied, practices* that constituted the construction of our racialised subjectivities during these tours⁶.

However, although discursive practices are available for analysis through the recordings of our talk, this is not always the case with the material practices of race which are sometimes discursively 'represented' and other times not. In their beach research, Durrheim and Dixon (2005a) rely on their observations of the embodied practices of white and black beachgoers (who moves where and when) and on the way in which material practices and linguistic practices are often mutually constitutive. An example of this is how the white beachgoers' talk about their plans to arrive at and leave the beach at certain times had the material effect of facilitating their avoidance of contact with black beachgoers. While the method of using deictic references in the talk (Durrheim and Dixon, 2005a, p. 453) to analyse material or embodied activities was available to me, the distant observer method was not available in my project because I participated in the tours, drawing heavily on the

⁶ I chose the word 'tour' for a range of reasons, including because the use of 'tour' allowed me to avoid the forced choice between the concepts 'interview' and 'conversation', neither of which seems appropriate nor accurate. Usually touring refers to traversing a place one is not familiar with – which is not the case here since all participants know the city well – but the mobile interview was an unfamiliar *practice* in this familiar space, so in that sense 'touring' involved *doing* something unfamiliar.

interactivity between us for my data. The embodied racial practices I was interested in were occurring between the (other) participants and me, and between us and others that we encountered briefly along the way, for example, with restaurant or café staff. So while I could rely on trace references in our conversations to these various ‘non-discursive’ ‘activities’, I also relied to some extent on my notes and impressions as a participant observer.

Another very useful method for analysing embodied practices became apparent to me while on ‘tour’ as it became apparent that many of our (the participants’) discursive and embodied practices were *place-bound*, that is, contingent on where we were when they were happening. When transcribing the digital recordings of the tours I could recall exactly *where* we were when we were having that particular conversation or interaction.⁷ And so I came to rely on a different and additional source of information for my analysis of the embodied (and discursive) practices that constituted our subjectivity: place (also known as ‘social space’). This implaced ‘information’ about participant subjectivity also became available through our discursive interaction, in how we talked about certain places as sources and representations of aspects of our identity. Given the extensive body of literature available on place-identity, that is, writing which, broadly, highlights the role of place in the construction of identity (including racial identities), place-identity writing was indeed profitable, ontologically, epistemologically and methodologically in this project. The fact that the “government of space is, and always has been, a central feature of racial domination in South Africa” (Dixon, Foster, Durrheim and Wilbraham, 1994, p. 277) made this choice all the more pertinent.

As I finish writing the final draft of this thesis, the connection between place and identity in Durban is highly topical because in August 2008 local government officials implemented a resolution of the Municipal Council of 28 May 2008 to rename many of the city’s streets after ANC heroes and heroes of the ANC. The renaming of streets, buildings, towns, airports and other similar spaces has been a popular governmental project in South Africa since 1994 and one which is mired in controversies. Most of the objections to renamings, according to Phakamani

⁷Given the way in which tour practices were so clearly spatialised, I have recorded spatial information about where our interactions took place in the city [*in italics in square brackets*] in the transcripts. I have also included field notes that I had written before and after the tours, and while transcribing. I integrated these prospective and retrospective reflections into the transcriptions where I thought they were related and relevant. See Appendix 3 for an explanation of this transcription method.

Mthembu, Director for Living Heritage who also works with the South African National Geographical Names Council, are lodged by people who believe renaming is a needless expense or by those who object when Afrikaans names have been changed to Zulu or Xhosa names, a process seen by some to be “eroding Afrikaans” heritage (Sunday Tribune, July 23 2006, p. 20). On the contrary, National Heritage Council Chief Executive Officer Sonwabile Mancotywa says that name changing is important in “decolonising African heritage” and must be seen as “restoring dignity to the millions who were not consulted when their heritage points were named” (Sunday Tribune, July 23 2006, p. 20). There can be no doubt of the significance of this renaming process: that in some ways who we are when we are walking in a (colonial) street named West Street in 1854/55 after the first (British) Lieutenant-Governor of Natal, Martin West, is different from who we are when, in August 2008, we are walking in a street named Dr Pixley KaSeme Street after one of the founders of the ANC. Indeed, place names are “cultural signifiers that signify belonging” (Cresswell, 1996 in Hubbard, Kitchin, Bartley and Fuller, 2002, p. 70), significant to individual and social identities and the broader nation-building project because the (re) naming of places can maintain, reproduce or resist spatial hegemonies (Cresswell, 1996 in Hubbard et al., 2002, p. 70). This idea of the symbolic and material significance of space to subjectivity should be familiar to those South Africans who lived through apartheid where space was used to great effect to produce a particular set of hierarchical social relations and subjectivities. Durban’s Mayor Obed Mlaba alluded to the cultural significance of place names in a renaming ceremony where he was officiating when he said that, with the new names citizens “will feel a sense of pride when they walk or drive through the city, it won’t feel like they are in someone else’s country anymore” (Mlaba, 2005, at the renaming of Martin West building and M4 highway). Amidst all these debates we should remind ourselves that the (re) naming of places after people revered by the government of the day is an old and familiar practice in our country, and, indeed, most countries in the world. In fact the South African National Geographical Names Council was founded as long ago as 1939 (known then as the National Place Names Committee). Of course, under colonialism and apartheid, the icons that were chosen to be tangibly honoured through having streets, buildings, airports and towns named after them were heroes of the prevailing social systems of those times.

In the pilot walking tours that I conducted with officials of the municipality, it became evident that a theoretical focus on place-identity would be a useful and obvious way to conceptualise this project. As this project is about race, I am particularly interested

in that place-identity work which is focused on the racialisation of subjectivity in and through and with space. Indeed, researchers of place practices in the last few decades have found ways to produce rich analyses of place as the site of social reproduction. Some of this work – a limited amount at present – has focused on researching place as a site for the reproduction of structuring social identity mechanisms like race, gender, age, sexual orientation, disability, etc, with a focus on how subjectivity is transformed in this process. Back (2005) has done very interesting work on race and space in London, leading him to conclude that: “Racism is by nature a spatial and territorial form of power. It aims to secure and claim ‘native’/white territory but it also projects associations onto space that in turn invests racial associations and attributes in place” (p. 19). This idea of racism as a spatial and territorial form of power is evident, for example, in the physical and racial assault of Ziningi Shibambo at the Ellis Park rugby game. Also, according to spectators who phoned in to a talk show on Radio 702, at this same rugby game a group of spectators shouted a racial epithet (*kaffir*) at (black) Springbok hero Jongi Nokwe each time he scored a try (The Times, Wed 3 September 2008, p. 1, p. 4). Both of these racialised practices – the assault of the spectator and of the player – were facilitated by place; in this instance, the Ellis Park rugby stadium which has been and is a white-dominated place, and which is a mainstay of white, male, (mostly) Afrikaans chauvinism, identities strongly associated with the practices of apartheid. This kind of racialised place makes this kind of practice possible, which in turn makes the process of racialised subjectivity formation possible. This is exactly the catholic argument of place-identity theorists: that spatial practices determine who we are when we are in these spaces (Dixon and Durrheim, 2000, p. 27) just as past and present practices in these spaces reciprocally define the spaces. By extension then, the discursive and material racial practices inscribed into the city over time continue to impact on who we are as citizens of Durban today (and vice versa) and can perhaps help to explain how, in post-apartheid Durban, race continues to be constructed and perpetuated, including in the practices of xenophobic violence which scarred the South African landscape this year.

The focus of my analysis then is on the discursive and material (or spatio-embodied) ways that the racialised subjectivities of whiteness and blackness are constructed on these tours, partly as a consequence of the ongoing racialisation of the spaces we move through. The mobile methodology utilised in this research – the collection of data while research participants are moving through the cityspaces – is central to this project as it aligns with and reinforces a core ontological assumption of space as

integral to (racialised) subjectivity. This mobile methodology also, through incorporating the movement of participants through place, serves to exacerbate the ways in which place produces subjectivity. While an immobile conversational interview would to some extent reveal the placement of subjectivity, the constant change in place while walking or driving – which is inherent in this mobile methodology – exaggerates this placement, and makes it repeatedly palpable.

The process of this thesis (an overview)

This is a qualitative project and hence my approach to the production of knowledge through research is iterative and reflexive, embedded in the confidence that ontologies, epistemologies and methodologies are interactively related and mutually informing. Consequently I have moved around and between the methodological, theoretical and empirical issues, with debates in each of these three areas influencing decisions in the other areas. For example, the project did not involve the broad traditional sequence: formulation of ‘hypothesis’ through literature reviewing, data collection, data analysis, and write-up. I have done all of these activities at all times during this research.

Employing an inductive approach meant that initially my research questions were vaguely formulated. I was immersed in theoretical and methodological reading and I was interested in studying the racialised discourses about the transformation of city spaces. I recognised that my choice of methodology to study race was important. As Pascale (2008) points out:

The ability of researchers to critique race cannot be separated from the tools we use to examine it. Research on race developed in the social sciences, much as it had in the ‘natural’ sciences, as a legitimated form of knowledge about ‘the Other’ produced by and for those in power (Cannella and Lincoln, 2004). (p. 723-724)

When I began this project I had recently spent five years working in the eThekweni Municipal Authority (EMA) – local government in Durban – and I knew that city officials had interesting personal and professional stories to tell about the racial changes in the city since democracy had been legislated in 1994. I conducted an office-based exploratory interview with a black friend-colleague working in local

government, Mandla⁸. He had lived in Durban most of his life and started work for the municipality as an artisan apprentice prior to 1994, and was and is now part of senior City management. It was a traditional question-and-answer (Q-and-A) interview with me positioned as The Researcher asking him, The Subject, a series of Questions, such as: Tell me about your experience of working in Durban and for the City Government. How do you explain your rise to success in local government? Tell me about your geographic journey and the various places you have lived in Durban. What was it like living there and why did you move on? What are your professional and personal goals over the next five to ten years?

During this interview Mandla told me troubling stories about the impact of apartheid on his personal and occupational life, and stories of how he had overcome apartheid obstacles and achieved multiple successes. Afterwards when I reflected on the transcription of this interview I recognised 'familiar' apartheid and post-apartheid episodes and themes in Mandla's accounts. I could not however identify anything in this interview that I could use to facilitate novel analysis and insights about the perpetuation of race. Moreover when I considered doing similar sessions with others I felt that I could anticipate how the interviews would run, what options existed for how we might position ourselves and construct our subjectivities, what political processes we would reference and what kind of analysis I might proffer. Given the subversive power of race I concluded that this methodology was inadequate. I had to find a way to have spontaneous, unpredictable conversations about race that would be surprising and revealing about the various ways in which racialised subjectivities were (still) being constructed. It occurred to me that physically moving the interviews out of government offices and into public city spaces was likely to generate new stories and subjectivities. Ultimately too, this change of setting fulfilled a number of other functions. For example, moving through active, engaging city spaces facilitated analytical work on the methodological power of space to produce (race) talk and subjectivity, or as I came to know it through the literature, to investigate 'located subjectivity'. From a postmodern standpoint this methodological movement could also be expected to generate local, specific narratives rather than talk about the grand metanarratives of Reconstruction, Development and Progress. So increasingly, "[k]nowing what I needed to find out [was leading] inexorably to the

⁸ I have used pseudonyms throughout and changed identifying data where it could reveal participant identity. I attempted to make them appropriate. Some of the participants chose their own pseudonyms.

question of how [I would] get that information” (Miles and Huberman, 1984, p. 42 in Silverman, 2005, p. 110).

Continuing my work as a qualitative research bricoleur, a “professional do-it-yourself person” (Levi-Strauss, 1966, p. 17 in Denzin and Lincoln, 2000, p. 4), I began to piece together a research strategy. I considered the option of interviewing participants in a local city café of their choice. We would be out of official buildings and in the public spaces of the city, and the technological recording of our conversations would be relatively simple. However, it seemed possible that after some time had passed in each interview, the relatively static café environs would be backgrounded and we would have similar kind of predictable/routine storytelling opportunities as we could have in *The Office*. I needed free-associative, spur-of-the-moment talk and to achieve this I needed to find a way to ‘talk on the move’ where constantly changing settings would ‘interactively’ prompt situated, relaxed interview work. Through networking and synchronicity I became aware of a new ‘Mobilities Movement’ – based chiefly in the disciplines of Geography and Sociology – wherein the focus of the empirical work is on mobile methodologies which capture and record movement in and through space, facilitating an analysis of the subjective significance of being in or near space or between spaces (McGuinness and Spinney, 2006). This kind of interviewing was novel and potentially very productive for my purposes so I chose to use it. After lengthy investigations I found a highly sensitive and unobtrusive digital voice recording (DVR) system that recorded more than 95% of a two-way discussion on a busy main street in the city during lunchtime (see Appendix 1 for further information on the DVR). The participants and I walked through the city of Durban talking about the transformation of the city and our stories and other interactions on these tours in this cityspace came to constitute the empirical data of this thesis.

This mobile methodology was not simply an interesting way to generate data. It is also theoretically significant because, as mentioned, while we were walking through historically and contemporaneously racially charged social spaces, what we (all of us, the participants) could say and do was (partially) determined by the racialised social practices of the spaces we were moving through, which contributed to the racialisation of our intersubjective subjectivity. It also became apparent that the space we were moving through was highly salient to what it was we could or did do or say about the racial transformation of the city. Inevitably I was led to place-identity literature and an interest in how space and subjectivity are interconnected. During

this process, this project became oriented around the ways in which racialised subjectivities are implaced.

Before moving on further I would like to make an initial comment about broad ethical concerns in this project. As a constructionist project this research cannot be traditionally reliable (repeatable) or generalisable. However, with the aim of producing dependable work I have included throughout my thesis much detail about the iterative process entailed in making methodological decisions about, for example, pilot studies, sampling, and data generation and analysis techniques. This provides the reader with detailed descriptions of “how certain actions and opinions are rooted in, and develop out of, contextual interaction... [By] providing the reader with a frank statement of the methods used to collect and analyse data” (Van Der Riet and Durrheim, 2006, pp. 93-94, Silverman, 2005) she can hopefully be convinced that “the findings did indeed occur as [I] say they did” (Van der Riet and Durrheim, 2006, p. 93). Allowing relatively extensive access to the data generated is also part of the effort to establish reliability in qualitative work. It is intended that through providing the reader with access to significant portions of the data, she will be in a position to establish for herself the analytical dependability of this data. Reflections about generalisability, validity, reliability, and participant ‘protection’ – critical research concerns – are interspersed throughout. In terms of research ethics concerning participants, Appendix 2 is a summary of my efforts to ensure that participants were accorded their rights to autonomy, respect and dignity, nonmaleficence, beneficence and justice (Wassenaar, 2006).

One last issue about the thesis process needs to be highlighted here: in postgraduate research the voice of the supervisor is usually (guiltily) smudged out by the supervisee, and the supervisor’s voice is ‘blended’ within the reported voice of the student. In effect, however, postgraduate research is (appropriately) a collaborative project between supervisor and student. At various stages of this research process my supervisor, Kevin Durrheim, and I have emailed and talked (in person and on the phone) daily, weekly or monthly, discussing macro and micro aspects of the research proposals I drafted. Along the way he referred me to reading material that we discussed and which significantly influenced my research design and practices. Together we analysed the pilot studies and re-designed the research strategy. I presented my analytical ideas to him and we debated them extensively, and in these discussions my ideas altered and developed considerably. The ‘natural history’ of the research process at this postgraduate level cannot be construed as an

individual process. It is frequently 'co-biographical'. So, most often references to 'I' index a multiple voice, including most largely Kevin and me, but also those others I have talked with, listened to or read with. I include this story of research collaboration as part of the transparent elaboration of the research process, but also because I wish to participate in the elucidation of the ways in which knowledge is generated in qualitative research.

The product of this thesis – and the research questions

In summary, this project as product is an examination of how racialised subjectivities are produced through our everyday practices in racialised spaces and how this impacts on the continuing reproduction of race, and the possibilities for racial change. More specifically the focus is on how the practices of discourse, social space and embodiment are imbricated in this production of racialised subjectivity, of blackness and whiteness and black-and-whiteness. The broad research questions guiding this research project are therefore the following:

- How are our racialised subjectivities, our blackness and whiteness, produced through our everyday discursive and material, or spatio-embodied, practices?
- How do these discursive and spatio-embodied practices articulate?
- How does this articulation impact on the continuing production of race, specifically in the still racialised city of Durban?
- How does a mobile methodology function as a way of 'accessing' these practices?
- What are the possibilities for racial transformation within an understanding of this articulation?

Following this introductory chapter Chapter 2 is divided into section A which is a consideration of relevant place-identity theoretical frameworks and section B which outlines the use of place-identity theorising in a genealogical presentation of Durban's race-space over time. Chapter 3 is a theoretical consideration of the discursive construction of race. This is a brief chapter as this process is well documented in the social sciences. Chapter 4 elaborates on the methodological processes, decisions and concerns central to the production of knowledge in this research project. In Chapters 5 and 6 I present empirical analyses of the discursive constructions of place-identity by black and white participants in the Durban 'racespace' (cf. Phalane, Hoddinott, Parker, and Richards, 2007). Chapter 7 is a

theoretical and empirical examination of the enactment of race through the construction of spatio-embodied racialised subjectivities while on tour. This thesis ends (Chapter 8) with a summary and a reflection of the key offerings of this research for theoretical and empirical work on race and racialised subjectivities. There is also a focus on the possibilities for extending and furthering this work, including comments on the research gaps and opportunities which arise from this particular project.

Throughout this project I am inspired by the Foucauldian view of identity as constructed through powerpolitics, the circulation of sticky webs of power in our sociosphere. I hope, however, to also consider a more 'agentic' approach to identity construction than that of the rather fatalistic Foucault. This then entails a focus, not only on subjectification (on how circulating power invisibly ensnares us) but also on how we can identify, impact on and reshape these (political) webs of subjectification.

Chapter 2: Place and Identity

Chapter 2 is divided into section A which is a consideration of relevant place-identity theoretical frameworks, and section B which outlines the use of place-identity theorising in a genealogical presentation of Durban's race-space over time.

Part A: Theorising place and identity

To be (at all) is to be in (some) place. (Archytas of Tarentum, in Orum and Chen, 2003, p. 1)

Identity is formed at the unstable point where the “unspeakable” stories of subjectivity meet the narratives of history, of a culture. (Hall, 1988c, p. 44 in Wetherell and Potter, 1992, p. 78)

Introduction

The significant contribution of the early place-identity theorists, Fried (1963), Tuan (1974), Relph (1976) and others, was to ‘voice’ the importance of place as an attribute of identity, that is, to acknowledge that we are always ‘in place’ and that this situatedness profoundly influences our ‘way of being’ in the world. This phenomenologically inspired work emphasises the particularistic and unique ‘signatures’ of place (Stedman, 2002, p. 562, Clement, 2006, p. 2; Walker, 2007, p. 4) and looks to ‘place’ as part of an existential endeavour “to understand what it means to be human” (Tuan, 2004, p. 46). Relph (1976) captures the same orientation with his argument that to be human “is to live in a world that is filled with significant places: to be human is to have and know *your* place” (1976, p. 1, original emphasis, in Hopkins and Dixon, 2006, p. 174). In one of the first empirical studies of the significance of place on person, Fried (1963), using Bowlby’s psychoanalytic emotional attachment theory, examined the impact of their forced relocation on a group of East Boston residents and concluded that there was a “parallel between the grief response to the loss of significant people and the loss of place”. Fried then named place as an “important constituent of identity” and articulated the novel idea that we all have ‘spatial identities’ (Hopkins and Dixon, 2006, p. 175). Fried (2000) later summarised this description of spatial identity as “the physical/geographic dimensions within which houses, streets, even whole communities can bound,

intensify, and provide a spatial locus for identification and community attachment linked to social group identity” (p. 197 in Utz, 2001, p. 20).

A few years later Proshansky (1978) continued this intriguing theorisation of a connection between place and identity, as

Those dimensions of self that define the individual’s personal identity in relation to the physical environment by means of a complex pattern of consciousness and unconscious ideas, beliefs, preferences, feelings, values, goals, and behavioral tendencies and skills relevant to this environment. (p. 155)

Proshansky (1978) explained this correlation between place and identity in the following more ‘concrete’ way:

The family is not simply a mother, a father, brothers and sisters; it is also a place called *home*. A school is not just other people called pupils, teachers and principals; it is also a building with classrooms, play areas, toilets, a principal’s office, and a lunchroom. And a teenage gang is not just a social system relating its members to one another; it is also a back yard, a cellar hideout, or a corner poolroom, and perhaps all of these. (p. 155)

Key to the notion of place-identity, as developed by Proshansky, Fabian and Kaminoff (1983), is the idea of place-attachment. This concept has been multiply interpreted over time but is generally regarded to invoke the emotional bond between person/people and place (Proshansky et al, 1983; Williams et al, 1992 in Stedman, 2002, p. 563; Vonnikin and Riese, 2001) and to consist of “two interwoven components: an individual’s memories of a place and an individual’s expectations for future experiences in relation to that place (Milligan, 1998)” (in Milligan, 2003, p. 383). Place attachment is seen by some to be achieved through the ways in which special places over time offer restorative opportunities (Korpela, 1989 in Korpela, Hartig, Kaiser and Fuhrer, 2001). Another interpretation of the basis for the development of this positive symbolic bond between place and person is on the ways in which we “attribute meaning to landscapes and in turn become attached to the meanings” (Stedman, 2002, p. 563). The negative consequences of a lack of place attachment or rootlessness or placelessness (Relph, 1976; Tuan, 1980)” (Yuen, 2005, p. 202), as highlighted by Fried’s writings about the dislocation of the East Boston residents, has also been investigated by human geographers and others.

The articulation of the influence or impact of space on our identity may now seem obvious, a correlation simply waiting to be recognised. However, as with (most) revolutionary ideas (in the sense of ideas that can and do evoke and reflect fundamental ontological changes), it is an obvious correlation because we can review it in hindsight, and also because the idea of human life as a “topocentric reality” (Karljalainen, 2003, p. 88) has such excellent explanatory power. However, prior to 1960, general theorising of “the problem of the psychological and social consequences of urban life” was substantially neglected in the academy (Proshansky, 1978, p. 149). It was at this time that the ratio of urban to rural dwellers in the western world was just beginning to tilt towards a predominance of urbanites (Proshansky, 1978). This increasing urbanisation contributed to the interest in western theorising about place at this time as there was a preponderance of urbanites writing about their context, a context which increasingly included a range of social problems which needed to be examined and theorised. Nowadays city living is the (statistical) norm and social life is studied largely within the frame of complex, industrialised urban living (Nylund, 2000; Gospodini, 2002). With this urban domination (at least for those of us who constitute the urbanised majority), it seems plain that we ought to take seriously the impact of place on identity, especially in psychology where ‘identity’ work is a keystone of the discipline. In the social sciences there has been a boost in place-identity work through, for example, the increasing focus on the ways in which rural and urban space has become contested territory for citizenship rights (Veronis, 2007; Osborne, 2001; Waage, 2001; Gospodini, 2002; Nylund, 2000; Carter, Dyer and Sharma, 2007); on the impact of architectural practices, physical/concrete developments and other changes in urban designscapes on place-attachment and corresponding personal identities (Vonnikin and Riese, 2001; Utz, 2001; Havik, 2003; Milligan, 2003; Felonneau, 2004; Larsen, 2004; Martin, 2005); on the positive work of place-identity in promoting ‘multicultural’ interaction and ‘community’; on the restorative value of the construction of certain kinds of spaces (Korpela et al., 2001; Stedman, 2002; Pretty, Chipuer and Bramston, 2003; Haapala, 2003; Nylund, 2000; Wilson and Peters, 2005; Chan, 2006; Manzo and Perkins, 2006); on place-identity constructions as a means to develop environmental awareness (Walker, 2007; Clement, 2006); on place-based planning and the ‘manipulation’ of place-identity for the economic purposes of branding and marketing cities, towns and countries (Gospodini, 2002; Yuen, 2005; Julier, 2005); and, on place-identity and power (Kong and Law, 2002; Chang, 2005; Neill, 2005; Bolam, Murphy and Gleeson, 2006) including work by on the ways in which “racialised identities have been constituted through the geo-politics of colonialism” (Taylor,

2000, p. 27) and apartheid (Steyn, 2001; Dixon and Durrheim, 2004; Durrheim and Dixon, 2001, 2005a, 2005b; Durrheim, 2005; Ballard, 2002, 2004a, 2004b, 2004c, 2005a, 2005b; Popke and Ballard, 2004). On the whole, most of this research into spatial practices “involves the interrogation of the everyday ... how people ordinarily use and make spaces and place for themselves, often without realizing” (Pile, 2008, p. 210).

Before progressing to a consideration of the nuances of the place-identity work, I wish to articulate a distinction in the literature between the words ‘place’ and ‘space’. This is not mere semantics or regressive binarism: these words have been used oftentimes as ‘codes’ or word-concepts which mean far more than they may, on the surface of the text, appear. The ‘place’ theorists, whose roots are planted in the phenomenological existentialism of the early human geographers and environmental psychologists, are interested in how place influences the ways that we, as individuals, come to be who and what we are (Relph, 1976; Tuan, 1974, 2004; Proshansky, 1978; Proshansky et al., 1983). This brings about a related research focus on how to reproduce, maintain or establish “restorative places” (Korpela et al., 2001) so that we can live evolved, fulfilling and meaningful lives (Tuan, 1974 in Manzo and Perkins, 2006; Speller, 2000 in Hauge, 2007; Hornecker, 2005). According to this view, place is inhabited space (and space is simply empty place). In contrast, those who write of ‘space’ instead of ‘place’ generally have their intellectual roots in the writings of Marxist geographers and radical urbanists who see space as a form or representation of the social structures that determine social life. For example, Lefebvre, the godfather of this movement, was interested in space as a relational form of social organisation. He was motivated by the political desire to undermine and transform capitalism and he believed that this was possible through the re-organisation of space (Smith, 1990 in Valentine, 2001; also see Nylund, 2003). However, in the partially fused interdisciplinary pick-and-mix academic world we now live in, theorists (including me) construct their views based on an amalgam of these two word-concepts. We do this at least partly because we are sceptical about a singular meaning of the (ambiguous, contradictory) constructs we are engaging with: space, place, subjectivity, identity (Nylund, 2003). More recently, on the sidelines of place-identity research, the geographic word-concept, ‘landscape’, has been used where place or space may have been used previously. It is a term frequently used by social constructionist geographers to refer to “culturally loaded geographies” which “constitute material records arranged palimpsest-like through time and space” and which “may be interrogated as artefacts and symbolically loaded signifiers of

meaning” (Osborne, 2001, p. 5). These distinctions between place, space and landscape circulate, overtly and covertly, in writings of place-identity, including this research project.

The nature of the connection between place and identity

In the place/identity literature there are nuanced distinctions between various formulations of the relationship between place and identity (are they mutually influential, dialectical, co-constitutional?) and these are impacted on by varying interpretations of place (for example, what constitutes place/space? Is it active/passive? Is it acted upon and/or acting?) and identity (is it individual and/or social? Is it mostly constant and/or fluid?). These differences may seem pedantic and arcane but they are, in fact, germane to this project because they have ontological and epistemological implications for interpreting the construction of the subjectivities of blackness and whiteness in the ‘racospace’ (Phalane et al., 2007) of Durban, and hence for the bigger project of identifying ways to undermine those negative aspects of this racialisation of subjectivity through space. For those influenced by the original phenomenological place/identity writers, the connection between place and identity is close but separate; they are related, mutually enforcing and influencing forces. This separation is apparent for example in Tuan’s (1974) evocative theory of ‘topophilia’ which he describes as a reference to “the affective bond *between* people and place’ (Tuan 1974b, p. 4 in Cresswell, 2004, p. 20, emphasis added) and in Relph’s (1976) view of place as an “attribute of identity” (p. 48).

Indeed, for Proshansky (1978), place-identity is, in fact, a *sub-identity* of individual or self-identity, in the same category as the sub-identities associated with “sex, social class, ethnic background, occupation, religion, and more” (p. 155). This assumption of place as separate and as ‘addition to’ the identity formulation process is reiterated in Proshansky et al.’s (1983) description of how “the subjective sense of self is defined and expressed not simply by one’s relationship to other people, but *also* by one’s relationship to the various physical settings that define and structure day-to-day life” (p. 58, emphasis added); and also in their comment that “the places and spaces a child grows up in, those that he or she comes to know, prefer, to seek out or avoid *also* contribute significantly to self-identity” (p. 73, emphasis added).

The coupled but separate relationship between place and identity is explored in an absorbing paper by Godlewska (2004) about a 17th century French woman, Marie

Guyart, who left her domestic life and her young son to be ordained as a nun in the catholic Ursuline Order, an Order primarily committed to the education of women. As a nun she was renamed Marie de l'Incarnation and she was mandated by the Catholic Church to travel to Canada to work with indigenous (first nation) Americans in compiling dictionaries of 'native' languages. While she was there she also established a hospital and a new Ursuline order. According to Godlewska, an analysis of Marie l'Incarnation's writings and the biographies about her reveals that being in a different place (for example, in a missionary educational space) necessitated Marie l'Incarnation engaging in the practices of those particular spaces (teaching, writing, learning, organising) and through engaging in these new practices, she constructed new identities from those associated with the practices of the domestic places she had left as Marie Guyart in France. This brings to mind Pred's (1984) poetic idea of place as "a process of becoming" (in Kong and Yeoh, 1995, p. 1). After reflection on the close articulation between place, practice and identity in the construction of Marie de l'Incarnation, Godlewska concludes that:

Who you are, who I am, has everything to do with the places we have inhabited and inhabit now. In other places we would behave differently. But no place is a simple concept. It is not a matter of here or there or of Africa or Canada. If place is integral to identity so is identity integral to place. Place is a complex network of subjective experiences, objective projections, embodied limitations, social expectations, opportunities and forces, and physical forces. As Foucault, Malpas and many others have pointed out, the dichotomy between the world wholly within me and the world wholly outside me does not exist (Foucault, 1978, 1979; Malpas, 1999). Place and identity, then, are inseparable. If we wish to understand identity, then we must struggle to understand that complex network that is place. If we wish to understand place, we must struggle to understand identity in all its complexity. (Godlewska, 2004, p. 175)

Godlewska is working here with an interesting notion of identity that is both individual and social. This is a familiar pattern in the work of place-identity theorists who are partially interested in social or cultural (place-determined) identities, but for whom the overarching tenor of their work has usually assumed a strongly individual identity focus. This 'ambivalence' is evident in a comment by Relph (1976) on the importance of familiar and significant places to each of us:

There is for virtually everyone a deep association with and consciousness of the places where we were born and grew up, where we live now, or where we have had particularly moving experiences. This association seems to

constitute a vital source of both individual and cultural identity and security.

(p. 43 in Proshansky et al., 1983, p. 60)

Although Relph indicates here an interest in 'cultural identity', the ontological framework from which he is operating is based on a belief in the centrality of an individualist identity. Although Proshansky et al. (1983) work with a more fluid and dynamic notion of identity as shifting and transforming through changes in place over time and they stress their commitment to "an ecological approach in which the person is seen as involved in transactions with a changing world" (p. 59), they effectively undermine this ecosystemic compass with a strong primary interest in the individual quest for an understanding of 'who am I in this place?' The dominance of this individual interpretation of identity is shown here:

The concept of 'built environment' is deeply rooted in our associations and beliefs about adult life. That 'life', of course, has been the nexus for the development of our complex industrialized society and with it has emerged in its urban residents a very strong belief in and attachment to this way of life, or what is commonly referred to as *urban-identity*. By this we mean an association between the array of physical settings and the complex pathways that connect them which constitute an individual's conception of the city, with his definition of 'who I am'. (Proshansky et al., 1983, p. 78, emphasis in original)

In this sense then place is seen to provide an answer to the question, "'Who am I?' by countering 'Where am I?' Or 'Where do I belong'" (Cuba and Hummon, 1993, p. 112 in Utz, 2001, p. 20). This individualistic notion of identity in the place-identity theorising is also reflected in the writing of contemporary phenomenological philosopher, Casey (2001): for him the focus on place-identity is on how "once having been in a particular place for any considerable time – or even briefly, if our experience there has been intense – we are forever marked by that place which lingers in us indefinitely and in a thousand ways, many too subtle for us to mention" (p. 688).

The early place/identity writing thus focused on "individual feelings and experiences" without placing "these bonds in the larger, socio-political context" (Manzo and Perkins, 2006, p. 335). These individual notions of identity obviously infused thinking about place (and hence place-identity and place attachment) as a rather decontextualised and individual experience. Hopkins and Dixon (2006) add to this argument with the suggestion that this is because the roots of place/identity work are in phenomenology and humanism and "such a perspective often assumes that this

meaning can be grasped independently of wider discursive and political practices of representation” (Hopkins and Dixon, 2006, p. 175).

A corresponding difficulty with building a social notion of place was that initially place was largely viewed as a passive container (Franck, 1984): as “mere background to, or container of, social relations, or as a behavioural setting that inhibits or encourages interaction” (Durrheim and Dixon, 2005b, p. 181). Increasingly, many of the place/identity theoreticians have begun to regard place more as “a signifying system (Eco, 1986; Duncan, 1990; Barnes and Duncan, 1992; Ashworth, 1998) in which a whole range of economic, political, social and cultural issues can be encoded” (Gospodini, 2002, p. 24) and places as “made through human practices and institutions even as they help to make those practices and institutions’ (Gieryn, 2000, p. 467; cf. Giddens, 1984)” (Brown and Humphreys, 2006, p. 248). Within this framework place thus is construed as “*both* the real, concrete settings from which cultures emanate to enmesh people in webs of activities and meanings *and* the physical expression of those cultures in the form of landscapes” (Agnew and Duncan, 1989 in Kong and Yeoh, 1995, p. 1, emphasis added). The use of the term *landscape* is revealing as it indicates a shift towards a more active conceptualisation of place in the place-identity relationship; landscape as “a verb, not a noun ... not as an object to be seen or a text to be read, but as a process by which social and subjective identities are formed” (Mitchell, 1994, p. 1 in Osborne, 2001, pp. 12-13). This is an analytic frame that requires a consideration of “not just what landscape *is* or *means* but what it *does*, how it works as a cultural practice” (Mitchell, 1994, pp. 1-2 in Osborne, 2001, pp. 12-13, emphasis in original; see also Brown, 2005, p. 11; Durrheim and Dixon, 2004, p. 470; Durrheim and Dixon, 2005b, p. 181). This is evident for example in the intriguing work by Till (2005) on the spatial transformation of the city of Berlin over the last century. Till positions herself in place/identity theorising through a critique of place/identity theorists who have fixed, non-interactive views of space and who treat the city and place more generally “as a stage on which the drama of history – represented as contested negotiations between key political figures, historians, philosophers and artists – is performed” (p. 8). In her view it is critical to recognise that

places are never merely backdrops for action or containers for the past. They are fluid mosaics and moments of memory, matter, metaphor, scene, and experience that create and mediate social spaces and temporalities. Through place making, people mark social spaces as haunted sites where they can

return, make contact with their loss, contain unwanted presences, or confront past injustices. (Till, 2005, p. 8)

Like Till, Brown (2005) interprets place as “an abstraction, not a set of physical properties just there for the eye to see” (p. 9). For her, place operates just as race and gender do, that is, “through the invocation and naturalization of matter” (p. 9). Brown soundbites this view rather evocatively when she comments that “place is not photographable ... although places are” (p. 9). The work of Till, Brown and others indicates a certain significant shift for place/identity theorists, a shift towards a view of place and identity which is far more social, more collective and which can take us “towards the development of alternative perspectives in which there is increased attention to the social processes and practices through which people’s sense of themselves and their relationship with place and space are constructed, contested and made psychologically consequential” (Hopkins and Dixon, 2006, p. 175). This is a framework shaped around the view that “place identity processes, however individual they may appear, are powerfully shaped by the history of relations between groups” (Dixon and Durrheim, 2004, p. 459).

A more social notion of place-identity

Till is an American writing about place/identity in Europe and, like many others writing about place and identity in Europe, she is greatly influenced by a European theoretical emphasis on the social nature of space and (related) ‘collective’ identity formulations. Principal amongst these writers is the French Marxist and urbanist, Lefebvre, who, in his formidable text *Production de l’espace* (1974) (*The Production of Space*, 1991) presents his radical thesis that social relations are foremost spatial relations. For Lefebvre the study of space is the most significant social dimension to study in a quest to understand social life because it

offers an answer according to which the social relations of production have a social existence to the extent that they have a spatial existence; they project themselves into a space, becoming inscribed there, and in the process producing the space itself. (Lefebvre, 1974/1991, p. 129).

Since the English translation of *The Production of Space* appeared in 1991, many English-speaking writers have substantively interpreted Lefebvre’s dense writing. I am most often convinced by Soja’s (1996) elucidation of his work. Here he presents his version of the radical core of Lefebvre’s perspective on space:

The message is clear, but few on the Left have been willing to accept its powerful connotations: that all social relations become real and concrete, a

part of our lived social existence only when they are spatially 'inscribed' – that is *concretely represented* – in the social production of social space. Social reality is not just coincidentally spatial, 'existing' in space, it is presuppositionally and ontologically spatial. *There is no unspatialized social reality*. There are no aspatial social processes. Even in the realm of pure abstraction, ideology and representation, there is a pervasive and pertinent, if often hidden, spatial dimension. (p. 46, emphasis in original)

The influence of this idea of the co-constitutionality of space and society, which put rather crudely is a reference to the idea that 'we are space and space is us', reverberated in Europe and in the USA, initiating the kind of thinking epitomised by Dixon and Durrheim's more social formulation of place/identity as "a collective construction, produced and modified through human dialogue, that allows people to make sense of their locatedness" (Dixon and Durrheim, 2000, p. 40). This idea is expressed vigorously by British geographer Massey (2000) with her argument that "[p]laces are spaces of social relations" (p. 458 in Brown, 2005, p. 11; see also Utz 2001), a view which entails seeing 'place' not as "simply reducible to some geographical location" but as "shaped by and in some sense the outcome of a prior set of interactions" (Goodings, Locke and Brown, 2007, p. 10). In addition, theorists like Manzo and Perkins (2006) have used these social notions of space to challenge the individualism of a key notion of place-identity theorising, that is, place-attachment, on the grounds that

A close examination of place attachments reveals how individuals identity and power relations manifest themselves in the everyday uses and meanings of place (Devine-Wright and Lyons, 1997; Dixon and Durrheim, 2000; Manzo, 2003). For example, who we are and where we belong are influenced by gender, race, ethnicity and class. (Manzo, 2003, 2005) (p. 340)

Manzo and Perkins (2006) combine environmental and community psychology literature on place attachment and meaning with the theory, research and practice of community participation and planning. They do this in order to "provide a greater understanding of how neighbourhood spaces can motivate ordinary residents to act collectively to preserve, protect, or improve their community" (p. 341).

The point underlying these challenges to traditional place-identity and place-attachment constructs is that "the relationship between self and place is not just one of reciprocal influence ... but also more radically, of constitutive coingredience: each is essential to the being of the other. In effect, there is *no place without self and no self without place*" (Casey, 2001, p. 684). This idea is captured poignantly in the

'autobiographical novel' by Richard Rive about District Six, a 'Coloured' area of Cape Town until it was zoned white in 1966. As the Coloured residents were being forcibly removed, the key protagonist, Zoot, one of the residents about to be moved comments to his neighbours:

We must tell about the District and the thousands of other districts that they have broken up because they wanted even more than they already had. We knew that District Six was dirty and rotten. Their newspapers told us so often enough. But what they didn't say was that it was also warm and friendly. That it contained humans. That it was never a place – that it was a people. (1986, pp. 197-198)

Osborne (2001) elaborates on this complex process of the construction of this place/identity co-constitutionality in the following way:

[T]here is no *inherent* identity to places: this is constructed by human behaviour *in reaction* to places. Quotidian practices of living and formalized rituals, commemorations and preservation impart meaning to place and develop identities with places. Monuments, streets, neighbourhoods, buildings, churches, and parks are all material *things*, but they also invoke specific kinds of meanings and serve as spatial coordinates of identity (Lynch, 1972). They are associated with specific kinds of activities. They are linked to society through repetitive prosaic practices, ritualised performance, and institutionalised commemoration. That is, there is an ongoing reciprocal relationship between people and the places they inhabit. People produce places, and yet they derive identities from them: "*people are constituted through place*" (McDowell, 1996). (p. 4, emphasis in original)

I would like to draw attention to Osborne's reference to how our practices – what it is that we *do* in space – determine this co-constitutionality between space and society. It is a focus echoed by Knowles (2005) in her comment that

[p]eople make themselves and their lives as they make space, so that space is the practical accomplishment of human activity. It tells its own stories about the making of people and places in gendered, racial and ethnic (and other) terms. Space is an active archive of politics and individual human agency.... The lives, activities and social relationships of people, past and present, establish the social character of space. (p. 90)

This emphasis on practices is crucial and does not mean that space is "devoid of any material basis" (Baerenholdt and Simonsen, 2004, p. 1) but rather that it is

“constituted through social relations *and* material social practices” (Massey, 1994, p. 254 in Hubbard et al., 2002, p. 13, emphasis in original). I elaborate further on this in Chapter 7.

Within this spatial framework, space is understood ideologically: “it is through the production of symbolic and material spaces that ideologies can become consolidated within the sphere of everyday life” (Lefebvre, 1991 in Durrheim and Dixon, 2001, p. 435; Dixon and Durrheim, 2004, p. 459). This facilitates critical work on “the power relations that shape how space is claimed, occupied, used and regulated to the benefit of some and the detriment of others” (Hubbard et al., 2002, p. 69). The significance of social space to an understanding of the functioning of power is evident in this comment from Foucault (1980):

Space was treated as the dead, the fixed, the undialectical, the immobile. Time, on the other hand, was richness, fecundity, life, dialectic ... The use of spatial terms seem to have the air of anti-history. If one started to talk in terms of space that meant that one was hostile to time. It meant, as the fools say, that one “denied history” ... They didn’t understand that [these spatial terms] ... meant the throwing into relief of processes – historical ones, needless to say – of power. (p. 149 in Agnew and Duncan, 1989, p. 1)

The analysis of the role of space in the ideological construction and reconstruction of national identities and nationhood in socially divided countries highlights this contested nature of landscape/place (Kong and Law, 2002) because of the attention given to matters of “who belongs, the rights and freedoms that people may claim and exercise, decisions about where we feel “at home” or “out of place”, where we may move to, or avoid, and much more besides” (Hopkins and Dixon, 2006, p. 174; see also Kong and Law, 2002).

Fascinating and imminently readable writing by Neill (2005) and Till (2005) on the transformation of Berlin illustrate empirically how spatial attempts are used to “reinforce and conceal hegemonies” (Dixon and Durrheim, 2004, p. 469). As the capital city of Germany, Berlin is a cityspace “where, more than any other city, German nationalism and modernity have been staged and restaged, represented and contested” (Till, 2005, p. 5). There are powerful links between Hitler’s use of place in his national socialist project to construct ‘the Aryan race’ (and the ‘non-Aryan’ Jewish ‘race’) and the use of place by the political administrators of colonial and apartheid South African to construct white and black ‘races’. Neill (2005) writes of how, in Berlin in 1937, when Hitler appointed Albert Speer as the Inspector-General of Buildings,

Speer immediately “began a process of inscribing a diabolically exclusivist national narrative in stone (Reichhardt and Schaeche, 1998) in the form of grand plans for a new Germania” (p. 337). The spatial structuring of Berliner identity continued during the Cold War in the 1960’s when Berlin was rigidly divided along its East-West axis by the infamous and impassable Berlin Wall, a barrier that was later dismantled by popular uprisings in 1989 in new social movements which again dramatically changed Berlin’s spatial relations and identities. Neill articulates the various ways in which space has been repeatedly used in Berlin not only to build a city but German identity itself (Neill, 2005, p. 33). He describes how current city planners are using space to literally erase parts of Berlin memory through the development of a new inner-city planning and design concept known as *Planwerk Innenstadt*. This spatial plan ensures that any plans submitted to the city authorities for the future development of the city will only be approved if the architects have drawn on 19th century and early 20th century architectural principles “when Berlin was a ‘normal’ and more classically beautiful city in the European tradition” (Neill, 2004, pp. 91-96 in Neill, 2005, pp. 341-342). In this way “the urban designer’s pen is used on a grand scale to consciously erase and etch physical traces of memory into the built fabric of the city” and “Berliners are to be reconnected with a shared history before 1933” (Neill, 2005, pp. 341-342). Indeed, certain (ex-) East Berlin spatial planners regard The *Planwerk Innenstadt* spatial plan as “a declaration of war” against the identity of East Germans (Hian, 2001, p. 74)” (Paulick, 2004a in Neill, 2005, p. 342) because it is seen to be denying the East Berliners’ spatial heritage in favour of the spatial memories and identities of the affluent west Berliners (Neill, 2005). Similarly, Chang (2005) documents how landscape has been used in the construction of ‘new Asia’ in places like Singapore to manipulate identity construction through a policy of sanctioning development which correlates with the official philosophy on urban planning and identity formation (p. 250). This philosophy is

wiped clean of unpleasant social memories (those relating to vice, poverty and ecological problems) ... infused instead with images and activities epitomising a progressive and dynamic Asian society (emphasising arts, local community and multiculturalism). (p. 251)

The impact of the co-constitutionality of place-identity on racial subjectivity

In the study of social formations like gender, class and race through space there is a need to recognise, as Cresswell (2004) points out, that these social formations do not “happen on the head of a pin” but “in space and place” (p. 27). Within this framework, Back (2005), as mentioned in Chapter 1, has been studying the “racial mapping” of South London and how “[b]eneath the signs of place names like ‘Brixton’ or ‘Handsworth’ or ‘Southall’ are racially encoded landscapes created as exotic or dangerous by turns that act like a kind of A-Z of racist geography (Keith, 1993, 2003)” (p. 19). For Back, these racial maps of neighbourhoods are created through the different stories being told about neighbourhoods, and “in the process new maps of belonging, safety and risk are drawn” (p. 19). So when we recognise that “racial difference is also spatial difference” (Mohanram, 1999 in Razack, 2002, p.16) and that “[r]acisms become institutionally normalized in and through spatial configuration” (Goldberg, 1993 in Razack, 2002, p. 16), then space/place offers a potentially powerful mechanism to investigate race and the production of racialised subjectivities. This is a key focus of the empirical chapters (Chapters 5 - 8).

Memory, nostalgia, place and identity construction

Writing about the transformation of spatial identities hints at the ways in which memory, time and place are interwoven. This is at least partly because places “give a spatial ‘fix’ to time” (Till, 2005, p. 5). Bhabha (1990), under the influence of Bakhtin ([1930s] 1981), put it like this: “the past is organized and structured through place to create a chronotope, or time-space formation, through which contemporary narrations and performances of subjectivity and authority are inscribed” (Bhabha, 1990 in Till, 2005, p. 10). This focus has brought memory work into theorising about place-making, with a particular focus on how memories are inscribed in place and how they construct place. Generally, memory work is read in place-identity writing as active: we construct place through our memories, through talk about places of the past and present and future, that is, “[t]hrough stories about places, they become inhabitable” (de Certeau and Giard, 1998, p. 142 cited in Till, 2005, p. 11). Till draws on the work of Benjamin (1970) to elaborate on this:

For Benjamin, memory is not just information that individuals recall or stories being retold in the present. It is not layered time situated in the landscape.

Rather, memory is the self-reflexive act of contextualising and continuously digging for the past through place. It is a process of continually re-making and re-remembering the past in the present rather than a process of discovering objective historical 'facts'. (Till, 2005, p. 11)

The invocation of place-memories is often a critical rhetorical device used politically to construct or reconstruct nations like the 'new South Africa' and national identities such as the 'new South Africans', where the desired effect of this place-memory invocation is to build an 'imagined community' (Anderson, [1983] (1991)). We can see this rhetorical use of memory and place in ex-President Thabo Mbeki's renowned and beautifully crafted 'I am an African' speech which he orated at the adoption of the new Constitution in 1996:

I am an African. I owe my being to the hills and the valleys, the mountains and the glades, the rivers, the deserts, the trees, the flowers, the seas and the ever-changing seasons that define the face of our 'native' land. My body has frozen in our frosts and in our latter day snows. It has thawed in the warmth of our sunshine and melted in the heat of the midday sun. The crack and the rumble of the summer thunders, lashed by startling lightning, have been a cause both of trembling and of hope.

The fragrances of nature have been as pleasant to us as the sight of the wild blooms of the citizens of the veld.

The dramatic shapes of the Drakensberg, the soil-coloured waters of the Lekoa, iGqili noThukela, and the sands of the Kgalagadi, have all been panels of the set on the natural stage on which we act out the foolish deeds of the theatre of our day.

I owe my being to the Khoi and the San whose desolate souls haunt the great expanses of the beautiful Cape – they who fell victim to the most merciless genocide our 'native' land has ever seen, they who were the first to lose their lives in the struggle to defend our freedom and dependence and they who, as a people, perished in the result.

Today, as a country, we keep an audible silence about these ancestors of the generations that live, fearful to admit the horror of a former deed, seeking to obliterate from our memories a cruel occurrence which, in its remembering, should teach us not and never to be inhuman again.

I am formed of the migrants who left Europe to find a new home on our 'native' land. Whatever their own actions, they remain still, part of me.

In my veins courses the blood of the Malay slaves who came from the East. Their proud dignity informs my bearing, their culture a part of my essence. The stripes they bore on their bodies from the lash of the slave master are a reminder embossed on my consciousness of what should not be done.

I am the grandchild of the warrior men and women that Hintsa and Sekhukhune led, the patriots that Cetshwayo and Mphephu took to battle, the soldiers Moshoeshe and Ngungunyane taught never to dishonour the cause of freedom.

My mind and my knowledge of myself is formed by the victories that are the jewels in our African crown, the victories we earned from Isandhlwana to Khartoum, as Ethiopians and as the Ashanti of Ghana, as the Berbers of the desert.

I am the grandchild who lays fresh flowers on the Boer graves at St Helena and the Bahamas, who sees in the mind's eye and suffers the suffering of a simple peasant folk, death, concentration camps, destroyed homesteads, a dream in ruins...

I come of those who were transported from India and China, whose being resided in the fact, solely, that they were able to provide physical labour, who taught me that we could both be at home and be foreign, who taught me that human existence itself demanded that freedom was a necessary condition for that human existence. (ex-President Mbeki, 1996, p. 1)

It is obvious how, in this very poetic speech, *place-memory* is a key rhetorical device used by Mbeki in his attempts to produce a “patriotic topography” (Daniels, 1993, p. 5 in Osborne, 2001, p. 13), a unique narrative that bonds people to place (Osborne, 2001, p. 13). Mbeki uses place to acknowledge colonial and apartheid crimes in a contextualised, non-accusing way to recognise and value original black presence in South Africa and, simultaneously, to celebrate migration and diversity. He is using place-memories to construct the past and the present and future, to ‘do’ South African history and in this way to “construct social traditions and, in the process, personal and social identities” based on the belief that “[w]e *are*, in a sense, the place-worlds we imagine” (Basso, 1996, p. 7 in Osborne, 2001, p. 4). Much of this retrospective construction of the past uses nostalgia as a rhetorical device, that is, a yearning amongst people “to transcend the constrictions of place and time and to recapture a lost past, often characterised by a lost place and a lost social world” (Kong and Yeoh, 1995, p. 9). The turbulent and uncertain year of 1996 is an opportune time for Mbeki to invoke nostalgia since nostalgia is “most likely to surface

when society has been confronted with such rapid change that people come face to face with reminders of the past and vastly differing conditions of the present all in the same lifetime” (Chase and Shaw, 1989 in Kong and Yeoh, 1995, p. 9; also see Milligan, 2003, p. 381).

As will become apparent in the discussion of the mobile methodology employed in this research project (Chapter 4), telling stories about spaces as we move in and through spaces, ‘automatically’ facilitates an analysis of memory since, as Cresswell (2004) points out, “[o]ne of the primary ways in which memories are constituted is through the production of places” (p. 85).

I would like to move now to a brief genealogy of the racialised place-identity of Durban over the last century or so. I do this in order to illustrate the ways in which place-identity constructions have formed and transformed racialised subjectivities in Durban historically. It is also relevant because it provides a spatial context for the tours that I conducted in Durban with participants whose racialised identity is impacted on by the historical racialised place-identity of Durban, because, “[i]t is impossible to separate the apparent presence of race from the historical production of race (Pascale, 2008, p. 735)

Part B: A (partial) genealogy of the construction of a racialised place-identity in Durban

The past histories of individuals, families and events cannot be separated from place. ‘Soweto’ is place, but also event and people. So are Sharpeville, District Six, Sophiatown, Chinatown, Newclare, Coronationville, Westdene, Fietas, Hillbrow, Durban’s Casbah, Cato Manor, Wentworth. And place is, inevitably, memory. And memory in South Africa is colonialism and apartheid. (Govinden, 2008, p. 9)

It was Es’kia Mphahlele who observed that our literature is marked by a *tyranny of place*. In the South Africa of the past, living in a particular place was the result of who you were in racial terms, and this also determined your experience and identity as a person. (Govinden, 2008, p. 26, emphasis in original)

Introduction

The segregatory practices of the colonial and apartheid administrators and inhabitants of Durban have racialised the city over time so that the city has functioned and still functions as a palimpsest, a 'cultural manuscript' onto which racialised practices of space have been inscribed and re-inscribed over and over (cf. Ashcroft et al., 1995, p. 393 in Taylor, 2000, p. 28). In this section I examine two of the historical and contemporary racespace practices that have been inscribed onto and into the city of Durban and that have and do impact on the racialised place-identity of Durban. My selection is random, but since "[h]istory is invested with the conceited aura of truth" (Brown, 2005, p. 72), I am engaging in a genealogical focus (in the Foucauldian sense) by which I mean "a trace that reconstitutes the present from its traces in the past" (Henriques et al., 1984b, p. 104). This practice involves using (often marginal) sources in the past as a stratagem for particular invested purposes (Brown, 2005, p. 72), which in this case is the development of a context for the analysis of this research into the (continued) construction of black and white subjectivities in the racespace that is Durban now. Two particular place-identity practices that I consider to be cogent in the construction of racialised place-identities in 20th century Durban are: the construction of municipal beer halls (built in and around the first part of the 20th century as part of the Durban System of Segregation); and the design of Durban as the spatially 'perfect' apartheid city.

The Municipal beer halls and the Durban system of segregation

The 'native' problem

From its inception in the early 1800s, Durban, as a port city and maritime trading station, was dependent for its economic growth on the physical labour of local (previously mostly pastoral) Africans who came to the city to earn money. They provided cheap labour, working as "dock workers, washermen, domestic servants, rickshaw pullers or as 'native' policemen, and as assistants in shops and offices" (Nesvag, 2002, p. 284) and lived largely transitory lives in backyards or in rough shelters that they constructed around town (Swanson, 1965). This created a situation in which there were "particularly fluid forms of contact, encounter and exchange between groups" (Durrheim, 2005, p. 447). This contact was a key problem for the white city officials and became known as the "'native' problem": the 'socio-spatial

problem' of how and where to accommodate these indispensable commercial and domestic African workers in ways that ensured the spatial segregation of Africans, whites and Indians, and the protection of the white 'race' (Swanson, 1976 in Govinden, 2008, p. 65). The extent of this preoccupation is evident in the town council's minutes where "from one quarter to one third of the entries in its minute books recorded transactions on these issues" (Swanson, 1965, p. 379). The municipal rates paid by the landowners in town to the Council were not considered a suitable source of funding for African accommodation (since it was 'white' money). In any case the funds were too limited for the size of the 'non-white' accommodation needs (Swanson, 1965).

Possible solutions to the "‘native’ problem"

There were numerous proposals made by and to the Municipality to address the 'native' accommodation problem. Two ideas gained most support: the establishment of hostels or barracks in town, and the development of a formal 'location' outside of town. The construction and reflection of racialisation of place-identity in the discourse about these two solutions is almost overpowering. This is evident, for example, in the argument made by Durban's Chief Police Constable, R C Alexander, for the barrack system:

My duty compels me to state plainly that I consider our community are not dealing wisely, or even justly, by our 'native' population. It is entirely forgotten that the 'native' is no longer the humble, docile and submissive being represented 50 years ago, but what was then predicted he would be if merely used as a beast of burden...We have now in Durban but 6,500 European men, about the same number of Indian males, and over 10,000 able bodied 'native's and 600 'native' women, besides 1,000 'native' visitors. This large 'native' population ... will, if steps are not shortly taken in the Boroughs and Townships of this Colony, become a source of great danger, for an evil-minded, barefooted black man on a dark night is a dangerous character to be at large ... The natives ... could have in their own compound all that was necessary, such as eating-houses, schools, churches, play ground, etc., and not, as they are now, between 5 and 9 P.M. [be] subject to all the temptations of liquor and other vices, and after that hour [be] penned up in hovels like so many pigs ... If it is necessary (which it is) to keep an army of our own race in a compound after 9 P.M., it is surely more imperative that we should keep our

10,000 uneducated savages under similar control. (Alexander, 1898, quoted in Swanson, 1965, p. 380-381)

Chief Constable Alexander's argument is structured by the then popular polygenetic argument that blacks and whites constituted biologically separate races. This polygenetic influence is evident in the opening line wherein he commented that "our community are not dealing wisely, or even justly, by our 'native' population" and then again at the end of the quote where he mentioned that "if it is necessary ... to keep our own race in a compound after 9 P.M., it is surely more imperative that we should keep our 10,000 uneducated, savages under similar control." Here his use of 'our' is clearly a reference to whites as distinct from the 'natives'. This polygenetic theory did not conceptualise different races as equal but as hierarchically organised with the 'white race' at the top of the triangle of civilization and the various 'black races' at the bottom (Young, 1995). Alexander is drawing on a number of Othering European discourses when he paternalistically assumes that whites are responsible for the accommodation and well-being of the 'natives' who, because of their inferiority or 'infantilism', need to be 'charges' of the Europeans, a responsibility which is, of course, framed within the hierarchical notion of Europeans (or whites) as superior to, or more advanced than, the 'natives'. Part of this construction includes the idea that 'natives' are unable to make rational and sensible adult choices and therefore need to have important decisions made for them by the whites (as referenced in Alexander's comment that the 'natives' must be kept away from the "temptations of liquor and other vices"). In various ways, Alexander also draws on and develops the colonial construct of the 'native' as a dangerous, animalistic savage (Young, 1995; Durrheim, 2005), including highlighting the 'native' as "no longer the humble, docile and submissive being represented 50 years ago" and then constructing the 'native' as he could potentially be ("if steps are not shortly taken in the Boroughs and Townships of the Colony" to provide accommodation for the 'natives'), that is, as "a source of great danger" as a (potentially) "evil-minded, barefooted black man on a dark night". There is also a mild threat embodied in the statistics presented here wherein Europeans are counted to be numerically outnumbered by 'natives'. Alexander ends with the blunt description of the 'natives' as "uneducated savages", a construction which centred around the notion of 'civilization', where civilization was defined by the knowledge and practice of the 'grand masters' of European-style art, literature, learning and science (Young, 1995; Said, 1978). Much of this discursive work relies on and invokes the construction of a powerfully racialised place-identity for 'natives' and for 'Europeans'.

The arguments by Alexander and others supporting the barracks solution were ultimately successful when in 1901 city officials resolved to do exactly this. The new compounds to be constructed comprised prison-like living conditions:

[C]ompounds with barracks for a total of 5,000 men to be placed on three sites – the Point, somewhere near the center and at the Western edge of town, each to be surrounded with a seven foot iron fence, and supervised by a white caretaker with a ‘native’ constable for every 200 inmates. A telephone would enable employers to call up for the requisite number of men they needed each day and the supervisor was to allot ‘natives’ to the employers. Unemployed men would be allowed to leave at 6am and all would return by 9pm, for the Vagrancy Law was to be strictly enforced. (Swanson, 1965, p. 381)

The building of these barracks was completed by 1904. The draconian levels of control – the seven foot iron fence, the close supervision by a caretaker and police constable, the control of the inhabitants’ work schedule by the supervisor, and the curfew conditions – all reflect the quality of the biological racial thinking of Alexander and others. The very structure of the barracks reflects the infantilising discourse of the ‘natives’ as children requiring supervision and control, and hints at the discourse of the (potentially) wild savage requiring strenuous constraining in order to protect those he could harm if he is not controlled (Young, 1995). The spatial collection of the ‘natives’ altogether in a ‘prison’, separated out from the ‘Europeans’ in town, constructs the white administrators and other white citizens in Durban as free agents but also as safe from the dangerous ‘natives’; whereas the ‘natives’ are constructed as caged animals, with blackness clearly constructed as bad and dangerous and needing containment and management. This is a powerful and obvious example of how space was used to construct a racialised social reality, to determine and represent the collective subjectivities of blackness as powerless and dangerous and infantile, and whiteness as powerful and controlling and vulnerable. In these ways, “[t]he ‘concrete space of everyday life’, to borrow Henri Lefebvre’s term, is ... enframed, constrained and colonised by the disciplinary technologies of power” (Kong and Law, 2002, p. 1505).

The racialised place-identity implications of the alternative solution to the problem of accommodation of ‘native’ labourers – the creation of a ‘native’ location’ on the periphery of the city – were not significantly different. The Natal Department of Health made a forceful motivation for accommodating ‘natives’ outside the bounds of the city on the grounds that “infectious diseases and plagues” would emanate from city

'slums' (Torr, 1996, p. 246). The preservation of the health of Europeans was a common explanatory motivator for racial segregation in European colonies.⁹ At this time in Durban there was no municipal money for the funding of a separate 'native' location but there was increasing support for this form of accommodation from various parties, including from Durban's first Magistrate, James Stuart, who argued for the location on the basis that the differences between black and white were so profound and understanding between them therefore so difficult that they could not be expected to 'come together' in the foreseeable future. According to Stuart, it was mutually destructive for whites to try to "force a continent to adopt a civilization for which it is manifestly unprepared: the "inferior example" of the 'native' was a danger to "the ruling civilized race" on the one hand, while on the other hand, it was imperative "to guard 'natives' in their own interests against excessive and indiscriminate contact" with the European culture especially in Pietermaritzburg and Durban (Stuart, 1904 in Swanson, 1965, p. 410). For Stuart, the 'natives' did not have a right to occupy any place in Durban:

They should, for many years to come, be regarded as mere visitors to the town; as such, though they give us labour, they do not contribute to the municipal rates and therefore have no right to share in the same privileges that regular citizens do. (Stuart, 1904 in Swanson, 1965, p. 410)

Stuart's polygenetic and separatist views were theoretically articulated at this time by a Durban merchant, scholar, and legislator, Maurice Evans, in his book entitled *Black and White in South East Africa: A Study in Sociology* wherein he asked:

Is it possible for a white race whose race aspiration is to the utmost economic development of the country ... to live with a black one, to whom the aspirations and efforts of the white do not appeal, and yet to adjust the life of each that both shall be content? (in Swanson, 1965, p. 412)

Evans answered his own question thus:

To so act in our relations with the natives and so guide them that they may have all reasonable opportunity for developing their race life along the best lines ... not necessarily following the line of evolution of the white man, but the one their race genius suggests. And that we ... shall also have an

⁹ For example, in colonised Lagos, Nigeria, the health of the Europeans was protected by separating the "European reservation" from the "Non-European reservation" by what was known as *cordons sanitaires*, green belts of at least 440 yards (Njoh, 2008, p. 596) and similarly in colonised Sierra Leone, Europeans were protected from potential malaria-causing mosquito bites by the development of 'Hill Station' in 1904, "an exclusively European residential community overlooking, and connected to, Freetown (Sierra Leone) by a narrow gauge, custom-built mountain railway" (Njoh, 2008, p. 589).

opportunity for development, and be not subject as a race to deteriorating tendencies". (Evans, 1911, p. 20 in Swanson, 1965, p. 412)

These 'deteriorating tendencies' referred to by Evans were seen to be developing amongst the 'natives' in town who, according to city officials, were drinking high alcohol beer brewed from hops instead of the low alcohol beer brewed from maize which the municipality had approved for sale in 'native' eating houses (Swanson, 1965, p. 419). The 'liquor problem' was associated with reports of increasing urban chaos (Swanson, 1965, p. 393). Thus ensued endless debates in the City Council Chambers with some Councillors (in the minority) who wanted to encourage the enterprising aspect of 'native' beerhalls, and others who wanted to establish municipal control over the alcohol consumed by 'natives'. These debates and the associated discourse about the 'deteriorating tendencies' of the 'natives' contributed towards the development of a new solution to the general 'native' accommodation problem, that is, the municipality sought to raise large sums of money to fund accommodation through the sale of (low alcohol) 'municipal beer' to the 'natives' living in and around Durban. To achieve this aim a bill was introduced (No.17 of 1907) by the Council "which sought to reverse the Liquor Act (No.38) of 1886 (Sec.66) and its amending Act (no.36) of 1899 (sec.2) to make legal the brewing and sale of hop beer to 'natives only in 'native' eating houses belonging to the Durban corporation. ... The net profits were to go to the Togat Fund" (Swanson, 1965, pp. 422-423, emphasis in original) which was used for 'native development'. In 1908, inspired by this bold legislative move in Durban, the Natal legislative assembly passed the Native Beer Act which determined that the profits from beer sales in Natal cities were to be paid into a newly established Native Administration Fund which was "linked directly to the implementation of the Native Locations Act of 1904 by a provision that the fund, after administration of the beer monopoly itself, was to be used to establish a location under that Act (No. 2 of 1904)" (Swanson, 1965, p. 428). Following the passing of this legislation, the Durban City Councillors decided to immediately exert a municipal monopoly over the brewing of beer. By January 1909 they had promulgated by-laws under the Native Beer Act in which it was determined that there would be a Native Beer House at the Point and that a number of other municipal eating houses would also be established around Durban. These were the only venues allowed to sell beer and only 'municipal beer' would be sold (Swanson, 1965, p. 429). Correspondingly, all non-municipal beer-selling operations were outlawed. This legislation created a furore in Durban amongst the African men and women who owned and ran the numerous beer halls around town. When Durban's

“Beer King” Matshikama Gumede protested against this violation of free enterprise, Chief Constable Donovan, drawing on common paternalistic discourses of the ‘native’ as primitive, uncivilised, uneducated and childlike, defended the new beer hall initiative thus:

The native does not appear on the one hand to have any ideas of business principles or on the other to feel any responsibility in conforming with the law. ...The fact is that the native is still too much of a child to carry on a business of this sort with any method of care. (Donovan, 1908, quoted in Swanson, 1965, p. 430)

The Durban System of Segregation

The use of profits from municipal beer selling in municipal beer houses for the development of ‘native’ accommodation became (in)famously known as The Durban System of Segregation. The revenue from the beer sales went into the newly established Native Administration Fund and was used to fund the development and administration of ‘native’ accommodation and other ‘native’ social services including the establishment of a fully fledged municipal Native Affairs Department with a professional manager and numerous supervisory, technical and clerical staff (Maylam, 1996; Swanson, 1965). The beer funds were substantial and increased significantly over the years:

Beer revenue in the first half of 1909 amounted to 4,500 pounds. By 1912, it reached 24,000 pounds, four times the current total income, and by the 1920’s had exceeded 50,000 pounds a year. (Swanson, 1965, p. 432).

A few years after the beer fund system was implemented, the then Durban Director of Publicity commented in a general publicity brochure, on the practices of those using the first Municipal Native Eating House on Queen Street:

A focus point of extreme interest to visitors and tourists from overseas is the Native and Indian market, beneath the shadow of the Emmanuel Cathedral. To pass through one of the gateways of the enclosure, from the colourful Indian quarter, is to enter the Orient, utterly remote from the civilization of West Street, only a few hundred yards away. Here on every side are stalls catering for the simple needs of half-sophisticated Zulus, with skins, beadwork and native ornaments prominent. ... Here will be found hundreds of natives seated at wooden tables in the open-sided eating house, devouring with evident relish, to the accompaniment of low guttural conversation, the most fearsome dainties, and, separated by a partition, hundred of ‘boys’

sipping the sour-sweet nectar of Kaffir beer, from shining metal pannikins. The beer, rich and wholesome, contains only 2 per cent alcohol and is brewed by the Municipality, the profits from its sale being devoted to the provision of recreation halls, etc., for the Natives. (Williams, 1934 -1937, p 87)

With the beer funds, various forms of 'native' accommodation were built: barracks were opened in Depot Road (later known as Somtseu Location) in 1915, while, simultaneously, construction started on 36 married accommodation dwellings in Baumanville on the Eastern Vlei (Swanson, 1965; Torr, 1996). In 1917 Depot Road and Baumanville were doubled in size. This conglomerate form of accommodation facilitated the monitoring and control of Africans through practices such as stricter procedures for worker registration and service contracts and a nightly 9pm to 5am curfew for Africans (Swanson, 1965). All of this served to further restrict African mobility and to close down spatial options for Africans (Maylam, 1996, p. 6), illustrating just how thoroughly spatial the colonial project was, and how colonial authorities used space to maintain a racialised social hierarchy (Ballard, 2004c). Franz Fanon ([1963]1961) eloquently depicts this colonial relationship between space and race in a monograph about the segregated conditions in the town of Blida (in French colonised Algeria) where he was working as a psychiatrist for the French authorities in a psychiatric clinic in the 1950's:

The zone where the natives live is not complementary to the zone inhabited by the settlers. The two zones are opposed, but not in the service of a higher unity. Obedient to the rules of pure Aristotelian logic, they both follow the principle of reciprocal exclusivity. No conciliation is possible, for the two terms, one is superfluous. The settlers' town is a strongly built town, all made of stone and steel. It is a brightly lit town; the streets are covered with asphalt, and the garbage cans swallow all the leavings, unseen, unknown, and hardly thought about. The settler's feet are never visible, except perhaps in the sea; but there you're never close enough to see them. His feet are protected by strong shoes although the streets of his town are clean and even, with no holes or stones. The settler's town is a well-fed town, an easy-going town; its belly is always full of good things. The settler's town is a town of white people, of foreigners. The town belonging to the colonized people, or at least the native town, the Negro village, the medina, the reservation, is a place of ill fame, peopled by men of evil repute. They are born there, it matters little where or how; they die there, it matters not where, nor how. It is a world without spaciousness; men live there on top of each other, and their huts are

built one on top of the other. The native town is a hungry town, starved of bread, of meat, of shoes, of coal, of light. The native town is a crouching village, a town on its knees, a town wallowing in the mire. It is town of niggers and dirty Arabs. The look that the native turns on the settler's town is a look of lust, a look of envy; it expresses his dreams of possession – all manner of possession: to sit at the settler's table, to sleep in the settler's bed, with his wife if possible. The colonized man is an envious man. And this the settler knows very well; when their glances meet he ascertains bitterly, always on the defensive 'They want to take our place'. It is true, for there is no native who does not dream at least once a day of setting himself up in the settler's place". (Fanon [1963] 1961 p. 39 in Kipfer, 2007, p. 710)

Fanon makes it clear, in great detail, that it is the racialised spatial practices of colonised towns that facilitate the construction and reconstruction of racialised identities. In the first line he sets up the tension between the spatial zones of the colonisers and colonized, a tension which is based profoundly on the fact that the zones they live in are "not complementary" but "opposed" and reciprocally exclusive of each other. Segregated space is the basis for the (racial) difference of experience and of subjectivity. Fanon develops this further by contrasting the space of the coloniser (brightly lit, evenly laid asphalt streets, emptied garbage cans) with the space of the colonised (people living on top of each other, starved of light, wallowing in mire) and creates a link between these spatial constructions and the construction of self and other by coloniser and colonised; the coloniser being constructed as well shod, well fed, easy going, and the colonised pejoratively as 'niggers and dirty Arabs', as hungry, lustful, on their knees, some of them 'people of evil repute', envious and desiring of the all that the colonisers have. For Fanon, land and territory are key means and resources of identity in the town of Blida (cf. Hook, 2003).

Fanon could just as well have been describing colonised Durban in the first half of the 20th century, for Durban "quickly developed into one of the most segregated of South African cities" (Edwards, 1994, p. 415). Indeed "[p]olicies developed and applied in Durban were to become models for many other South African towns and cities and to be cornerstones of the Union Government's national policy of urban segregation" (Edwards, 1994, p. 415). In particular the Durban System has been identified as critical for the administering of Africans (Swanson, 1976; Ambler and Crush, 1992; Freund and Padayachee, 2002). With this system, "Durban attempted to give concrete expression to the belief that urban Africans should bear a substantial portion of the cost of reproduction through the municipal Native Revenue Fund

(NRA)” (Torr, 1996, p. 245). This system was lauded locally and nationally for a number of reasons: it ensured separate white and ‘native’ fiscal and administrative affairs in local government, it generated monies from ‘natives’ to service their own ‘infrastructural needs’, and the controlled form of accommodation it funded ensured a regular and available source of (cheap) labour which facilitated economic growth in Durban (Freund and Padayachee, 2002). Other municipalities in South Africa tried to emulate the Durban System with varying degrees of success. Ultimately the Durban System formed the basis for the Union-wide Native (Urban Areas) Act No. 21 of 1923: “the essentials of the Durban system were incorporated in national legislation which enjoined the towns of South Africa to make provision for segregating and regulating ‘native’ urban life and residence, and enabled them to apply the essential features of the beer monopoly to their ‘native’ administrations, provisions “which then became a common basis of large-scale attempts to control urbanization in South Africa” (Swanson, 1965, p. 435) largely through prohibiting Africans from acquiring freehold tenure in municipal townships (Torr, 1996).

Resistance to the municipal beer hall monopoly

In 1929 there was massive resistance from African women brewers in Durban to the municipal monopoly on beer brewing and selling (Freund, 2007, p. 114). This was also a convenient focus for the tension mounting in the city over a range of issues, most particularly “the conditions of a crowded and restricted life” (Swanson, 1965, p. 440) for ‘natives’ and the related concern about the slow and inadequate provision of ‘native’ housing and particularly the lack of a ‘native’ location (Swanson, 1965). Seemingly “even the large beer profits were insufficient to finance a comprehensive programme of municipal housing for Africans” (Torr, 1996, p. 245). The Durban branch of the ICU, led by the charismatic, A.G. Champion, initiated the popular 1929 resistance campaign against the municipality (Swanson, 1965) when he denounced the beer hall system and the beer hall ‘riots’ erupted. The beer hall uprisings continued for some months with a highly successful boycott of all municipal eating houses. During this time there was extensive conflict and violence, lives were lost and property destroyed “as police and white civilian mobs on one side and natives on the other side clashed in the streets” (Swanson, 1965, p. 444). Ultimately the conflicts were quelled when national police detachments “appeared at the Point with tear gas and a machine gun and in a show of force put an end to continuing native defiance of authority” (Swanson, 1965, p. 444).

The resistance to the Durban System – and the subsequent repression that ensued – marked “the close of an era in Durban’s history” (Swanson, 1965, p. 445). National government set up the De Waal Commission and in the findings of this investigation, support for the ideas of the Durban system of segregation were intertwined with a mild rebuking of the Durban municipality for not providing adequate and sufficient housing for the workers of Durban (Torr, 1996, p. 347). National and local government responded to the uprisings with various carrot and stick strategies. A Native Economic Commission was set up to investigate ‘native’ conditions (Swanson, 1965). The Durban municipality set up a ‘Goodwill’ Native Advisory Board (with a number of ‘Zulu’ representatives on the Board) and in 1932 the construction of the Umlazi Native Township began (Swanson, 1965; Torr, 1996). Concurrently repressive measures were implemented by the national and local state. For example, national government banned Champion from Natal (Swanson, 1965), tightened influx control, restricted the movement of women in urban areas and expelled thousands of workers from Durban (Torr, 1996). In addition, by 1937 all residential areas of Durban were proclaimed segregated, so that, as Chief Constable Whitsitt said, the city could “get rid of the native inhabitants, with the exception of domestic servants”. (Maylam, 1996, p. 14).

However, despite all these efforts, by the 1940s, large numbers of Africans had moved into the city of Durban, and shack settlements had mushroomed in various parts of the city, including in Cato Manor (Maylam, 1996), near the city centre. The city officials were ‘double bound’ on these spatial developments however, for as T.J. Chester, the manager of Durban’s Native Administration Department commented in 1943,

We wanted their labour, and either we had to sabotage our war effort by turning them out of town, or tolerate them where they were at Cato Manor.

We took the lesser of the two evils. (In Maylam, 1996, p. 17)

However, racial segregation remained very much on the municipal agenda and in 1943, just before World War II ended and a major economic boom was predicted for the city of Durban, the city council’s Post-War Development Committee produced a detailed racial residential zoning plan which included the proposed resettlement of various African and Indian communities so that commercial and industrial initiatives could be pursued on the vacated land. The committee argued that it would be in the interests of whites, Africans, Indians and Coloureds to be housed separately [City of Durban, 1943, Post-War Development – Report of Special Committee, p. 18] (in

Maharaj, 2002; Maylam, 1996). This residential racial zoning map laid the groundwork for the construction of Durban as the 'perfect' apartheid city.

The 'perfect' apartheid city

By the time the Group Areas Act was promulgated by the new National Party Government in 1950, Durban was "largely segregated by race *de facto*" (Freund, 2007, p. 191), so when this new Act was passed, legislating the formalisation of racial segregation, "it met with an enthusiastic response from Durban's authorities" (Maylam, 1996, p. 22). Indeed only a few months after it was passed, the Durban municipality had established a Technical Sub-Committee to consider how best to implement the Act in Durban. This Committee made extensive use of Post-War Development Committee proposals for the pattern of land usage and racial settlement (McCarthy, 1991) so they were more than ready when, in 1958, municipal collaboration with national government "resulted in the Group Areas proclamation of 6 June 1958 in terms of which Durban was zoned a 'white city'" (Maharaj, 2002, p. 176) and the various areas in and around Durban were zoned either white, African, Indian and Coloured. One of the key proposals of the overzealous Durban Technical Sub-Committee was that "each race group must have access to its place of employment without traversing the area of another group" (Maharaj, 2002, pp. 175-76). To implement this particular proposal required significant 'relocations' or forced removals, so that is what was done. The municipality forcibly relocated Indian and African people to the newly created townships of Chatsworth, KwaMashu and Umlazi (Popke, 1997) on the periphery of the city. The dislocation was extensive:

About 80 000 Indians were forced to move from their homes, often in stable, long-established communities, as a result of group areas proclamations issued between 1958 and 1963. During the same period 120 000 Africans were removed from the Cato Manor shack settlement under the Prevention of Illegal Squatting Act. It was also during the late 1950's and early 1960's that over 8000 African migrant workers were relocated from Durban's central hostels in Bell Street, Ordnance Road and Somtseu Road. All were moved to hostels in the new township of KwaMashu. (Maylam, 1996, pp. 22-23)

In a study by Kuper, Watts and Davies (1958) the racism of the relocation policies became apparent: "whereas 60 per cent of Durban's black population would be displaced in terms of Group Areas ... the equivalent figure for whites was 10 per cent" (McCarthy, 1991, p. 265). The 1959 efforts to forcibly relocate the inhabitants of Cato Manor, which had been proclaimed white, initiated rioting amongst the women

liquor brewers in Cato Manor as well as others who had no desire to leave their homes in Cato Manor (Maylam, 1996). Ultimately, however, state repression ensured that “Cato Manor was almost entirely uprooted and its Indian and African inhabitants forced to move into townships elsewhere in the early 1960s” (Freund, 2007, p. 191).

According to Group Areas principles, African, Indian and Coloured townships “were to be sited as far as possible from white residential areas but reasonably close to centres of employment. The spatial segregation of residential areas was to be reinforced by buffer zones and by natural or other barriers” (Maylam, 2001, p. 182). This was not difficult in Durban given its undulating topography: city planners maximised usage of the hilly terrain, ensuring that topographical features of the city, particularly mountains and rivers, provided natural buffers between areas allocated to the different races (Kuper et al., 1958). The mountainous nature of the broader Durban region also ensured that the various townships could be tucked behind hills and thereby obscured from the line of sight of white citizens. City planners ensured that the rail and road linkages were so well placed that African, Indian and Coloured workers never passed through white areas on their way to work and whites did not have to pass through or view a township on their way to work, or anywhere else. The townships became “social spaces which were neither seen nor discussed by the average white South African” (Popke, 1997, p. 11). All of this facilitated the construction of what became known as ‘the perfect apartheid city’, a city layout which, when implemented, ensured that “racial intermingling” was kept to “a bare minimum” (Kuper et al., 1958, p. 36). These Durban proposals on how to build the perfect apartheid city were influential throughout the country “because neither the central state bureaucracy nor the executive had yet given thought to how it would be practically implemented” (Maharaj, 2002, p. 175).

Conclusion

The two race-space practices that I have chosen to include here – the construction of municipal beer halls and the Durban system of segregation; and, the construction of the perfect apartheid city in Durban – are both instances in which race was inscribed into the cityspace of Durban, and in the process, these spatial practices (re)racialised the identities of Durban residents, demonstrating clearly the ideological impact of place-identity constructions.

Chapter 3: A discursive approach to the study of race and racism

Language is “a mobile army of metaphors, metonyms and anthropomorphisms – in short, a sum of human relations, which have been enhanced, transposed, and embellished poetically and rhetorically, and which after long use seem firm, canonical, and obligatory to a people: truths are illusions about which one has forgotten that this is what they are.” (Nietzsche, 1954, pp. 46–47 in Said, 1978, p. 203)

Introduction

It was during the world war against Nazism that the term ‘racism’ first entered the English language (in a translation of Magnus Hirshberg’s German book, *Rassismus* (1938) (Miles, 1989 in Rathzel, 2002). This identification of the idea of ‘racism’ was a portent of the challenge to racism that was to follow the war against Nazism in the West. This challenge was led by UNESCO, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation, which, as part of its post-World War II efforts to build peace and security, mandated psychologists, biologists, cultural anthropologists and ethnologists to extensively investigate the evidence for the existence of race. In 1950 in a report entitled *The Race Question* these researchers concluded that race is a “social myth” and that there is only one human race with more commonality than difference across populations (UNESCO, 1950). With this report UNESCO sought to assert leadership in the immense task of deconstructing centuries of a multi-faceted racial mythology, a mythology which had become lore and was working “as an ideology, permeating both consciously and implicitly the fabric of almost all areas of thinking of its time” (Young, 1995, p. 64). In the aftermath of World War II, in the Western World, the decolonisation movements in Africa, the civil rights movement in the USA and the related value placed on ‘human rights’ and racial equality as (purportedly) “dominant ideological values” ensured public condemnation of overt racism (Petrova, 2001, p. 49, in Bhavnani et al., 2005, p. 51). In this context of “strict social norms against ethnic prejudice, discrimination and racism” nobody in the ‘West’ wanted to be “considered a racist” (Van Dijk, 1984, p. 46 in Bonilla-Silva and Forman, 2000, p. 76) and hence explicit racist talk became a taboo. Indeed, in the USA, large-scale survey research documented substantial changes in whites’ racial views, a finding which was disputed by interview-based research which consistently

found higher levels of prejudice amongst whites (Bonilla-Silva and Forman, 2000, p. 51). Seemingly 'racetalk' (Bonilla-Silver and Forman, 2000, p. 52) had simply become implicit.

In Britain this increase in the demand for ways to do race through implicit race talk (in the context of the norms against prejudice) coincided with "large-scale 'non-white' immigration into the United Kingdom ... when the 'Empire returned' to Britain" (Bonnet, 1996, p. 866). According to Barker (1981), "immigration restrictions proposed in the UK in the late 1970s were justified by politicians as a necessary protection for the British 'way of life', which it was claimed was under increasing threat from an influx of foreign cultures" (Every and Augoustinos, 2007, p. 426). A subtle form of race talk which developed then became so prevalent that Barker (1981) referred to it as 'new racism', in contrast to 'old fashioned' blatant and hierarchical biological racism (Augoustinos, Tuffin and Every, 2005). Certain race analysts thus began to focus not on race per se but on the practices of race in talk (Bonnett, 1996; Henriques et al., 1984), highlighting the effects of the rhetorical strategies of 'racetalk', that is the ways in which these (often contradictory) strategies allow "white speakers to safely voice views that might otherwise be interpreted as racist" (Mallinson and Brewster, 2005, p. 789). Every and Augoustinos (2007), Augoustinos and Every (2007) and Fozdar (2008) provide extensive listings of this research into racetalk in 'western liberal democracies'.

Varieties of this 'new racist' discourse only became the focus of (some) race researchers in South Africa when with "democratisation in the 1990s (and arguably in the 'reforms' of the 1980s) South Africa's moral position on racism ... shifted to be broadly in line with that of the West" (Ballard, 2005b, p. 6). With racism "no longer as explicit as it once was, defensive identity making processes have continued" (Ballard, 2005b, p. 7) in South Africa, partly at least through forms of this 'new racism'.

As is apparent, the study of the political power of discourses is also explicitly the study of the formation of identity (cf. Norris, 2007). Hall (1996) clarifies this relationship between discourse and identity with his definition of identity as

the meeting point, the point of *suture* between, on the one hand, the discourses and practices which attempt to 'interpellate', speak to us or hail us into place as the social subjects of particular discourses, and on the other hand, the processes which produce subjectivities which construct us as subjects which can be 'spoken'. (p. 19)

'New racism' and the discursive response

'New racism' also became known as 'cultural racism' and 'differential racism' (Taguieff, 1997 in Campani, 2002; Frankenberg, 1993) because differences between people became characterised as cultural, behavioural or social, as well as, or instead of, as essential, scientific or biological (Mason, 1994). The historical hierarchies of race/s are subtly drawn into this cultural racism so that the cultural characterisations of groups as different are (implicitly) not only descriptive but are, notably, evaluative (Appiah, 1992) and discriminatory. In addition, biology continues to underlie many of these cultural notions of difference "since a cultural group continued to be understood in terms of descent rather than practice" (Frankenberg, 1993, p. 13). Often, in order to achieve the same discriminatory effect without being controversial or seeming to be politically incorrect, culture is used then in place of race. In this way culture "gets used as a cipher, a code for the same things that were attached to race and racial identities" (Ratele, 2002, p. 390 in Hofmeyr, 2003, p. 6). Indeed there are those who maintain that both 'new racism' and 'old racism' are full of slippages that revealed the difficulties of sustaining purely biological or purely cultural idioms" (Skinner, 2007, p. 937). In Stuart Hall's phrase, biology and culture become simply "racism's two registers" (Hall, 2000, p. 223 in Skinner, 2007, p. 938). This 'slippage' is evident in the way in which anti-racist US and UK programmes in the 1960s and 1970s, designed to encourage tolerance and respect of 'cultural difference' by locals for 'other ethnic groups' (immigrants from Central and South America into the USA and from the Caribbean and Asia into the UK), inadvertently accessed biological notions of race through talk about the need for the tolerance of 'difference' and in the process provided the 'justification' for anti-immigration and anti-integration sentiments and activities against those who were not English/British born (Solomos and Back, 1994; Wimmer, 1997 in Bhavnani et al., 2005). The slippage between biological and cultural underpinnings of race and racism was apparent in South Africa when in 1950 the whites-only parliament was debating the proposed Population Registration Act. The National Party proponents made it clear that they were using a very 'elastic' approach to the definition of rather fixed racial categories (Posel, 2001, p. 55), definitions that included biological and socio-cultural criteria. According to the then Minister of the Interior, "racial appearance and social habits, not birth certificates, must be the deciding factors", and in evaluating a person's appearance "his habits, education and speech, deportment and demeanour should be taken into account" (Posel, 2001, p. 56).

Frequently this 'slippage' between culture and race is possible because the undercurrent of biological race is still circulating underground in social life, resulting in the essentialisation of 'multi-culturalism' (Campani, 2002, p. 169). This naturalising of culture then allows people to 'do race' by claiming that different cultures are fixed, fundamentally different and therefore unassimilable (Rathzel, 2005, p. 7). This is evident in white discourse about culture in Durrheim and Dixon's beach interviews where white participants justify racial segregation by "naturaliz[ing] racial differences in terms of culture" (2000, p. 95), construing "preferential practices of self-segregation as 'anthropological universals' [Balibar, 1991b]" (2005, p. 217), and therefore as essential and natural which correlates easily to 'fixed' and 'unchangeable' (Durrheim and Dixon, 2000). In addition, another effect of the white beachgoers' appeals to 'universal' notions of cultural difference is to "provide speakers with a flexible and strategic lexicon for constructing images of racial self and other" (Durrheim and Dixon, 2000, p. 97), for example, facilitating their self-construction as reasonable and rational through the construction of "self-segregatory practices as a function of their rationality" (2005b, p. 216). This corresponds with Billig's (1988) argument that the advent of 'new racism' was nothing more than a representation of the desire of speakers to appear rational, or rather, not to appear irrational. Condor et al. (2006) explain this view as follows:

[G]eneral norms and values against irrationality prohibit blatant forms of prejudice, which since the Enlightenment, has come to be understood primarily as an irrational, unreasonable and subjective/emotional response (Billig, 1988; van Dijk, 1992). In view of this, speakers attempt to maintain a 'rational' subject position by strategically working up their views as reasonable, and framing their talk in such a way as to undermine or prevent possible charges of prejudice. Those who wish to express negative views against out-groups take care to construct these views as legitimate, warranted and rational (Rapley, 2001), denying, mitigating, justifying and excusing negative acts and views towards minorities in order to position themselves as decent, moral, reasonable citizens. (quoted in Every and Augoustinos, 2007, p. 412)

So, in certain ways perhaps, the 'newness' of this new racism is simply that of a new "rhetorical disguise" (Mason, 1994, p. 849), wherein new ways are found to produce old views in more palatable ways, thereby ensuring the ideological longevity of racialised practices such as (informal) segregation. This was Durrheim and Dixon's (2005a, 2005b) suggestion too when they found that white beachgoers interviewed on the 'desegregated' beaches in post-apartheid South Africa simply found subtle,

implied discursive means to present old racist stereotypes (p. 216; see also Barnes et al., 2001). In Chapter 5 I focus further on this, and other, research into the white discursive construction of place in Durban and in South Africa.

Wetherell and Potter's (1992) *Mapping the language of racism* is a benchmark for critical discursive work on whiteness and race, illustrating (with many examples from numerous interviews) how the way in which white New Zealanders or Pakehas (the Maori word for white New Zealanders) talk about Maori 'culture' allows the Pakehas to manage a fundamental dilemma, that is, it allows them to avoid supporting policies "that would make their lives more complicated" or it allows them to avoid doing anything which potentially involves them "in abandoning resources or privileges or lead to potentially threatening social change" (Hepburn, 2003, p. 186). At the same time it ensures that they are not heard as "racist or bigoted, particularly when being interviewed by a sympathetic and liberal-seeming researcher" (Hepburn, 2003, p. 186). In this talk about culture, the Pakehas presented Maori 'culture' as important for various reasons including for reasons of 'heritage'. The Pakeha culture-as-heritage repertoire worked against the Maori's political aspirations because it "could be used to freeze a social group into a particular position by separating 'cultural' actions from the 'modern world' of politics" (Hepburn, 2003, p. 187). In this way, the talk of culture, which could be heard as positive, could also do traditional racist work, that is, maintain "the idea of natural or fundamental differences between groups" (Hepburn, 2003, p. 187). Similarly and more recently, Augoustinos et al. (2005) investigated the notions of disadvantage and affirmative action in student focus group discussions on 'race' relations in Australia. Augoustinos et al. (2005) documented the "rhetorical and discursive resources available to majority group members when they discuss Indigenous disadvantage and affirmative action", demonstrating how invoking liberal-egalitarian principles of fairness, social justice and individual rights allows "the unsayable to be said" (Augoustinos et al., 2005, p. 316 in Tileaga, 2006, p. 481-482) with the effect that existing social relations and inequities are legitimated (Augoustinos and Every, 2007, p. 137).

We are led then by the critical discourse analysts working on race to focus on the small, everyday, veiled discourses where race has mutated, often "clothed in the caring ethics of liberalism and common sense" (Hepburn, 2003, p. 188), frequently 'blaming' black people for their exclusion and poverty (Bhavnani et al., 2005) through, for example, associating them with 'social deficiencies' such as single parent families, drug abuse, gang violence, low achievement values, and dependence on

welfare and affirmative action (van Dijk, 2000, p. 34 in Bhavnani et al., 2005, p. 11). Bobo and his co-authors (Bobo and Kuegel, 1997; Bobo et al., 1997) labelled this 'laissez faire racism' which, unlike Jim Crow racism,¹⁰ is "an ideology that blames Blacks themselves for their poorer relative economic standing, seeing it as a function of perceived cultural inferiority (Bobo and Kuegel, 1997, p. 95)" (in Bonilla-Silva and Forman, 2000, p. 69). Bonilla-Silva and Forman (2000) call this 'blaming of the victim' discourse a "color-blind racism" (p. 69). Ethnicity theorists in the USA, strongly influenced by the 'New World' meritocratic notion of 'sameness' and 'colour blindness' which is "grounded in liberal-egalitarian values of justice, fairness and equality" (Augoustinos et al., 2005, p. 317), embraced the view that "racial inequality was incompatible with American society" (Frankenberg, 1993, p. 13). This meritocratic regime then worked to conceal 'race' though a "double move towards 'color evasiveness' and 'power evasiveness'" particularly since "any failure to achieve in this 'equal opportunity context'" is presented as "the fault of people of color themselves" (Frankenberg, 1993, p. 14; see also Augoustinos et al., 2005). Ballard (2002) also analyses the discursive ways in which the whites he interviews in his research manage to delink white privilege from black poverty thereby 'blaming the victim' for their difficult circumstances (see also Popke and Ballard, 2004).

In the context of British 'Islamophobia', Phillips (2006) argues that in Britain the authorities and the media use 'culture' to blame Muslims for what is labelled 'self-segregation', that is, discursively constructing Muslims as self-segregating rather than being segregated out/against by others. Muslims are then 'blamed' for the effects of this (apparent) self-segregation, for opting out of their responsibilities as citizens of British mainstream society, and creating the context for the potential participation of 'isolated' Muslims in militant Muslim 'cells' (Phillips, 2006). Phillips' research reveals that although some British Muslim families do 'self-segregate' because they value "residential clustering, for reasons of culture and tradition, familiarity, identity, and security" (p. 34), the foremost reasons for what appears to be self-segregation are the constraints of poverty (the inability to buy into more

¹⁰ In the USA "the dominant Southern plantation owners, though they lacked the authority of the laws and traditions of slavery, were able to reinstate a system of dominance to replace it, namely that of the Jim Crow laws. These laws claimed simply that black Americans had no rights as citizens, and that they were to live apart in separate circumstances and quarters from whites. Jim Crow laws meant that black citizens could not hold the same jobs as whites, nor could they conduct business in the same quarters. They were soon deprived of their brief tenure as citizens, becoming, in effect second-class citizens who lacked the right to vote" (Orum and Chen, 2003, p. 75-76). This racial segregation and discrimination only changed with the passing of the Civil Rights Acts in 1964 and 1965 (Orum and Chen, 2003).

expensive housing) and concerns about racial harassment in predominantly white neighbourhoods (Phillips, 2006).

The Foucauldian influence is strongly felt in the work of the critical discursive analysts who are interested in “how the effect of truth is created in discourse and in how certain discourse mobilizations become powerful – so powerful that they are orthodoxy, almost entirely persuasive, beyond which we can barely think” (Wetherell, 2003, p. 14). Wetherell (2003) describes this active, ideological function of language, so often entangled in the reproduction of hegemony (cf. Brown and Humphreys, 2006), as a central precept in critical discursive work:

It is argued that the state of play, policies, groups, identities, and subjectivities are instead constituted as they are formulated in discourse. The criteria for truth (what counts as correct description) are negotiated as humans make meaning within language games and epistemic regimes, and often, locally and indexically in interaction, rather than guaranteed by access to the independent properties of a single, external reality. (p. 12)

It is no surprise to read Wetherell’s (2003) comment that “this kind of study of discursive practices was previously subsumed under studies of ideology and the history of ideas” (p. 14). It is clearly profoundly influenced by the recognition that “theory and politics, knowledge and power are locked in a mutually conditioning system of effects so that the analysis of one must directly engage with analysis of the other” (Henriques, 1984, p. 64-65).

Discursive psychology and the study of racialised subjectivity

Within psychology, ideas from discourse analysis and some aspects of social psychology (Tileaga, 2005, p. 605) have coalesced into what became known as ‘discursive psychology’. While the term ‘discursive psychology’ is sometimes used interchangeably with ‘discourse analysis’, discursive psychology has a more explicit focus on what constitutes sensible and ‘valid’ matter for study in psychology and offers a challenge to the nature of the ‘subject’. I shall examine these two focus areas in terms of the racialisation of subjectivity.

Drawing from, inter alia, Austin’s (1962) writing about how the performativity of mental talk “does not mirror some external/internal reality but is essentially part of our social processes” (in Hepburn, 2003, p. 161), Billig, Condor, Edwards, Gane, Middleton and Radley (1988), Billig (1988,1991), Edwards (2003) and others

challenge the traditional psychological focus on the inner world of individuals (their thoughts, feelings and attitudes) as *the* source of meaning which is brought to bear on their interactions with others in the world. Edwards suggests instead that psychology should study the “relationships between mind and world, as psychology generally does, but as a discourse topic – as a participant’s concern, a matter of talk’s business, talk’s categories, talk’s rhetoric, talk’s current interactional concerns” (Edwards, 2003, p. 31) so that, for example, “[p]rejudice, or any other mental state or interpersonal disposition, is approached analytically as something that may be attended to in various ways in talk itself” (Edwards, 2003, p. 32). Thus the anti-mentalist approach of discursive psychology locates “these language practices or ‘ways of talking’ at a societal level, as products of a racist society rather than as individual, psychological and/or cognitive products (Wetherell and Potter, 1992)” (Augoustinos et al., 2005, p. 318). The analytic site is therefore “not the ‘prejudiced’ or ‘racist’ individual but the rhetorical and discursive resources that are available within an inequitable society” (Augoustinos et al., 2005, p. 318).

Embedded within this challenge to what constitutes appropriate matter for study in psychology is a dispute about the way in which studies are conducted, or more precisely, a dispute about what constitutes appropriate sampling strategies and participant selection for research. Discursive psychologists are interested in analysing “discourse in terms of its entry into the world of practical affairs: *everyday* conversation and texts” (Wetherell and Potter, 1992, p. 90, emphasis added), focusing on the implementation of “discourses in *actual settings*” (Wetherell and Potter, 1992, p. 90, emphasis added). Wetherell and Potter (1992) therefore prefer to talk about ‘interpretative repertoires’ (rather than discourses), and by interpretative repertoires they mean “broadly discernible clusters of terms, descriptions and figures of speech often assembled around metaphors or vivid images ... the building blocks used for manufacturing versions of actions, self and social structures in talk” (p. 90). This is a focus then on ‘lay ontologies’ (Durrheim and Dixon, 2000), that is, the ontological reasoning processes of ‘ordinary’ (lay) citizens in everyday contexts about various aspects of “human nature, the world, or reality” (Durrheim and Dixon, 2000, p. 98). This spotlight on the talk of ‘ordinary people’ is illuminating in race research because it represents a shift in focus away from the obvious “bigots or extremists who fit the traditional authoritarian picture” (Hepburn, 2003, p. 186) to the people ‘like us’ for whom racism had not been seen as a problem but who constitute a vital target group. As Hepburn (2003) points out,

people like us are involved in potentially the most important consequences of racism, as they control intakes to professions, dispense resources, have the power to label and exclude individuals, and are instrumental in the running of basic institutions of policing, employment and law making. They are also the people most able to disguise or discount racism. Often this involves the ability to provide articulate justifications for policies that have racist effects or cover injustices and inequalities. (p. 186)

Durrheim and Dixon's (2000) beach research demonstrates that, contrary to popular opinion about 'lay' speakers, the white beachgoers interviewed had a solid grasp not only of "scientific theories about culture and segregation, but also with the formal properties of scientific reasoning" (p. 104) and hence were able to use these theories and logical reasoning processes in discursive justifications for the continuing racial segregation of the beaches along universal "cultural lines" of fixed differences (Durrheim and Dixon, 2000).

The other major challenge discursive psychology offers to mainstream psychology is to the conceptualisation of the nature of the 'person'. This challenge – which I alluded to earlier using Hall's definition of identity – is not unique to discursive psychology but is part of a larger critical movement including the new paradigm psychologists such as Davies, van Langenhove and Harré, and postmodernists and constructionists, all of whom contest mainstream psychology's essentialist notion of the "free willed, autonomous, self-constituting" self (Hepburn, 2003, p. 155). The 'positioning theory' of social psychology's 'new paradigm' thinkers is particularly influential. Here Davies and Harré (1999), the leading exponents of this reframing of the notion of selfhood and 'roles', argue that:

the constitutive force of each discursive practice lies in its provision of subject positions. A subject position incorporates both a conceptual repertoire and a location for persons within the structure of rights and duties for those who use that repertoire. Once having taken up a particular position as one's own, a person inevitably sees the world from the vantage point of that position and in terms of the particular images, metaphors, storylines and concepts which are made relevant within the particular discursive practice in which they are positioned ... and accordingly who one is, that is, what sort of person one is, is always an open question with a shifting answer depending upon the positions made available within one's own and others' discursive practices and within those practices, the stories through which we make sense of our own and others' lives. (p. 35)

This analysis shifted the focus from thinking about ‘a person’ as an individual agent to constructing a person as a ‘subject’ (Davies and Harré, 1999), by which Davies and Harré purport to mean, following Smith (1988), “the series or conglomerate of positions, subject-positions, provisional and not necessarily infeasible, in which a person is momentarily called by the discourses and the world he/she inhabits” (Smith, 1988, p. xxxv in Davies and Harré, 1999, p. 37). A related way of framing this notion of subjectivity has been Bakhtin’s theory ([1930s] 1981), of the “mind as formed out of social processes to be made up of voices” (Hepburn, 2003, p. 157), a metaphor which links the individual and the social context, providing “a way to get historical or social relations into the person and therefore a way to understand apparently individual phenomena in more social terms” (Hepburn, 2003, p. 157). In these various movements, all joined loosely by their social constructionist leanings, the ‘subject’ as agent has mostly been positioned ‘bi-directionally’ (De Fina et al., 2006) interpellated by “historical, sociocultural forces in the form of dominant discourses” in a Foucauldian sense, and also more agentially, as a “constructive and interactive” agent choosing the means by which to construct identities in relation to others and in relation to dominant social narratives (De Fina et al., 2006, p. 7),

In the discursive movement, Billig (1988, 1991) catalysed this challenge to the nature of selfhood with his thesis that our talk is rhetorical and dilemmatic, oriented towards persuading people of our point of view as we argue against available spoken or unspoken points of view (‘commonplaces’) and attempt to influence “alternative versions of social reality” to bring them closer to our own version of reality (Every and Augoustinos, 2007; Billig, 1991).

Conclusion

Within the discursive psychological framework our talk has ideological effects because we are participating in and drawing on ‘debates’ circulating in and reproducing society. Billig’s notion of rhetoric represents a profound challenge to traditional notions of the decontextualised, ‘independent’ psychological subject because it constructs the subject as dialogical (cf. Bakhtin, [1930s] 1981) and therefore as socially constituted: as we construct self/society with our discourses, so we also draw on the discourses circulating in society to construct ourselves, or (as the Foucauldians in their not-so-agentic way prefer to frame it) so the circulating discourses construct us. In the South African context then, our subjectivities are

constructed and re-constructed within the powerful discourses circulating in society, discourses which reflect “entrenched asymmetries (on the basis of ‘race’, class and gender)” which have been “created and maintained through historical processes (such as apartheid, struggle politics, and the negotiated transition to a liberal democracy)” (Franchi and Swart, 2003, p. 149). Within this context subjectivity “is not only defined by, but functions to re-define, contest, legitimate or transform social or historical processes” (Franchi and Swart, 2003, p. 149). The ‘racialised subject’ within discursive psychology research is therefore studied as a product or producer of talk which is either explicitly racialised, through, for example, conversations and interviews about current themes of race relations and/or, more implicitly, through ostensibly ‘apolitical’ everyday talk. Much of this work is done through constructions of the ‘Other’ as different and lesser than. Indeed, as Tileaga (2006) points out, “one of the most important contributions of discursive psychology to the study of social inequality was the study of racism, prejudice and discrimination in talk about ‘others’” (p. 482). This is work profoundly influenced by Fanon’s (1986) and Said’s (1978) writings about the Othering process, for example, Said’s writing about the European invention of ‘Orientals’ and ‘Orientalism’, “a political vision of reality whose structure promoted the difference between the familiar (Europe, the West, “us”) and the strange (the Orient, the East, “them”)” (Said, 1978, p. 43) within the context of a “relationship of power, of domination, of varying degrees of complex hegemony” (Said, 1978, p. 5). This notion of the contextual, discursively defined self is inevitably then a politicised notion of subjectivity and one which guides the empirical analysis in this thesis.

The analytic processes using this discursive psychological framework are documented in the next chapter.

Chapter 4: Methodology

[W]ithout a certain kind of space, a certain kind of story is simply impossible.
(Moretti, 1998, p. 100 in Back, 2005, p. 19)

Everything in the universe is encounters, happy or unhappy encounters.
(Deleuze in Thrift 1996)

Introduction

The recording of my methodological work comprises a chain of active “field notes about the development of thinking” (Silverman, 2005, p. 306) and practice. This transparent approach to methodology write-ups is what Silverman refers to as the “natural history” approach (Silverman, 2005, p. 306). I have made every effort to ensure that this write-up is reflexive rather than indulgently confessional.

After a brief explication of the current socio-economic context of Durban in which this research is located, I have documented the process of sampling, since it was in the conversational engagement with the participants that I was able to iteratively sharpen my ideas about the most appropriate methods of gathering data in order to provide suitable data for the research questions emerging in this project. Then I proceed to a consideration of interviewing methodologies: how it was that the interactive and mobile interviewing methods developed in the academy, practically how they were operationalised in this research project, and why these methodological choices are appropriate for this research problem. There is also a focus on the transcription and analytical methods employed.

Setting

This project is located in Durban, a city where colonial and apartheid planning policies have ensured that even today in post-apartheid Durban most residential areas have remained highly racially segregated despite the repeal of the Group Areas Act in 1991 and some movement of black and Indian residents into ex-white suburbs and black families into formerly Indian areas (Kitchin, 2002). The spatial movement that has taken place has notably been in “poor, and therefore more

affordable suburbs, and new suburban developments where all the householders arrived together” (Christopher, 2001, p. 455 in Kitchin, 2002, p. 2)

The largely continuous forms of racialisation of suburban space impacts significantly on the racialisation of resources. According to a report in the eThekweni Municipality’s recent strategic plan, “[m]ost of the historically black formal residential areas, as well as the black informal and peri-urban areas, are located on the outer periphery. This spatial configuration has resulted in a distinct pattern of inequity and inefficiencies” (p. 105) in the municipality so that “a spatial analysis of needs shows that many of the communities that are worse off are located in the historically under-invested [black] township areas where a great deal of informal dwelling infill [shack dwelling] has occurred” (p. 107) and “communities in the [black] rural periphery have the lowest access to services and lowest socio-economic status” (eThekweni Integrated Development Plan 2010 and beyond, March 2008, p. 107).

A key spatial trend in Durban in the last ten years (and elsewhere in South Africa and other parts of the world) has been the development of edge cities and gated communities to the north and west of the city centre, creating a polycentric city formation (Maharaj, 2001 in Kitchin, 2002; Kitchin, 2002; Ballard, 2005b; Freund, 2002, 2007). These edge cities are based on an American model in which corporate services and headquarters move their white collar workers to the edge/s of the city where they can be accessed from newly created private suburban gated villages and serviced by massive shoppertainment centres. In the North of Durban, the staff of the many and massive new corporate headquarters on La Lucia Ridge can live in Mount Edgecombe golfing estate (or one of the other new gated villages springing up) and can do all their shopping and entertainment in Gateway, the nearby shoppertainment centre akin to a small village (Freund, 2002; Freund, 2007; Kitchin, 2002). Many spatial theorists are highly critical of these edge cities as “the spatial templates on which a middle class consciousness is produced and reproduced” (Maharaj, 2001 in Kitchin, 2002, p. 8) providing opportunities for the middle classes to ‘semigrate’, that is, to partially emigrate “without leaving the borders of South Africa” (Ballard, 2005b, p. 2). With these acts of ‘semigration’ the middle classes abandon the metropolitan city spaces to the poor who do not have the necessary private transport or funds to participate in life in the plush new urban centres, unless it is as cleaners or shop assistants (Maharaj, 2001 in Kitchin, 2002, p. 8). This city centre, largely white at the height of apartheid, is therefore now utilised by and accommodating of mostly poor black South Africans and foreign black Africans. Significantly, where once informal

street trading was banned (Popke and Ballard, 2004, p. 104), now mass street trading redefines “(D)urban life, space and culture” (Nesvag, 2002, p. 283; Popke and Ballard, 2004). Indeed the post-apartheid Durban city centre is “the setting for new forms of racial interaction, negotiation and conflict, which have transformed the nature and experience of social space” (Popke and Ballard, 2004, p. 99) and it is therefore an important place to explore how race and racialised subjectivities are (still) being produced.

My descriptions (in this thesis) of the places we toured refer to the names of the streets at the time of the tours. In Appendix 7 I include a list of key street name changes in the city centre.

Sampling

The (iterative) selection of ‘tour guides’

I did eleven tours with ten men (five African, three Indian and two white), all aged between 31 and 49, all working for local government. According to the eThekweni Municipal Employment Equity report of March 2007 these racial ratios are more or less representative of the total staff employed in the eThekweni municipality in 2007, that is, 60% of the staff is black/African, 29% Indian, 9% white and 2% coloured. These staff figures are fairly (racially) representative of the total population of Durban which is racially comprised as follows: black/African 68%, Indian 20%, white 9% and coloured 3% (2005/6 Corporate Policy Unit, eThekweni Municipal Authority). I did not do any touring with the smallest ‘race’ group, that is, Coloureds who comprise 2% of the staff population and 3% of the populace of Durban. Each tour lasted between 70 and 165 minutes (see Appendix 6 for a detailed description of the routes of the tours).

Sampling criteria

My sample comprised mainly senior men who work in different departments in the eThekweni Municipal Authority (EMA) of Durban. This choice to work with EMA officials is related to local government’s status as not only a critical sphere of political governance but also as an important social space with a particularly significant history of the racialising of space. In different ways Durban’s local government

continues to be implicated in race, both programmatically (externally) as legislation such as the Municipals Systems and Structures Acts require the City to focus on development rather than maintenance issues, and procedurally (internally) as, in many instances, black staff with a history of participation or leadership in democratic community based organisations opposed to apartheid, are far better positioned to do the work required by local government.

I chose to tour only with men. Historically it is men who have produced and designed the city space of Durban and conjuncturally men continue to dominate in the influential positions of power within the City. Although under legislative and social pressure the gender equities are slowly shifting, a gender review of pivotal positions in the City's political and administrative structures shows that in 2007 men occupied approximately 72% of the Councillor positions. In the administrative layer women constituted 25% of the staff totals, including 22% of the staff in top management, 18% of senior management and 24% of the professional staff (eThekweni Municipality, 2007). In 2008, statistics in an electronic newsletter from the City Manager to the residents of Durban revealed that the 2008 gender ratios amongst staff were almost identical to those in 2007 (City Manager's newsletter, email communication, July 2008).

I also chose to work only with men because I wanted this project to foreground issues of race. Prior to this project my research has only had women in the sample groups and the issues of gender (in my work) have always overshadowed the issues of race. This does not mean that gender is not present as a social factor in this research: gender issues are pervasive in the project, in the linguistic and embodied interactions between me and the other participants, in my discussions with my supervisor and others about my work, and in my broad analytical frame. Even if I were a man like the rest of participants, 'gender' would still be a significant factor, for example, in the gendered spaces we moved through as participants in a highly gendered society.

I toured with men who under the apartheid classification system were labelled as African, Indian or white and in terms of which I was classified as white. Given the continued structuring effects of race and racialised subjectivities in South Africa, being African, white or Indian was determinant in all the inter-actions between the participants and me. In a racially charged environment like South Africa this is inevitable. The 'racial focus' of the tour talk, that is, the transformation of city space,

only served to highlight this. Research on the effects of interviewer race indicates that “the race of an interviewer makes a difference only on questions specifically related to race” (Fontana and Frey, 2000, p. 650). This research work is oriented to discovering whether race ‘interferes’ in the outcome of general research topics through racial dynamics between interviewers and interviewees and thus I am specifically interested in this ‘interference’, in how our racialised subjectivities are mutually impacting.

Another significant sampling choice I made was to work with men with whom I had a prior working relationship. I had worked directly and indirectly with these men during the five years I had been employed in City government and had become friends with some of them. There are now some qualitative writers who advocate that researchers interested in ‘sensitive’ social issues subjects should interview peers with whom they have already established relationships, because “[m]odern racist beliefs and arguments are rarely expressed and carried out in real-life oppositional situations ... more often they are rehearsed between people who are close to and similar to each other in a nonhostile environment, where positions and supports can be shared, honed, evaluated and reinforced” (Kleiner, 1998, p. 212). Indeed my choice to work with peers was related to the slipperiness and furtiveness of the construct of race. Having pre-established relations of trust with the sample group would facilitate them talking more openly with me about race than if they did not know me and hence would be unsure whether they could trust me. Race talk is so contentious that it is feasible that people who did not know me would have refused me an interview about race-related matters. One participant, Brian, indicated that this was the case for him. (After discussions, he did agree to do a tour.) However, engaging participants with whom I had a working relationship or friendship or both could potentially result in the unethical exploitation of participants and thus it required a number of steps to be taken to avoid this. One of these ethically ‘protective’ factors was that my previous work in the City had involved relatively high profile ‘left wing’ work in the Transformation and Restructuring office of the Municipality, so the men I toured with were appraised of my views on race, having previously heard these views aired publically. Since talking about race (or other controversial issues) “implicates a position or perspective with respect to the controversy” (Pomerantz and Zemel, 2003, p. 215), not having to be uncertain about my racial perspective meant that there was a reduced chance that the participants would find an interview with me about race unnerving or manipulative. In addition, I told potential participants a number of times that my research was about race, allowing them to choose whether to participate or

not based on their own assessment of the potential harm to them psychologically and professionally. During the tours I was regularly upfront about the importance of race to my research. I also took seriously the question of participant anonymity (see ethical considerations in Appendix 2).

A secondary effect (and benefit) of knowing the participants is that the regular 'small talk' that occurred between us because of our previous connections created a relaxed and informal conversation, and this made controversial discussions easier. Conversely, the initial conversation on each of the tours was awkward, partly because of the unfamiliar positionings of the interview mode in already-established relationships with familiar positionings. After some time we relaxed into the conversation, making the conversations often spontaneous, two-way efforts to grapple with the issues of race and racial transformation in the city. This conversational style of engagement with colleagues-friends meant that I, the researcher, was also a participant, putting my views 'on the line', which hopefully contributed towards making the research process ethically more 'just' and 'even-handed'.

Working within the relations of trust that exist among friends and acquaintances did, of course, place a higher burden of ethical responsibility on me, particularly because some participants may not have found it easy to refuse to do a tour with me given our pre-existing relationship. In this way their participation could perhaps be seen as potentially involuntary. Ethically this was possibly problematic because it could violate the principle of autonomy, a principle that "finds expression in most requirements for voluntary informed consent by all research participants" (Wassenaar, 2006, p. 67). When I spoke to each participant on the telephone I worked hard to make it possible for him to refuse by, for example, indicating that I had a range of people I could ask to tour if he was too busy or would prefer not to participate. Another difficulty with the objective of voluntary and autonomous participation that was complicated by my having a prior relationship with the participants was their lack of interest in completing consent letters (see Appendix 5 for an example of the consent letters), which, by and large, they ignored (see Appendix 2 for further discussion of this dilemma).

The sampling process

The sampling process was flexible, iterative and theoretically purposive as I deliberately and incrementally chose participants with whom the processes I wanted to study were “most likely to occur” (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000, p. 370 in Silverman, 2005, p. 129) thereby allowing me to “develop and test [my] theory and explanation” (Mason, 1996, pp. 93-4 in Silverman, 2005, p. 131) and also hopefully to facilitate some theoretical extrapolation. For example, I preferred to select participants employed in the municipality in the first half of the 1990s because I was interested in their accounts of the spatial and racialised practices within the municipality before and after apartheid was formally dismantled. For similar reasons my preference was that they were men in their late 30s or in their 40s, men whose identities had been significantly influenced by the direct ideological effects of apartheid *and* who had a vested interest in their career prospects and presumably the future success of the city of Durban. Initially I also contacted men operating only in a senior strategic capacity in the City government because I was interested in obtaining “information rich cases for study in depth” (Patton, 1990, p. 169) and these men were likely to hold strong views about the (racialised) transformation of the city, both ‘internally’ as political government and ‘externally’ as social space, and because they quite literally construct Durban and local government with what they say (and what people do because of what they say). The generation of “detailed and rich descriptions of contexts” (Van Der Riet and Durrheim, 2006, p. 92) which constitute “detailed accounts of the structures of meaning that develop in a specific context” is important as these can then be “transferred to new contexts in other studies to provide a framework with which to reflect on the arrangements of meaning and action that occur in these new contexts” (Van Der Riet and Durrheim, 2006, p. 92). In addition, it seemed to me that the traditional asymmetry of the interviewing relationship would be reduced if the power differentials prior to interviewing were more equalised. I had occupied a relatively senior position in the City so interviewing senior people I had worked with seemed ‘less exploitative’ and tending towards being ethically just, fair and equitable (Wassenaar, 2006, p. 68). Magen, Mandla, Andrew, Mbuso and Sifiso met all of these criteria except the age criterion. Two were in their early 30s, which minimised the negative experiences that they had had of apartheid, relative to the older men, but the racialised interactions that we had on tour were rich and therefore warranted being retained as data for this project.

After I had done a number of tours it seemed possible that I might be missing important stories through only touring with *senior* City officials. Analytically I was beginning to develop a sense of the lack of personal engagement of senior officials 'with' the racially transformed city centre (for example, none of them socialised in the inner city). For the sake of validity, I needed to verify this theory with some plausible rival 'hypotheses' which "could provide an alternative causal explanation for the findings documented" (Durrheim, 2006, p. 38). In pursuit of a potentially 'deviant' story about local government officials and the city space, that "[did] not fit the inductively constructed pattern" (Perakyla, 2004, p. 292) that was emerging for me, I asked Nthando, a junior clerk if he would take me on a tour. Menzi, the next tour guide, was also in a relatively junior position in the municipal hierarchy. I came to interview Menzi when it became apparent to me that none of the men I had toured with actually lived in the city centre, so in pursuit of possibly contradictory or disconfirming conversations, I used 'snowball' sampling to find a tour guide who lived in the city centre. I had not worked with Menzi but we had been friendly because our offices were in the same building at the EMA. On the phone I explained to Menzi I was interested in touring with someone who lived in the city centre and he agreed to do the tour. When we met for the tour however it became apparent that he and I understood the geographic parameters of the city rather differently. In my city map he lives in a neighbourhood directly adjacent to the city whereas in his city map he lives in the city. We did the tour anyway and it was relatively generative. I did further snowball sampling in my efforts to find men whom I knew and who were living centrally and working for the city government but I had no success. In this study the lack of known participants who lived in the city centre and therefore who may have had a different personal engagement with the city compared to the more senior officials that I toured with, is one of the "trade offs" in my research design (Patton, 1990, p. 162). A few months later I was referred to two junior local government staff who did live in the centre but I did not know them and decided therefore not to interview them. In retrospect perhaps our lack of relational history might have provided useful deviant or 'unusual' material.

I did a second tour with Magen because a technical (user) hitch had resulted in the loss of half of the digital recording of his first tour. Also, during our first tour he had referred extensively to his experiences in the previously Indian zoned Grey Street complex which, for reasons of time and distance, we had not been able to tour on that occasion. I reflected afterwards that a tour of this area with him would potentially

have generated rich conversations, thus our second tour was located in the Grey Street complex.

Gregory was next on my original sample list. When he got into my car (I was parked outside his City office building) and we were talking about where to go on the tour, he told me that he did not use the city anymore. When I asked what part of Durban he did use, he named a previously Indian-zoned residential and light commercial area, Chatsworth, which is separate from the Durban city centre and where he had grown up. I suggested we tour that area. The tour we did of Chatsworth was fascinating and productive but with hindsight it might have been more useful to ask Gregory to do a tour of Durban centre (which he had agreed to in a prior phone call and email) because his accounts of why he did not use the city anymore, his positioning and our interactional work in that context would have been interesting and relevant to my research.

I had only toured with one white man at this stage so I contacted another white planner, Brian, who, after some concerns about the racial framing of my research, agreed to do a tour with me. Their tours revealed racial constructions closely aligned with those outlined in extensive literature on the construction of whiteness and I therefore did not deem it necessary to tour with more white men (cf. Silverman, 2005). Then I contacted Menesh, another city planner with whom I had worked. We agreed to meet in town and when he arrived (in his car) at the pre-arranged spot, he called out to me from his car and said he would drive us on the tour. Sifiso's tour of Florida Road became the last tour I did. It was highly generative and a review of my data after this tour revealed that the sample had "achieved redundancy in the sense that it was likely that no new information [could] be gained from increasing the sample size" (Durrheim, 2006, p. 50). I had generated a store of "information rich" data with which to work (Patton, 1990, p. 185).

Developing an ontologically and epistemologically aligned interviewing methodology

After the first pilot tour, which I conducted with a friend-colleague, Magen, I ruminated on the differentially racialised childhood experiences of the city we had discussed on the tour. Being Indian, Magen had had access to only the Indian parts of the city, whereas the privilege afforded me by my whiteness had insulated me from

even considering questions of 'access' in the city centre. Magen and I were not accustomed to talking so directly about our own racialised subjectivities and stories in the way that we had while on tour together and I felt these conversations had 'troubled' our friendship. I emailed Magen about this and his reply indicated that he did not agree: "Lyndsay, I am not sure about what you mean about race getting in the way. I honestly did not at all feel affected – I enjoyed the interview and thought it went very well". While I was relieved that for him 'race did not get in the way', I was acutely aware that I was racially positioned as white and historically privileged relative to Magen who was positioned, relative to me, as Indian and historically poor. Indeed, during all the tours the participants and I seemed to be (always?) in a racialised intersubjective engagement. For example, when Mandla talked about his childhood exclusion from the well-resourced white beaches, I reflected with shamed surprise that I had not noticed the whiteness of my beaches when I was a child. I later expressed to Mandla my relief that he also felt some alienation from the contemporary city because this could mean that my (similar?) sense of alienation might not be as racialised as I assumed.

In post tour reflections with my supervisor I recognised that, despite my methodological affiliation to a conversational approach and my commitment to being an 'immersed' researcher, I had not expected to be (so) implicated in the tour's racialised talk and practices. Indeed I was surprised to find that my own subjectivity was also under construction while on tour. Some important elements of my research became clear then: there were still traces of positivism in my construction of the research relationship; the mobile tours could generate good interactionally constituted 'data' about racialised subjectivity; and most importantly, the interactive interviewing style was highly generative. In fact the talk at our inter-facing was doing so much work, creating and constructing and reflecting that it seemed appropriate to reflect this by using the concept of an inter-action rather than an interview or conversation. This was critical because this collection of interactive 'data' on the move through social place ensured that this interviewing methodology was most suitable for this particular project given that the ontological focus of my research was increasingly on the 'implaced' nature of (racialised) subjectivities. In other words, the interactive and mobile methodological approach was appropriately synchronous with the epistemological and ontological concerns of this project.

An interviewing methodology: interactive interviewing

In Chapter 1 and in the section above I briefly discussed what led to the choice of an interactive and mobile interviewing methodology. What is required now is some detail about the development of the interactive interviewing approach and the development of the mobile interviewing methodology. It will then be possible to consider how the operationalising of these interviewing methods impacted on the kind of data and knowledge generated in this particular project.

All methodological choices are an argument with or for or against other methods. Interactive and mobile interviewing methods are no different. They are largely a response to the positivist interviewing methodologies which dominated the natural and social sciences in the 20th century where the focus was on the generation of quantitative data which would (ostensibly) demonstrate 'objective' 'knowable' 'truths' (Fontana and Frey, 2000). Quantitative work usually entailed conducting highly structured standardised "stimulus-response" interviews (Brenner, 1982 in Mishler, 1986, pp. 13-14) with large sample groups in order to collect data that could be analysed statistically and generalised widely.

However, by the 1980s the interfacing 'new' ontologies of feminism, humanism, radical ethnography, new paradigm thinking, postmodernism and social constructionism conspired to reject this positivist interviewing orthodoxy as exploitative and dehumanising for participants and as methodologically unethical and fraudulent. If we need to choose a notable historical moment to observe the genesis of this new interviewing faction, Ann Oakley's (1981) radical piece, *Interviewing women: a contradiction in terms*, more than serves this need. Oakley refused to use positivist interviewing methods in her research, asserting that her interviews with women on motherhood demonstrated the absurdity of framing interviews as neutral unidirectional transactions because the women wanted to talk to her about her own experiences of motherhood. In addition she challenged the ethical paucity and lack of feminist consciousness entailed in regarding interviewees as 'sources of data' when feminists are oriented towards the respectful validation of women's subjective experiences (Oakley, 1981, p. 30). In a related piece of work, Jack Douglas (1985), in his book *Creative Interviewing*, encouraged interviewers to abandon the rules of interviewer neutrality and to share their personal feelings and stories so that participants felt comfortable to do the same. Douglas proposed that with this

'emotionalist' approach interviewers would be provided with a "pathway to participants' authentic experiences" (Potter and Hepburn, 2005, p. 284).

Oakley and Douglas were writing as the highly organising Cold War rhetoric began to crumble and postmodernist futurists like Lyotard (1984) were expressing incredulity about grand metanarratives, favouring more local, decentralised, deconstructed, tentative notions of self, truth, knowledge and society. In outlying corners, social constructionism offered an ontological base to qualitative researchers who were hyper-reflexive about their role in actively co-constructing and negotiating selves, subjects' 'reality' and the located knowledge that emerged in interviews, and proposed new ways of conceptualising research interviews. Where previously interviews were framed as opportunities for 'neutral' interviewers to facilitate a clear recounting of interviewees' 'readymade' stories, now we are greatly influenced by the writings of Goffman (1986) and others who have drawn attention to "the inevitably relational dimension of meaning and the ways in which social acts construct shared understandings of 'what is going on'" (Condor, 2006, p. 6). In this paradigm, interviews are predominantly recognised as "negotiated conversational accomplishments" (Fontana and Frey, 2000) wherein both interviewer and interviewee actively participate in the live co-construction of the interviewees' stories and subjectivities (Gubrium and Holstein, 2003). The writing on intersubjectivity by Bakhtin (1984) and others has had a significant influence on this framing of the co-constructive interview. Bakhtin (1984) frames this co-dependency between self and other thus:

To be means to be for another, and through the other for oneself. A person has no internal sovereign territory, he is wholly and always on the boundary: looking inside himself, he looks *into the eyes of another or with the eyes of another*. ... I cannot manage without another, I cannot become myself without another. (p. 287, emphasis in original in Holloway and Kneale, 2000, pp. 73 – 74)

However, even in this postmodern/critical writing about jointly constructed interviews and "the significance of the interactional nature of interviews" (Potter and Hepburn, 2005, p. 284) (see also Potter and Mulkay, 1985; Potter and Wetherell, 1995), the assumption still remains that the researcher is the questioner and the 'interviewee' is the answering subject whose stories, by and large, constitute the researcher's raw material. Mishler (1986) makes this clear when he writes:

The discourse of the interview is jointly constructed by both interviewer and respondent....[b]oth questions and responses are formulated in, developed through, and shaped by the discourse between interviewers and respondents...[a]n adequate understanding of interviews depends on recognizing how interviewers reformulate questions and how respondents frame answers in terms of their reciprocal understanding as meanings emerge during the course of an interview. (p. 52)

This focus on the way *questions and answers are constructed* (and retrospectively analysed) is at the core of his critical thinking about interviewing. Indeed Gubrium and Holstein (2003) put it more explicitly: “The active interviewer’s role is to incite respondent’s answers, virtually activating narrative production” (p. 75). Kvale (1996), a self confirmed postmodernist researcher, also obfuscates this issue of the co-construction of the interview (and by implication, the construction of knowledge). On page 1 of his book *Inter Views: an introduction to qualitative research* (1996) he asserts that the purpose of interviews is for the researcher to find out how people understand their life world(s) through asking questions and listening to them:

If you want to know how people understand their world and their life, why not talk with them? In an interview conversation, the researcher listens to what people themselves tell about their lived world, hears them express their views on their work situation and family life, their dreams and hopes. The qualitative research interview attempts to understand the world from the subject’s point of view, to unfold the meaning of people’s experiences, to uncover their lived world prior to scientific explanations. (Kvale, 1996, p. 1)

On the next page he emphasises however that the qualitative research interview “is a construction site of knowledge ... literally an *inter view*, an interchange of views between two persons conversing about a theme of mutual interest (Kvale, 1996, p. 2). It seems to me to be contradictory to talk about the ‘Inter View’ as a mutual interchange of views about a theme of mutual interest *and* a focus on the Life World of the subject. Kvale is, in fact, describing a conversational style interview. But calling it a conversation in which two people are jointly constructing a story is possibly misleading. Perhaps it is a matter of how one understands the heavy constructive work of the interviewer’s questions. For Baker (2003), for example, “no question is neutral in respect of the way it characterizes the person being interviewed ... the identity work that emerges in the interview is a product of the questioning as much as it is a product of the answering” (p. 405). In general though, this conversational *style* approach is, I would argue, what most of the ‘postmodernists’ are referring to when

they talk about interviews as shared, co-constructed conversations (cf. Brown and Durrheim, in press).

Indeed Potter and Hepburn (2005) suggest that the failure of researchers to treat interviews as interactions is one of the biggest problems with the use of the interview as a research method. Their view is that this failure is related to a number of contingent ('fixable') and necessary ('inherent') problems in research work. The contingent problems (the deletion of the interviewer and the interview set-up in the research reporting, problematic or inadequate conventions for representing interaction, and the lack of substantive support for certain analytic observations arising from interview based research) can be resolved, according to Potter and Hepburn, with more rigorous research analysis and reporting. Inevitably, however, Potter and Hepburn are more concerned with what they regard as necessary or inherent problems in qualitative research interviewing more generally, including the flooding of the interview with social science agendas, the complex and various positions of interviewer and interviewee, the orientations to stake and the interest of the interviewer and interviewee, and the reproduction of cognitivism (2005, pp. 291-299). They maintain that these necessary problems with the interview can be circumvented by the choice to work with naturalistic data instead. Naturalistic data includes "audio and video recordings of conversations in everyday or work settings, records of professional-client interactions, television programmes, documents such as medical records or personal diaries" that is, data which is "not got up by the researcher" (2005, p. 301). According to Potter and Hepburn, the advantages of using naturalistic data include that this data can (1) throw up novel questions and issues; (2) go beyond familiar limits of memory, attention and perception that underpin people's accounts of their practices or the organizations in which they work; (3) get representations and 'cognitions' in action; (4) provide resources for appreciating issues of application (p. 301). (See Potter, 2003; Potter, 2004, for an overview and discussion of these points.)

While the study of naturalistic data offers many obvious benefits, there are also a number of general difficulties, such as getting access to ethically sensitive data or being able to choose to study something that is perhaps not available in naturalistic data. Pitting inter-active data generation methods against naturalistic methods and more directed conversational style interviews (and other methods of inquiry) is pointless, "a leftover from the paradigmatic quantitative hostility of past generations" (Fontana and Frey, 2000, p. 668). The choice of methodology is made on the basis

of what it is that we want to find out. I wanted a method which would allow me to consider how race and racialised subjectivities mutated subjectively and intersubjectively. This required inter-action not available through the use of naturalistic data collection methods. On this issue I found support from Condor (2006) who, drawing on Shotter's (1993) "account of dialogic behaviour as a form of 'joint action'" (in Condor, 2006, p. 3), points out that the lack of attention to the collaborative character of talk is particularly problematic in studies of prejudice, because "the public expressions of prejudice normally involve socially situated activity; that is, actions that occur *between* individuals" (Condor, 2006, p. 2).

In order to research this inter-activity, we need to disrupt the conventional expectations of the Q-and-A research interview and the productive or directive role of the researcher. Condor (2006) did this by instructing a research interviewer to approach a group of people – 'social friends' who were 'just chatting' – and ask the friendship group for an impromptu response to a seemingly innocuous topic such as 'how cities have changed', a topic which, not unexpectedly, brought about very interesting, collaboratively determined 'prejudiced talk' which was recorded, transcribed, and analysed. My approach was to 'conduct' mobile interviews where the inter-action between researcher and research participant was at least partially 'directed' by the (moving) situation/space rather than interviewer questions (Brown and Durrheim, in press).

Mobile interviewing

Mobile interviewing is located within the interdisciplinary Mobilities field that has emerged in the last few years. This field (or paradigm?) initially developed from radical global and local shifts in the transport, information and communication networks and has subsequently converged around theoretical resources from studies of (relational) space, place, boundaries, corporeality and movement (Sheller and Urry, 2006). Much of the work is built therefore around a challenge to the 'sedentary', 'a-mobile' (Sheller and Urry, 2006) 'a-spatial' nature of social science research, and a commitment to studying the "occasioned" activities, embodied experiences and relationships that occur whilst on the move (Lyons and Urry, 2005 in Sheller and Urry, 2006). Although the mobilities movement comprises questions, theories and methodologies, it is the methodological material that I have found particularly helpful. Sheller and Urry (2006) describe the methodological work as "mobile ethnography" that is, "participation in patterns of movement while conducting

ethnographic research” (p. 217). Anderson (2004), in his research with environmental activists, uses a mobile methodology he calls, following Evans (1998), ‘bimbling’, i.e., aimlessly walking while talking. According to Anderson, bimbling functions as “an active trigger to prompt knowledge recollection and production” (p. 54) and as a “midwife of thought” (Botton, 2002 in Anderson, 2004, p. 258). In their work on the role of noise in mobile interviews, Hall, Lashua and Coffey (2008) offer the empirical practice of ‘soundwalking’: “the mobile exploration of (local) space and sounds” (p. 1019). In Kusenbach’s (2003) ethnographic mobile fieldwork she uses what she terms the ‘go-along’ method wherein she accompanies informants going about their daily business while she asks, listens, questions, observes (in Hall et al., 2008, p. 1029). Here talking while walking or driving through space can function as a kind of ‘elicitation technique’, an interviewing device used by anthropologists and other social scientists to prompt conversation and “uncover unarticulated informant knowledge” (Johnson and Weller, 2001, p. 491). This is partly because, as Casey (1987) pointed out, memory is place-oriented, or to turn this around, because place has “intrinsic memorability” as a “container of experiences” (Casey, 1987, pp. 186-187 in Cresswell, 2004, p. 86; see also Nora’s writings on symbolically-loaded sites as *lieux de memoire* in Osborne, 2001, p. 12).

Features of this mobile data collection process

Some of the features of these mobile interviews include the following: researcher and (other) participant walking/driving alongside each other; moving through disruptive space; having situated, indexical conversations; engaging in a ‘line of inquiry’ in these conversations; encouraging participants to guide the tour; and relational engaging. The discussion of each of these features, which are largely inter-linked and co-dependent, naturally generates a discussion of the impact of these features on the relationship between participants and the kinds of knowledge generated. I will expand on each one by drawing on examples of events and talk that took place while touring the city with participants.

Being alongside each other

The physical activity of walking/driving *alongside* each other, facing outwards and away from each other, de-emphasised the contact between me and the other participant and interpellated the space we were in as (co)producers of our dialogue. For example, when Magen (Indian) and I (white) walked near a branch of Game

Discount World Stores, a massive discount store we both used to visit when we were young, we stood next to each other for a while on the street corner looking at Game and talking about how I used to enter the store via the entrance from West Street (which was a white zoned street) and how he used the entrance from Pine Street (which was a 'grey' zoned street, a border street between the white and Indian sections of town). Here is the relevant extract from the tour:

Magen (Indian) and me (white)

M: just (.) picking up on that theme right uh::hm I recall uh::h in terms of my er sense of space that furtherest that my Dad and I used to walk was up to Pine Street er::r because there was a Game I'm not sure is there still a Game still

L: Over there [M: is it?] Ja ja I know that Game (.) ja it had an entrance from this side and

M: Yes so for example we used to shop at Game [L: ok] and that was the furtherest we used to go in that in that (.) direction and then we used to come back uh::h and walk down and then do all the rest of the shopping in Queen Victoria streets um:::m (2.0) ok [3.0 *inaudible because of vuvuzelas¹¹ blowing*]

L: around that time my memory of Game is always coming in from the other side and I wonder if Game designed it that way

M: Actually very interesting [*we are standing diagonally opposite the ex-Indian entrance to Game next to a street lamp, lots of posters on the walls around us, lots of street traders everywhere and taxis, so busy that nobody notices us really, just the odd person looking intently at us and moving past*]

L: they put it this point [M: yes] because it was at the connection between the two areas [M: yes] and they've got entrances on both sides and I would be (.) of course we can't look back now but it would be interesting to see what goods they put in this front entrance and what goods they put in the other side you know [*how crushingly depressing, this idea of different products for different races and economic classes*]

M: Yes because I would always enter through this way [L: uhh] but if my recollection of Game is correct always entering this way and then coming back this way and never going uh (.) you know to the bayside so [L: uh] so um (1.0) um ok [*whites had the bayside entrance, it even sounds nicer and it was*]

¹¹ Vuvuzelas are long horns trumpeted primarily at, or in connection with, soccer (football) matches.

Magen and I were acutely absorbed with this historically racialised capitalism and stood alongside each other on a noisy street corner for quite some time, ‘interfacing’ with the Game Discount World Store as we reworked our segregated accounts.

Moving through a constantly disruptive space

There is something about moving through a constantly changing, visually and aurally demanding environment that makes a free associational and haphazard conversation inevitable. It is impossible to tune out the ever-changing noise and activity and a scheduled to-and-fro question and answer interview becomes disjunctural and unviable in this maelstrom of activity. This kind of active and noisy environment is contra-indicated in almost all interviewing rulebooks, which covertly or overtly advise an environment uncontaminated by distractions. Yet being mobile in a moving, noisy environment informalised and (partially) equalised the conversation and research relationship. In an email (below) after his first tour, Magen commented on how he saw this working: “Regarding the methodology I think it is a wonderful method not only because the respondent is more comfortable, but because there are visual prompts all the time that make for good commentary and hence analysis”.

This impact of the visual and aural prompts of our ‘active’ and noisy environment on our conversation and relationship is evident in the extract from the tour with Magen where we stood and looked at and talked about the Game Discount World Store we both visited regularly in our youth. This tour conversation took place on a Friday morning the day before a much anticipated soccer final (Pirates v Chiefs) was to be played in Durban and we were surrounded by street traders selling soccer fan paraphernalia, including *vuvuzelas*. The street traders, getting into the spirit of things and edging into the over-catered market, were intermittently blowing the *vuvuzelas* so that in many instances during this tour Magen and I struggled to be heard through the hooting. During another tour, while walking along Smith Street with Andrew, we had to cross a store’s service entrance and a delivery truck nearly reversed into us. The engine and the beeping reverse noises of the truck, its movement and size, caused us to stop talking for a few seconds and to concentrate on safely getting past the service entrance. Given the city setting of the tours, these kinds of disruptions were ever-present. They were not a deterrent in anyway, however. On the contrary, the disruptions informalised the tours further and distanced the ‘activity’ we were engaging in further from the traditional format of the Q-and-A Interview, making it all

the more conversational and interactive. Hall et al. (2008) talk about the positive impact of (noisy) mobility on traditional participant/researcher power relations:

[A] further related gain, as we see it, is the considerable potential that noisy, peripatetic journeying as a vehicle for conversation has to even out some of the power differentials that even the most informal of sit down interviews can struggle to throw off. ...Out and about the pressure is off. It is much harder – intentionally or otherwise – to put one’s interlocutors on the spot, to oblige them to deliver (themselves). Questions asked in noisy spaces lose the authority a quiet room affords, thinned out as they are by the myriad other sounds into which they dissolve. Answers, likewise, bear a lesser weight of expectation: respondents can speak without breaking silence; they can pause without things going quiet. We want to emphasise the leveling effect that noise can have on relations of inquiry and the ‘space’ that it makes for everyday speech. (p. 1035)

Situated talk

One of the many fine features of a mobile interview is that conversations inevitably become situated and contextual, contingent on the surrounding visual and auditory distractions rather than on a list of questions which the researcher has planned. The researcher can comment on something in the context, the participant can ask a question, and in these reversals of the traditional Q-and-A interaction, responsibility for the conversation is shared and traditional power relations between researcher and participant are tilted about. This situated mode of interacting takes some time to establish given that it is rather unfamiliar interview practice. For example, while walking and talking, Magen provided me with a planning analysis of the city, including comments such as: “Essentially ok as we are going to get into the shopping precinct we’ll have found that (0.5) over the last five years or so there has been a flight of uh particularly white but generally capital out of the CBD into areas north and west of the city centre”. The planning analysis Magen articulated is part of a history that he and I were both familiar with, and he knows that I know this story. He was not telling it to me only but also to the microphone and the readers of my research. This narrative practice is a recognition that his story “depends upon communities that will create and hear those stories” (Plummer, 1995, p. 45 in Atkinson and Silverman, 1997, p. 316). He was also attempting to meet my expectations and to fulfill what he understood to be my research requirements. He was making use of the “standardized discursive domains” of the “interview society” drawing on “well-

established and widely understood conventions for biographical work” (Atkinson and Silverman, 1997, p. 314). This rehearsal of self (Atkinson and Silverman, 1997, p. 314) through the interview is a familiar activity to Magen as a subject of the ‘interview society’ in which he watches, reads and listens to interviews daily and is himself interviewed regularly as part of his work (by, among others, students, international academics and international city officials). I, in turn, am also well schooled in this model and asked Interview Questions and encouraged his didactic inputs. Fortunately my ability to cue participants to talk in a located way had improved by the time Magen and I did a second tour.

In a later tour of the yacht mole with Brian he and I became so absorbed in our context, and the talk about this context, that we eluded traditional interviewing positions and Brian positioned himself as questioner and me as answerer. An interaction between us illustrates this:

Brian (white) and me (white)

L: it was just beautiful (0.2) I love this part of the city [B: yes] I really really love it

B: Now why is that Lyndsay? [*standing near the corner where we could walk up towards Café Fish*]

L: I don’t know (.) it makes me feel profoundly happy being here (.) I can’t really explain (.) I can’t really explain (0.2) it’s the water [B: yes] um (0.5) I suppose (0.5) um [B: it’s the beauty] (0.5) its its just very very beautiful [B: ja] and (1.0) I mean I come here (.) if I go anywhere here from Bat down here to Wilsons Wharf [B: yes] I’m always happy being here in this space [B: yes ja] (0.2) I (.)

B: Does it feel safe? (1.5) its open

L: I suppose (.) ja (.) I suppose it does feel safe to me

Situated talk is also at times mundane, ordinary, and irrelevant – like the extended conversation Mandla and I had with a security guard about where to park when we arrived at the municipal depot we were going to tour. This kind of situated talk ‘fills in the spaces’, relaxes us, and informalises the research relationship in positive and productive ways. This is useful in the light of research which has suggested that conversations between black and white people are often negatively impacted on by people engaging in “self censoring” (Best, 2003, p. 909). Hopefully being more relaxed in the ‘interview’ meant there was less self-censorship.

In contrast to this situated talk I asked Mandla while we were driving back to his office the kind of abstract theoretical question that I might well have asked in a static Office Interview. I obtained an answer from him which seemed ‘rehearsed’ and familiar and which was racially much less revealing than the situated inter-actions we had whilst walking and talking. The same often happened with other participants: if I asked un-situated questions, the answers were often uninterestingly recognisable. I soon abandoned the idea of doing static Q-and-A sessions with participants after the mobile tours as it was apparent that these static semi-structured café interviews were not only disjunctural with the mobile conversations but also that they were not productive of the kind of data that interested me. In retrospect my initial reluctance to abandon semi-structured interviews was partly related to my novice-researcher’s belief in the (unfounded) power of triangulation as a ‘belts and braces’ approach to ensuring that I achieved some unobtainable “objective truth” (Miller and Fox, 2004, p. 36) about a (non-existent) singular reality. Rather, reality and subjectivity were being produced by the methodology I was using and it was “naively optimistic” to assume that “the aggregation of data from different sources [would] unproblematically add up to produce a more complete picture” (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1983, p. 199 in Silverman, 2005, p. 122).

Co-incidentally, the powerful situatedness of talk was referred to by one of the participants, Mbuso, when he told me about a ‘social experiment’ that he conducted when, as part of his job, he took a visiting (white) French donor (and his wife) to a European style café called Europa in Florida Road, which is part of a suburb previously zoned white. It was an experiment by Mbuso because the conventional donor/donor recipient practice entails taking foreign visitors to (black) cultural centres and under-resourced black townships so that they can witness ‘black experiences’ and ‘local culture’. Mbuso, however, wanted to see how the interaction with this donor would be different if he took him to a different kind of context because, as he said, “where you are at also stimulates and directs a conversation in a particular way”.

Pile (2002) makes the point that “[s]tories about the self are always situated; they have a particular time and place” (in Till, 2005, p. 14) and similarly Hall (1990) comments that “it is worth remembering that all discourse is ‘placed’” (p. 223 in Brown, 2005, p. 54). Hence one might conclude that moving through space should not make a significant difference to the stories that participants tell. However, I would argue that moving through familiar spaces does inevitably more *reliably* guarantee

the unearthing of memory-stories about those particular spaces. This would not necessarily happen in a static 'office based' interview where these situational prompts are absent¹². As Cresswell (2004) points out "[t]he very materiality of a place means that memory is not abandoned to the vagaries of mental processes and is instead inscribed in the landscape – as public memory" (p. 85). So situated talk was not simply contingent on what was happening immediately in the spaces we walked through but also on what we associated with those spaces, what individual or social/public memories were imprinted in those spaces for, by, and with us.

Line of inquiry

Our situatedness easily facilitated a '*line of inquiry*' between us as the participants, that is, a discussion which is unfixed and fluid, and which offers an opportunity for us to "*construct* versions of reality interactionally rather than merely purvey data" (Gubrium and Holstein, 2003, p. 32, emphasis in original).

Initially I (almost involuntarily) asked situated questions about the context and/or participants initiated discussion about what we encountered. After a while I expanded my conversational repertoire and instead of only asking questions, I began to *comment* on participant answers to my questions. Unintentionally this became a pattern. I would ask a question, he would answer, I would ask another question and when he answered I would comment on his answer. In this way the interview style of exchange became interspersed with more dialogical conversational work which was more inquiring and open-ended rather than fixed. It was difficult not to do this since the context was as interactionally demanding as a third party and because I was accustomed to interactive (two-way) conversations with many of the participants.

A useful flattening out of the power relations in this dialogical approach was inevitable because it generated a more equitable line of inquiry approach in which the tour dialogue was (hopefully) constructed as unfixed, fluid engagement about, for example, racial transformation of the city, where we explored ideas, without searching for a 'right' or 'final' 'answer'. This "dialogue as discovery" as Denzin calls it (2003, p. 153) is a technique which felt familiar as I knew the participants, thus it was closer to our usual relational positioning than those hierarchical positions which

¹² 'Static', office interviews do perhaps offer good opportunities for researchers to access the 'stock scripts' and hence provide talk and text which is useful for an analysis of everyday talk. This, however, was not what I was interested in.

would have been available to us in a formal interview. In this approach the talk and tour of the city was not (just) a Trojan horse, that is, an indirect means to get people talking about race in space. It focused on debates that the participants and I had been involved in and continue to be engaged in. In this way this dialoguing also generated a sense of us having an equitable 'exchange' of ideas, making meaning together through entering into open discussions about unresolved social and political dilemmas. This presumably benefited (at least some) participants who seemed to find the discussion personally and professionally rewarding and useful, as well as accessible and engaging, when conducted in a collaborative manner in which their views were engaged and respected. There was often a sense that being on the tour energised both the tour guide and me as we talked and learnt about the city and about race.

There was considerable personal disclosure from both of us as a by-product of this interactional style, serving to informalise the tour relationship further. (In the interests of participant anonymity, no personal information is included in this thesis).

The 'line of inquiry' approach prompted me, on occasion, to facilitate 'inter-tour' interaction when I recounted (anonymously) to participants some of the 'stories' from previous tours I had been on. This often spurred interesting exchanges such as when I told Sifiso about a conversation Nthando and I had about the racial practices at Joe Cool's bar, which prompted Sifiso to share his own anecdotes and analysis of race and place vis-à-vis Joe Cool's.

There were times, however, when I sabotaged the line of inquiry approach by choosing not to dialogue openly and I slipped into the safer, more familiar traditional interviewer role. Usually I did this by asking a litany of questions. At other times I did this by avoiding answering a question posed by the participant. On the tour with Menzi, for example, I reverted to traditional researcher power relations to avoid answering a difficult question from him about why white people are racist towards black people by saying lamely "I don't know. I try I try not to be racist in my life".

(Partially) Participant-led

When we started out on a mobile tour it was often difficult for the participants and me to become accustomed to the unconventional interview practice of the tours being participant-led. Magen's questions to me early on in his first tour – "So uh (.) what's

the rules of the game? There aren't none? Basically it's left to me to choose the route or (0.2) ja?" – indicated that he was familiar with the traditional researcher/participant power relations in interviewing and that mobile tours run counter to those. It is apparent here, as in other tours, that "interviewing has become a routine technical practice and a pervasive, taken-for-granted activity in our culture" (Mishler, 1986, p. 23). Even in his second tour, Magen again verified this 'freedom' when he asked: "do you want to just leave it to me? Shall we just play it by ear?" I requested that we visit the Madressa Arcade, and in so doing, I temporarily undermined the participant-led nature of the tour and reinforced Magen's uncertainty about taking the lead. He thus asked again: "So how shall we start do you want me to?" I answered his question, saying: "Tell me about this place and how it was". This time he ignored my response and took the lead by deciding not to talk about 'this place' but about his previous tour.

In the following extract from the tour with Andrew it is apparent that he was also unsure of how to proceed in this participant-led interview mode. He started his tour by asking, 'What shall we do?' When I told him, 'Anything you like', he repeated what I had said as though familiarising himself with the idea:

Andrew (white) and me (white)

A: Ok::k (.) what shall we do?

L: Anything you like.

A: Anything I like

L: Anything you like.

A few minutes after this exchange we were standing immobile on a street corner and I cued him about his position as the tour leader by deliberately asking him in which direction we should go. He then took the lead, as is evidenced below:

Andrew (white) and me (white)

L: Which direction shall we go? [*standing at the traffic lights next to the Virgin Active gym near the Workshop*]

A: We'd better go on with that man [*green man/person on one of the traffic lights near us*]

Later Andrew, accustomed to determining the direction that our tour would take by virtue of my cueing, told me at the corner of Smith and Broad Street: "Ok (.) that's the end of your trip up (.) let's go down." As I did more tours, I learnt to more deliberately

cue participants about the participant-led orientation of the tours, including through sending them explanatory pre-tour emails.

There were a few instances where I undermined the participant-led format, relying on traditional researcher/participant power relations to determine the course of the interview. An example of this is when I convinced Sifiso to do a tour of a certain part of town when he was initially quite reluctant to do so: in the early stages of our meeting we were chatting about how he likes to socialise in the cafes and bars of Florida Road on the periphery of the city and I asked him to take me on a tour of Florida Road. He was initially reluctant but then he agreed to do it. The tour of Florida Road and surrounds rendered relevant and interesting racialised conversations and subjectivities but I am retrospectively regretful about having missed out on conversations that may have taken place and other potentially rich data that may have been generated had we done a tour of the city centre. However, the overall authority that the participants had in determining the course of the tour was a significant feature of these mobile tours and it positively shifted the power relations between us, making it more feasible for us to produce spontaneous, situated dialogues (and presumably contributed towards generating more ethical research).

Relationality

My conversational participation and the consequent generation of *relational data* were unintentional in the first two tours (with Magen and Mandla). Before I had initiated the tours I had conceptualised them as *interviews* where the participants talked about *their* personal and professional experiences of the transformation of the City. I agreed with the criticism of positivist interviewing relationships wherein researchers positioned themselves as experts (artificially) attempting to be 'neutral', treating their research subjects (unfeasibly) as vessels of fixed, ready-made answers. I had been influenced by postmodern methodology textbooks and recognised that my interviews would be actively co-constructed "interactional accomplishments" (Mishler, 1986) between the researcher/interviewer and the participants. From this new thinking about interviews I gleaned that a more reflective 'co-constructive' approach was a reference to the need for the interviewer to be aware, when asking questions, of her influence on the interviewee responses, and to be hyper-reflexive about this influence when doing a post-interview analysis. I had not intended to take so *literally* the idea of actively co-constructing the interview by offering my own views and comments on what participants were saying, what was happening around us and

even recounting my own childhood and adult tales of the city. But this is what happened. This kind of participation is neither advocated nor censured by postmodern interview research, and it has a rather specific usage, for example, in these tours it had a positive impact as it relaxed us and, at times, generated rich spontaneous dialogue.

Gergen (1994) maintains that in social constructionist work the individual has been replaced by the relationship as the source of knowledge (p. x in Kvale, 1996, p. 45). Certainly in my research it is the practices (of talk and body) that were engendered *relationally* between researcher and participant that proved to be the most generative for my purposes. This interactive relationship was significantly produced through the decision to be mobile while on tour. This is largely because mobility facilitated some symmetry in this traditionally hierarchical relationship. So although the participant/researcher relationship in my research could definitely not be described as symmetrical (the idea, after all, was mine, the tours were part of my research, if questions were asked it was usually me doing the asking, and we had powerful gender and race relations to contend with), in certain ways, walking and talking facilitated a participant/researcher relationship which *tended to symmetry*, which was *not* just about researcher questions and participant answers but also about a 'more equitable' and dialogical line of inquiry between us. In this way, changing the relationship changed the nature of the data generated. For example the shift in power relations contributed towards (some) participants finding it relatively easy to challenge me despite the fact that disagreements are generally "a *dispreferred option* in micro-level interactions" (Edwards, 1997 in Fozdar, 2008, p. 536). For example when I commented to Andrew that while walking in town I noticed white people noticing me and I noticed that I noticed them back, it seemed easy enough for him to tell me that he thought that this was a racist practice that I engaged in.

Being interactively relationally engaged with the participants also created a predisposition in our interaction to what Reavey and Brown (2007), following Middleton and Edwards (1990) and Middleton and Brown (2005), call 'social remembering' wherein a recollection is "a social act, which accomplishes something in the present, irrespective of its literal accuracy in relation to the past (Shotter, 1990; Edwards et al., 1992) (p. 9)

Summary

These features of the mobile data collection process ensure that mobile inter-active interviews occupy an interesting point along a continuum between naturalistic data collection methods and those interviewing methods that are directed/produced by the interviewer. Working at this position on this continuum – where relational power circulates but does not settle in the relationship between researcher and participant – researchers doing mobile data generation can, to some extent, subvert the traditional authority or power relations between interviewer and interviewee. It is a strange blending and stretching of roles for researcher/participant and participant/leader, and it is not always clear who is in ‘authority’. It does, however, offer a useful place from which to explore the boundaries of these power relations in the research relationship. It also has an interesting impact on the kind of data generated.

Conclusion: how do mobile inter-active interviews support this particular research project?

The kind of subjectivities being constructed as we talk while moving through spaces are in line with constructionist notions of the subjects as fluid, multiple and contingent and produced intersubjectively in ‘conversation’ rather than with the dated notions of The Self as organised, fixed and predetermined. This discursive, social notion of the self “recognises that the “I’s” in being “me’s” must inevitably be intermingled with the “you’s” of many “other’s”” (Shotter, 1989a, p. 96 in Thrift, 1996, p. 40) and that the formation of subjectivity in the social stratum is constituted by interactive social practices. The mobile interviewing methodology offers an opportunity to ‘witness’ (to surface, make intensely visible) the fluidity and flexibility of subjectivity because as we move through the various spaces and different stories are invoked (of the past or present) this multiple subjectivity is being produced through these multiple reflections, stories and interactions.

The walking or driving and talking process of interactively constructing multiple subjectivities facilitates the foregrounding of the racialisation of our intersubjectivity, providing rich data about this process which is so easily muted and disguised. In the interaction between us we were coming to know our racialised stories differently, we were generating or reflecting new and other ways of thinking about them and creating different forms of local, specific, intersubjectively determined knowledge and reality (Brown and Durrheim, in press).

Transcribing

I transcribed the two initial tours in the same week as doing the tours, engaging in a nascent early analysis, doing what Miles and Huberman (1994) describe as “[cycling] back and forth between thinking about the existing data and generating strategies for collecting new, [often] better data [as] a healthy corrective for built-in blind spots ... [and to] make analysis an ongoing, lively enterprise that contributes to the energizing process of the fieldwork” (p. 50). In this process, transcribing the tours turned out to be more challenging – and more productive – than I had anticipated. It was highly generative analytically, a creative and ruminative engagement which was, in effect, interpretive and constructive (Lapadat and Lindsay, 1999; Silverman, 2005).

Jefferson’s transcribing system, often used by conversational analysts and discourse analysts, “evolved side by side with, and informed by the results of, interaction analysis ... [highlighting] features of the delivery of talk (overlap, delay, emphasis, volume and so on) that have been found to be live in interaction” (Hepburn and Potter, 2006). Given Jefferson’s focus on interaction these conventions provided a useful basis for the transcription which I then adapted to suit the mobile interactivity by including information in the transcriptions that went beyond ‘what had been said’ by the participants. This came about because while I was listening to and typing up the recordings of the tours I could place our conversations almost exactly geographically: when listening to the recordings of the tours even months after the tours I knew precisely where we had been in Durban when we had been talking. As I typed this spatial information into the transcription record it became apparent that the text was inseparable from the context (Langellier, 1989 in Rhodes, 2000) and that our talk was indeed “indexical (situated, invokes context)” (Edwards, 1991 in Lapadat and Lindsay, 1999. p. 73), not just intersubjectively but also spatially. I recorded this spatial information [*in italics in square brackets*] in the transcripts.

Contextual information is “infinitely delicate and infinitely expandable” and always involves selection (Cook, 1990 in Lapadat and Lindsay, 1999, p. 72). The spatial information I chose to include is no different. In my transcriptions I also included field notes that I had written before and after the tours, and while transcribing. I integrated these prospective and retrospective reflections into the transcriptions where I thought they might be related and relevant. This ‘information’ is also [*included in italics in square brackets*] in the transcription texts I have constructed. This expanded

transcription process contributed towards some lessening of the distancing, decontextualising effects associated with transcription (Mishler, 1986) “where the transcript detaches itself from the uncertain relationship between meaning and language” (Rhodes, 2000, p. 520). As Denzin (1995) points out, “by creating videotapes and transcripts as ‘cultural texts that represent experience’, we create worlds one step removed from the real interactions that we are trying to study. ... Each new retelling is different than the original event in that the meanings and contexts change” (p. 9 in Lapadat and Lindsay, 1999, p. 75-76). This was my experience on previous research projects when working with the same transcripts over time: they became more and more ‘distant’ and context-less over time. Including spatial and intersubjective contextual ‘information’ in the tour allowed the data to remain (relatively) contextual.

The transcription process was complex and the dilemmas I encountered while transcribing introduced me to some of the core debates in qualitative research. As Lapadat and Lindsay (1999) point out: “The primary difficulties surrounding transcription as a methodology have to do with the ‘big questions’ about the nature of reality and how to represent it, the relationships between talk and meaning, and the place of the researcher in this interpretive process” (p. 82). The process of conceptualising, initiating, conducting and transcribing the pilot tours assisted me substantively with the theoretical and methodological reformulation of my research design. It had become apparent through this work that situated, interactional talking while moving in and through space did generate novel race talk, *and* intriguing, illuminating racialised interactions between the participants and me.

The transcription codes I used are available in Appendix 3.

‘Data’ analysis

Discursive psychological analysis

The analysis is framed within the ontology and epistemology of critical discursive psychology (as theoretically detailed in Chapter 3). Analytically, this is an approach which entails zooming in on our tour *practices* (what we said and did), ‘reading’ the *resources* we drew on in what we said and did, and zooming out again to gain perspective and to consider the racialised *effects* of these practices (cf. Wolcott, 1990, p. 69 in Silverman, 2005, p. 88) on our subjectivity and sociality. This requires

an analytical engagement with the dual or “twin sense of construction” (Potter, 1996b) in discursive social psychology, that is, researching “the *practices* that are sustained by particular constructions of the world (accounts, descriptions)” and “how those descriptions are built, how they are fitted to their context of use, and the resources they draw on” (Potter, 1996b in Potter 1998, p. 235, emphasis in original).

Very practically this involved a comprehensive review of all the ‘data’ (interview transcripts, which included my own notes), directing initial (distant, sceptical) analytic attention to basic coding through seeking patterns and possible discourses. The more intensive analytical focus is then broadly driven by constant comparative work (‘why this talk here? why now?’) (cf. Wetherell, 1998) in trying to understand the organisation of the interaction, and by the ‘refutability principle’, that is, trying to ‘disconfirm’ those theories formulated too easily, too early or too simply. The guiding questions I used for my discursive analysis were informed by all the reading I had done. What follows is my quilting together of these questions which informed my analysis:

What social norms/regulations is the interactive talk oriented to? How does talk deviate from norms? Where and how are things going well or badly in the interaction? How is the discourse organised rhetorically? What rhetorical commonplaces are used to make particular evaluations coherent and accountable? Where are the ‘racial sticking points’? How is vested interest constructed and managed? How are parties positioning themselves? How are the various discourses interpellating or recruiting participants and researcher into various subject positions? Where is there variability (inconsistency) in the discourse and how is it functioning socio-politically? And how does all of this contribute towards the construction and maintenance of racialised subjectivities? How have patterns of racial identity formation been produced and how have and are they being used in South Africa? How could all of this be challenged? (cf. Potter and Wetherell, 1994; Potter, 1998; Wetherell, 1998; Parker, 2002; Taylor and Foster, 1999)

This kind of comprehensive data treatment is also an important part of ensuring the validity of my research.

In summary, in conducting the analytical discursive work, I was drawn to Wetherell’s (1998) eclectic approach where she draws on the different strands of discursive work, constructing what she calls the discipline of ‘critical discursive social psychology’, which she describes as

that discipline which focuses on the situated flow of discourse, which looks at the formation and negotiation of psychological states, identities and interaction and intersubjective events. It is concerned with members' methods and the logic of accountability while describing also the collective and social patterning of background normative conceptions (their forms of articulation and the social and psychological consequences). It is a discipline concerned with the practices which produce persons, notably discursive practices, but seeks to put these in a genealogical context. (p. 405)

Analysis of spatio-embodied practices

As detailed in the Introduction (Chapter 1) the spatio-embodied practices in the tour are available in a range of ways for analysis: through reference to these practices in our discourse, through my notes as a 'participant observer', and, more obliquely, through the various ways in which located subjectivities are registered in our interactions, for example, through the mnemonic features/devices available in different places (cf. Osborne, 2001). These are the focus of the empirical Chapter 7.

Chapter 5: The (white) discursive construction of place-identity

Naming 'whiteness' displaces it from the unmarked, unnamed status that is itself an effect of its dominance. (Frankenberg, 1993, p. 6)

Introduction

This chapter is a consideration of how the implaced discourses of the white participants facilitate and reproduce the racial construction of places. It is also an analysis of these discursive constructions as producers and reproducers of white subjectivity and privilege. This work coalesces closely with local and international theoretical work on the racial construction of place by whites (and the related implications for whiteness). The overlap with this literature assists in establishing validity in this project given that there are only three white voices analysed here (mine, Andrews and Brians).

The broad focus on whiteness in the academy arose largely from the concern of theoretical-activists that blackness was being perpetually 'problematized' and that whiteness was continuously 'unmarked' (Frankenberg, 1993), the outcome of which was the propagation and extension of white advantage and black disadvantage. In this vein, the black woman academic/activist, bell hooks (1984 [2000]; 1992) along with other black women academics and authors, charged those white feminists who had challenged gendered notions of 'biology as destiny' (de Beauvoir, 1953) with racism. hooks backed up her claims by referring to Friedan's legendary work, *The Feminist Mystique*, in which, hooks said, Friedan's focus on the "problems and dilemmas of leisure-class white housewives" (hooks, 1984/2000, p. 2) was solipsistic because she "primarily called attention to issues relevant primarily to women (mostly white) with class privilege" (hooks, 1984/2000, p. xii) and, in generalizing about these, made "the plight of white women like herself [Friedan] synonymous with a condition affecting all American women" (hooks, 1984/2000, p. 2). Frankenberg (1993) replied to hooks' charge of white feminist racism by writing the seminal book *white women, race matters: the social construction of whiteness* in which she details how white people are "'raced', just as men are gendered" (1993, p. 1) and in which she describes whiteness as: "a location of structural advantage, of racial privilege"; "a 'standpoint', a place from which white people look at [them]selves, and others, and at

society”; and as “a set of cultural practices that are usually unmarked and unnamed” (Frankenberg, 1993, p. 1). On the other hand, “[n]aming ‘whiteness’ displaces it from the unmarked, unnamed status that is itself an effect of its dominance” (Frankenberg, 1993, p. 6; see also Henriques, 1984; and Hall, 1996). Frankenberg’s work reflected an academic trend: since the 1990s a fairly extensive international body of writing on whiteness has emerged focused primarily on shifting the ubiquitous problematising gaze of the academy on ‘racialised people’ (which contributed towards the Otherness of the ‘Other’) to the ‘gazer’ so that whiteness/Europeans could no longer so easily pass ‘unmarked’ by culture, ‘culture-less’ or ‘culture-free’ (cf. Frankenberg, 1993).

In South Africa, Ballard’s (2002, 2003, 2004a, 2004b, 2004c, 2005a, 2005b) work on white identity is strongly influenced by Frankenberg’s writing. He focuses on the discursive ways in which white South Africans in post-apartheid South Africa attempt to distance themselves from apartheid, seeking to construct themselves as racially tolerant, and often denying the existence of discriminatory racial practices in South African society, while simultaneously being racist in their denialist talk. Ballard’s work demonstrates thoroughly how white “color evasiveness” (Frankenberg, 1993) can disguise the “continued belief in the inferiority of certain groups in society in much the same way that racism used to” (Ballard, 2003, p. 5), producing a reactionary, exclusionary effect through claims to antiracism (through being color evasive) (Frankenberg, 1993 in Ballard, 2003; Ballard, 2003). Ballard details the ‘thinness’ of the veil of white antiracism and the rather transparent ‘racial hierarchy’ in white talk in the new South Africa. For example, blacks ‘like us’ are considered acceptable to whites living in ex-white-zoned neighbourhoods, but with the first sign that these new neighbours are defying ‘white-norms’ (e.g. through slaughtering cattle in their gardens for ceremonial purposes), white racism surfaces immediately, often, but not always, in various discursive guises (2005a). Ballard reports that there are some whites drawing on what Frankenberg (1993) calls ‘race cognizant’ discourses, that is, discourses couched within “a socio-historical awareness of structural and institutional inequity and a valorization of ‘subordinated cultures’” (Frankenberg, 1993, p. 140). Steyn (2001) also documents a number of the discourses that white South Africans appear to be drawing on in their constructions of subjectivity in post-apartheid South Africa, including a colonial discourse in which whites continue to define themselves as ‘more powerful’ than blacks who therefore need their ‘assistance’ (p. 59); a race denialist discourse (p. 101); and an inclusive ‘transformative whiteness’ discourse (p. 115).

This work on whiteness in South Africa has been very profitably extended to a focus on the ways in which the racial construction of place by white discourse contributes to the reproduction of white power. In South Africa most notably Dixon and Durrheim's (2000, 2004) and Durrheim and Dixon's (2000, 2001, 2005a, 2005b) and Durrheim's (2005) place-identity research and writing explicitly links the construction of whiteness to the racialised discursive constructions of place. Durrheim and Dixon chose to work on the beaches of Durban and Scottburgh (on the south coast of KwaZulu-Natal) monitoring how white beachgoers resist and avoid the presence of black beachgoers on what were formerly white-zoned beaches. For example, Durrheim and Dixon (2001) analysed racist discourses about beach desegregation congealing in newspaper articles during the transitional political period in South Africa and proposed that particular discourses, for example, beaches as 'family places', facilitate racial exclusion because of the racial alignment of what ('legimate') practices these 'family places' are seen to include (e.g. parents watching children playing in paddling pools) and exclude (e.g. political demonstrations, showering semi-naked under beach showers). Perhaps the most influential contribution to place-identity research by Durrheim and Dixon was to critique the tendency towards the 'mentalism' and individualism in place-identity work and to propose the recognition of the collective and social nature of space and place as developed through the "relations between persons, identities and material settings" (Dixon and Durrheim, 2000, p. 29). In this analysis Dixon and Durrheim (2000) develop a "social understanding of place identity by showing how places may become significant and contested areas of collective being and belonging" (p. 30). This is relevant to our understandings of race, place and identity because it illustrates how discourses about/in places are able to invoke and reproduce collective notions of whiteness. They have also done formative work on 'located subjectivities' and the 'loss of place' experienced by white beachgoers who, in having to share beaches with black beachgoers, feel a sense of dislocation from both self and place (Dixon and Durrheim, 2000, 2004). Dixon and Durrheim (2000) invoke the discursive as a key mechanism for this (racial) socialising of place writing that, "place-identity is something that people create together through talk: a social construction that allows them to make sense of their connectivity to place and to guide their actions and projects accordingly" (p. 32). Most recently their work on place has included a focus on the impact of the material practices of place on the construction of racialised subjectivities (Durrheim and Dixon, 2005a, 2005b).

Popke and Ballard (2004) do similar work in their writing about urban space, race and identity construction when they document the various ways in which (some) whites in Durban are discursively hostile towards forms of urban desegregation and, relatedly, towards the urban poor for threatening “the achievement of modern first world cities (Ballard, 2004a, 2004b; Popke and Ballard, 2004)” (Ballard, 2004a, p. 79). Popke and Ballard focus on the “various ways in which the activity of street trade has disrupted long-established modernist norms governing the occupation and use of the urban space” (p. 99) and on how this becomes an ‘explanation’ for white relocation from the city centre to the new private spheres of urban shopping malls and gated villages (Popke and Ballard, 2004; Ballard, 2004a) where they can opt out of “the obligations of citizenship” (Barell, 2000 in Popke and Ballard, 2004, p. 108).

Drawing on the work of these theorists, in particular Dixon, Durrheim, Ballard and Popke, I set out in this chapter to articulate the racial construction of the Durban city centre by the white participants in my research (including me). The focus is firstly on their (our) talk about the city of their (our) childhood, and secondly, in talk about the current racially ‘transformed’ city spaces leading to an explication of how this discursive work on the racialisation of place contributes to the development and reinforcement of white subjectivity.

Topophilic stories of a ‘free’ white childhood city

Building place-belonginess through regularity and routine

The stories told by white participants (including me) about the city of our childhood were whimsical and nostalgic, constructing an open, inviting ‘playground’ space of a city where we played freely and without borders. This nostalgic construction work was done principally through the participants’ talk of *regularity and routine* in their interaction with the city, that is, in the way that visits to the city were described as a regular part of their childhood social life, with entrenched and familiar routines entailing repeated visits to favourite shops, movie houses and restaurants, and the City Hall. This regularised, routinised connection with the city was constructed in Brian’s talk about his favourite locales in the city while he was growing up:

Brian (white) and me (white)

B: if I look at my own upbringing and you know (.) we used to come into town (0.2) I don’t know (0.2) probably every weekend [L: uh] you know we used to go into

London House arcade there was a radio controlled car shop there (0.2) which my brother and I used to milk my folks (0.2) and (1.5) and we used to go to the (0.2) the (0.2) The Three Monkeys coffee bar and go and have coffee (0.5) and to (.) to (.) Edgars and (0.5) to [L: Greenacres] the ones up there [L: yes] (2.0) and we used to go to The Carvery in (0.2) in Broadwalk (0.5) and the Roma revolving restaurant was my Dads (0.2) favourite (.) favourite place

Brian's nostalgia here was almost tangible as he revisited and constructed his memories of past places in our talking walk through the city, inducing a "sense of nostalgia for the past and for past selves" (Till, 2005, p. 15) through these memories that were defined by his "mourning for that which can no longer be present" (Derrida, 1986 in Till, 2005, p. 14).

In Brian's narrative he established his routinised connection to the city in his youth through the deployment of the repetitious past continuous verb tense 'used to' in phrases such as 'we used to come into town', 'we used to go into London House arcade', 'we used to go to the...Three Monkeys coffee bar', 'we used to go to The Carvery'. The "particularization" (Mallinson and Brewster, 2005, p. 793) and "exemplification" (Fozdar, 2008, p. 531) contained in his listing of the specific names of the places that he and his family frequented – the radio controlled car shop, London House Arcade, The Three Monkeys coffee bar, Edgars, Greenacres, The Carvery, Broadwalk, the Roma revolving restaurant – had the same "semantic-rhetorical effect as an objective and credible reporter with quantitative 'evidence'" (Mallinson and Brewster, 2005, p. 793) and contributed towards the construction of Brian's claims to these 'historical' parts of the city through his routinised and regular connection with them. Such "displays of attending to the accuracy and detail of the account rhetorically function to give the story its status as 'factual'" (Augoustinos and Every, 2007, p. 128) extending their power and 'validity'.

This discursive work was evident too in the stories told by other white participants where we also made extensive use of the past continuous verb tense 'used (to)' to connote routine and regular engagements with particular city spaces. Some examples include the following: "This used to be a department store [where] I used to come and have tea with my grandmother" (Andrew); "The Playhouse Theatre used to be a movie house and I used to go there" (Andrew); "I used to come here [City Hall] when I was a kiddy ... for concerts and all sorts of things" (Andrew); "When I was a kid [I] used to just hang around here [City Hall]" (Andrew); "we used to come and

shop at ABC shoes on the corner” (Lyndsay); “this is what we did we came to town and shopped” (Lyndsay); and “I used to spend a lot of good times here in this park [Albert Park]” (Lyndsay). Regular and habitual visits are also implied in the use of the continuous tense in a comment I made to Andrew on his tour: “ok so it’s different [*the city now*] from when I was a child having tea with my Granny there at you know (0.2) Greenacres [*department store*]”. This kind of talk strongly echoes the “nostalgia for an idealized urban past” reflected in the white talk about urban change in the Durban city centre as recorded by Popke and Ballard (2004, p. 103). In these white stories about the city is it very apparent that “place-identity is founded on a ‘psychological investment’ with a setting that has developed over time, an *attachment* bond that is captured in the everyday phrases such as feeling ‘at home’ or having a ‘sense of place’ (Vaske and Korbin, 2001, p. 7)” (Durrheim and Dixon, 2005b, p. 183). Indeed, the regularity of these visits to town, oriented around habitual routine practices, does construct a *familiarity* and a ‘sense of place’ (Relph, 1976) for participants as ‘insiders’ (cf. Popke and Ballard, 2004) who belong(ed) in the city. In his writing on belonging and place-identity amongst elderly residents of an Appalachian community, Rowles (1983) articulates three forms of insideness: physical insideness, social insideness and autobiographic insideness:

Physical insideness designated their ‘body awareness’ of their environment, expressed as a kind of tacit knowledge of the physical details of place (e.g. knowing how to find one’s way). *Social insideness* designated their sense of connection to a local community, a recognition of their ‘integration within the social fabric’ (e.g. of knowing others and being known). Finally *autobiographic insideness* designated their idiosyncratic sense of rootedness. Often unspoken and taken for granted, autobiographical insideness seemed to arise out of individuals’ transactions with place over time. (p. 302 in Durrheim and Dixon, 2005b, p. 183)

The white participants presented a strong retrospective autobiographical insideness in their talk of their childhood city. This is a form of place-belongingness, compelled by a “strong desire for and emotional attachment to his or her early childhood home and its related physical settings” (Proshansky et al., 1983, p. 76), created through fantasy (Proshansky et al., 1983) perhaps in order to, temporarily at least, evoke a sense of place attachment and identification and so avert a sense of dislocation in the city now (Durrheim and Dixon, 2000; Durrheim and Dixon, 2005b).

Constructions of the city now

Obstructed by street traders

There is a stark contrast between the nostalgic constructions of the childhood city by white participants and our constructions of the city now. These constructions of the contemporary city were often pessimistic and depreciatory (in obvious and less obvious ways) and almost always construed the current city as an ‘unfamiliar’ space in which we experienced a profound sense of ‘outsiderness with no ‘place-referent’ personal continuity (Twigger-Ross and Uzzell, 1996). Instead we constructed a place associated with “a loss of sense of self” (Durrheim and Dixon, 2005b, p. 185). The following extract taken from Brian’s tour demonstrated this sense of ‘loss of place’, a loss which results from the disruptions and changes to the activities and practices of this once ‘precious’ cityspace. According to Brian these changes are primarily perpetuated by the inconsiderate and unruly informal traders occupying the city pavements with their trading stalls:

Brian (white) and me (white)

B: we won’t revitalize the city if we (.) don’t improve our urban management (0.5) because we’ve got competing interests within the city [L: mm mm] (0.2) in the sense that we’ve got a (0.2) an informal sector struggling to eke out a living (0.2) and you can’t blame the folk for taking any opportunity that you can (0.2) I mean if I was in that situation I would also take any opportunity you can (1.0) but how do you manage the interface between formal (.) business that relies on (0.2) the foot traffic and (0.2) the unpleasantness of (0.2) walking along the sidewalk (.) with all their [*informal traders*] wares out on the pavement so there’s a contradiction for me because I can see that they’re trynna eke out a living but it bloody irritates me [L: mm mm] and (1.5) because for me the space is no longer a (.) pleasant space in which to (0.2) co-operate (0.2) or just to kind of walk through (0.2) I mean I (.) just in the last say (0.2) year and its (0.2) I don’t know if it has so much to do with (.) with (.) with kind of informal traders on the sidewalks but its (.) the issue of crime (1.5) I mean I (0.2) I’ve never (.) felt (.) scared walking along the sidewalks but now I feel wary [L: ja] because (0.2) you know (.) I’ve (.) I’ve just heard too many (0.2) incidents of people being mugged and all that (.) sort of stuff and its like a really negative thing and I think it effects the whole country but particularly a cbd (1.0) because (1.0) if people don’t feel safe (1.5) if its no longer a pleasant walk into town (2.0) well (1.5) you just start changing your shopping patterns (0.2) you start changing your habits you know

your daily habits (.) I used to walk into town maybe go to Woolworths maybe go down to the coffee shop I mean I hardly do it anymore [L: mmm] um (0.5) and for me that's (.) that's sad (0.2) cos (0.5) if I look at what the role of the cbd (.) for me should be is it should really be a vibrant place (.) yes fine you can have your informal traders but they've got to be very well managed. They can have informal traders as long as they're very well managed

Brian presented the difficulties between the informal traders and formal business in the city as a conflict over pavement space because, according to him, the informal traders create congestion when plying their wares on the pavement, obstructing the free flow of pedestrian space and therefore creating difficulties for the formal traders who rely on passing 'foot traffic' for their economic success. This focus on the 'chaos' created by street traders who are constructed as 'out of place' in what is (or, for Brian, what should be) the orderly modern, urban world illustrates the way that for Brian "street traders have come to signify a *loss of agency*, and a sense of autonomy that was part and parcel of apartheid's urban imaginary" (Popke and Ballard, 2004, p. 105). Later on the tour Brian talked about the changes in his shopping habits as a consequence of feeling unsafe due to street traders (he now shops in the malls on the edges of the city) which illustrated again a sense of his loss of agency and autonomy because he no longer feels able to move about with the sense of freedom and implicit safety in the city centre.

From the outset of his rhetorical discussion about the traders Brian positioned himself as a part of the city management's team of professionals working on the contemporary 'problems' of the city, including the street traders. Here he was doing what Fozdar (2008) calls 'credentializing': referring to his status and knowledge to authenticate his views (p. 531), and also utilising the discursive device of claiming access to 'special knowledge' rather than "commonsense understandings of events" (Billig, 1991 in Fozdar, 2008, p. 540). He did this in a range of ways. He used 'we' repeatedly when talking about city concerns, for example: "we won't revitalize the city if we (.) don't improve our urban management (0.5) because we've got competing interests within the city [L: mm mm] (0.2) in the sense that we've got a (0.2) an informal sector". He 'assumed responsibility' for "manag[ing] the interface" between the 'competing interests' of the various sectors of the economy. This construction of a city management that weighs up 'competing interests' objectively is reinforced through Brian's use of technical economo-planning terms such as 'urban management' and 'foot traffic', and the theorised distinction between "formal

business” and “informal traders”. Brian constructed himself here as one of a team which “does not jump to conclusions based on shaky evidence” (Mallinson and Brewster, 2005, p. 795). The city management team (which includes Brian) is, through this discursive work, positioned as technical, professional and objective about the ‘social problems’ of the city. This positioning allows Brian to smuggle in a stronger defence for the case of formal business in the debate. One other way that he did this is through the presentation of the economic argument about ‘foot traffic’ from the perspective of formal business, when in fact the ‘foot traffic’ marketability principle applies to informal businesses too, perhaps even more so since they cannot rely on media advertising campaigns in the way that formal business (often part of large chain stores with big advertising budgets) can and do.

Brian’s construction of the city management team created an us/them situation which facilitated his ‘generalising’ about the informal traders as a homogenous group, extending “the characteristics or activities of a specific and specifiable group of people to a much more general and open-ended set”, a move which “parallels the kind of categorical generalization that is often symptomatic of stereotyping or cognitive prejudice (Van Dijk, 1987)” (Teo, 2000, p. 16) and which allowed Brian to see the informal traders as “less variable” and “less complex” than he is” (Teo, 2000, pp. 16 –17). Teo outlines the significant ideological effect of this kind of generalisation: “the less evaluative and more factual generalizations appear, the less questionable and more naturalized they become” (Teo, 2000, p. 17).

The professionalising of the conflict between traders and formal business also inoculated Brian (at least temporarily) from any accusations of personal bias or heartlessness or even possible charges of racism that could have arisen from any negative comments that he might make about the street traders. He invoked a ‘consensus warrant’ by drawing other professionals into this work on/with street traders. This is a discursive tool that contributed towards building the ‘truth value’ of this account grounding it in the external world rather than in the psychology or mind of the speaker (Edwards, 2003).

There are a number of other rhetorical strategies which were oriented to this potential trouble of being seen to be against change or of being racist, including his positioning as understanding and supportive of the plight of the informal traders when he says, “you can’t blame the folk for taking any opportunity that [they] can” to “eke out a living”. Here with this “apparent concession” (van Dijk, 1987 in Tileaga, 2005, p. 612)

Brian acknowledged an argument in which some people may blame the traders for their choice of economic activity, setting himself up in contrast as sensible and empathic enough to recognise the 'survivalism' inherent in this 'choice' by the traders. He further established his solidarity with the traders when he 'put himself in their shoes', saying, "if I was in that situation I would also take any opportunity [I could]". Here he "constructs himself as a fair and balanced person who takes the time to consider both sides of an argument" (Mallinson and Brewster, 2005, p. 79; see also Tileaga, 2005), who presents his views as "the outcome of difficult and sensitive deliberation" (Edwards, 2000 in Tileaga, 2005, p. 325). In addition, by "taking the side of the other" (Billig, 1987a in Billig, 1991, p. 145) he worked to dissolve the impression that he was simply airing "a negative attitude" (Kleiner, 1998, p. 209) which would perhaps have the effect of his views being dismissed as simply Afro-pessimistic. He continued to deflect and dilute possible 'charges' against him by producing himself as reasonable and rational, able to recognise the "contradiction" between his irritation at the presence of the informal traders and his acknowledgement that they are simply "trynna eke out a living" (a phrase repeated twice for a doubled effect). He added to this benign self-production when he framed himself as harmless, helpful, and non-disruptive through his talk about how he wants a clear pavement "in which to (0.2) co-operate ... or just to kind of walk through". In this way, he also made good, albeit loose, discursive use of what Wetherell, Striven and Potter (1987) refer to as "the principle/practice dichotomy in which a principle is cited but then is immediately undercut by the impracticalities that the upholding of this principle would entail" (Augoustinos and Every, 2007, p. 137).

This discursive work continues the unspoken contrast he set up between himself and the traders who disrupt pavement flow and also contributed to the 'loss of place' narrative which he articulated. This narrative continued when he talked about how the city is 'no longer a pleasant place to walk', referring rhetorically to a time when the city was a pleasant place to walk and a place where he 'belonged', reminiscent of the talk about the playground city of the white childhood. This discursive work made it relatively easy for Brian to engage in 'strong talk' about the traders with whom he is "bloody irritated" because they make the pavement space "no longer a pleasant place to walk" (repeated twice for emphasis and effect) and who therefore have "got to be very well managed" (a phrase also repeated twice for maximum impact and which interpellated the traders as potentially unruly and out of control). Brian constructed himself here as 'pushed out of the city' by the activities (and associated problems) of the informal traders, a construction that Dixon and Durrheim (2004) and

Durrheim and Dixon (2005b) encountered in their interviews with whites on the desegregated beach of Scottburgh. Having positioned himself as the reasonable, empathic professional, Brian then assumed the rhetorical space to make a damning connection between informal traders and crime when he said: “I don’t know if it has so much to do with (.) with (.) with kind of informal traders on the sidewalks but its (.) the issue of crime (1.5) I mean I (0.2) I’ve never (.) felt (.) scared walking along the sidewalks but now I feel wary [L: ja] because (0.2) you know (.) I’ve (.) I’ve just heard too many (0.2) incidents of people being mugged”. He presented his position in this argument as tenuous and uncertain (“I don’t know if it has so much to do with”) – establishing credibility for his arguments as considered and not rash or reckless – but then he went on anyway to discursively tighten this connection between crime and informal trading considerably. One way that he did this was to lend this connection ‘objective validity’ by constructing it within a time frame (“in the last say (0.2) year”). Next he used his personal experience to back up his argument: “I’ve never (.) felt (.) scared walking along the sidewalks but now I feel wary”. Barnes et al. (2001) describe the use of personal experience as a “particularly powerful rhetorical strategy because it draws on an empiricist register to make a truth claim (cf. Edwards and Potter, 1992)” and because “it is not open to external verification” (Barnes et al., 2001, p. 332). With the extra clout of this personal testimony, Brian shored up his tentative observation making the connection between informal traders and an increase in crime difficult to dispute.

Earlier on Brian’s criticism about the informal traders was the physical obstruction that they created to a pleasant walk through the city. Here he drew on this earlier construction to further the connection between informal traders and crime when he said: “if people don’t feel safe (1.5) if its no longer a pleasant walk into town”. The use of ‘if’ implies a possible or likely consensus from these others (cf. Edwards and Potter, 1992) who also “don’t feel safe” and who also find the walk into town unpleasant. This connection between the unpleasantness of the walk (because of the informal traders) and the feeling of being unsafe (because of the informal traders) is discursively tenuous but it served the rhetorical purpose of adding weight to his discursive connection between informal traders and crime.

In this extract and throughout his tour Brian drew on prominent narratives about the street traders of Durban: narratives of chaos, congestion and pollution (Popke and Ballard, 2004). Later on in his tour he questioned whether “unmanaged informal trade” is part of the city’s Africanisation programme and he described the informal

trader stands attached to the colonial post office building as “an absolute eyesore”. During this tour with Brian I participated in this pejorative construction of the traders by conceding that their vending stalls are a ‘visual interference’ when set up against beautiful old buildings like the post office building. I interpreted this visual interference as a ‘sacrifice’ we have to make in the interests of the vendors and the economy. This interpretation was evident when I said to Brian “that’s [*traders stands against the post office building*] what we have to adjust to (0.2) and you know (0.5) how are we going to transform our economy (0.2) I mean I don’t know how much the informal sector like that does impact (.) but I presume those five people’s lives are impacted on in some kind of significant way”. My discursive work was an argument for the traders to be tolerated in the name of individual financial benefits and the growth of the national economy but it did nothing to undermine the interpretation of traders as negatively impacting on the city’s aesthetics (which could be seen to impact on the economic standing of the city). Indeed my views represent an oblique participation in the depreciatory construction of informal traders and the correlated sense of ‘loss of place’ that Brian and I worked up where we are positioned as ‘outsiders’. The street traders signify for us “more than simply spatial chaos and restricted agency; they also signify the *dislocation of subjectivity* brought about by the dissolution of the boundaries that had separated self from other in Durban” (Popke and Ballard, 2004, p. 106, emphasis in original).

Dirty, dangerous and in disrepair

In the white talk of the tours the negative narratives of informal trading (and the related unarticulated but ever present ‘loss of place’ construction) were extended to talk about the city more broadly, including the following: “there’s litter all over the place” (Brian); “the pavings not even completed” (Brian); “this thing probably hasn’t been washed in how long [*mosaic on pavement*]” (Brian); “there’s holes on the pavement” (Brian); “[the Cell C sign is] [g]etting a bit tatty now” (Andrew); “[*the lower end of Smith Street*] basically just got more and more run down you know” (Lyndsay); “[Masonic Grove’s] a bit tatty” (Andrew).

These complaints are redolent of apartheid talk about places where black people were to be found. For example, in the 1950s when Africans were living in Cato Manor, too close to the areas where whites lived, Cato Manor was described in the local English press as “the uncontrolled, disease-ridden shanty town at Cato Manor (Daily News, August 24, 1951)” (Popke, 1997, p. 7) and “an incredible cesspool of

filth and crime (Daily News, April 7, 1956)” (Popke, 1997, p. 8). Popke observes that “the most striking and consistent theme of such accounts is the public concern for social and spatial order, and the fear of the ‘contamination’ of that order represented by the ‘filth’ and ‘disease’ of Cato Manor” (Popke, 1997, p. 7). And as Robinson pointedly comments, in apartheid times and writings “it was African (and Coloured and Indian) people who are consistently seen to inhabit ‘filthy and dangerous’ areas of town and their poverty, together with ideologies of racism and routine modern concern for order and normalization, combined to cement strategies for urban intervention in specifically racial terms” (Robinson, 1997, p. 378). This is thus a historical practice of associating efforts to clean up the city with “the spatial management or isolation of outsiders or undesirable groups – the poor, the working class, immigrant communities, ethnic and religious minorities who were removed from public space (Stallybrass and White, 1986; Sibley, 1995; Cresswell, 1996)” (Popke and Ballard, 2004, p. 106). This discourse of the ‘city as cesspool’ clearly circulated in some of the white tour talk.

There was similar discursive work done on crime. For Andrew the city is “scary for people who are not used to it” and “it’s a nice walk (.) nice bit scary these days [*walk to the Wheel Shopping Centre from the City Hall*]”. My field notes, typed up while transcribing the walking tour through Albert Park also illustrated this construction of a dangerous city when I described how, as I walked into Albert Park, “things feel quite differently hostile and decaying and I feel vaguely afraid and very hypervigilant” and “vaguely threatened” in what I described as “an unwelcoming and dangerous environment”. This construction of the unsafe city happened in a conversation between Andrew and me about what he called the “no-go zones of Warwick Avenue”, a conversation in which we talked about the set of elaborate personal safety manoeuvres we used as whites to protect ourselves in black spaces. This talk was reminiscent of Bourdieu’s habitus, that is “the tacit ‘knowledge’ that is apparent when people act in routine but accomplished ways” (Durrheim, Hook and Riggs, in press). The discursive work in the next extract is taken from Andrew’s tour:

Andrew (white) and me (white)

A: The no-go zones for me [*in the city centre*] are Warwick Avenue. I would want to strip to like naked before going there (.) I haven’t been there a lot so I’m not used to it (.) I’m not (.) I don’t feel streetwise in that area (.) here I feel fine.

L: Richard Warwick (.) what's his name (.) Richard Dobson introduced me to it [A: Ja] and I spent time working there [A: Ja] and I (.) it became very familiar to me then you know

A: You just get used to it I think.

L: Ja (.) Ja

A: but at the moment it's a bit (.) I would go there (.) I would take a tourist there but I would say no watch [L: ja](.) no bag (.) leave everything in the car [L: Ja] let's walk (.) we'd be fine.

L: Ja (.) park at Richard Dobson's spot [*a funny collusion amongst afraid whities*]

A: Ja (.) park there and walk and just be clearly not worth robbing

Andrews rather extreme response to managing the no-go zone of Warwick Avenue was to want to strip naked before going there in order to eliminate any chance of being mugged for his possessions. He continued this construction of Warwick Avenue as a danger zone with his talk about how you need to be 'streetwise' and 'used to' it in order to venture there. I concurred with this when I talked about how I was 'introduced' to the place by Richard Dobson, the senior local government official in charge of the area and how, after "I spent time working there", "it became very familiar to me". Here Andrew and I were discursively constructing Warwick Avenue, transport hub to millions of city commuters, as a dangerous, unknown and 'foreign' space which we could not visit unless we were accompanied by a 'local' mediator who could introduce us to the area and gradually teach us to read it and become familiar with its workings so that we could (hopefully) avoid becoming crime victims. According to the two of us, a visit to Warwick Avenue also required other elaborate safety strategies such as taking no valuables along; leaving all possessions in the car; parking in the fenced and secure area at the local government offices and, more vaguely, being "clearly not worth robbing".

In this very "white talk" (Sin, 2007, p. 487) there was a tone of vagueness in phrases such as "I'm not used to it" (Andrew) and "you get used to it" where the meaning of 'it' is not immediately obvious; and "here I feel fine" (Andrew) when it is not obvious in which ways he does not "feel fine" in Warwick Avenue. This vagueness is reinforced by our unfinished sentences: "I'm not" (Andrew); "and I (.)" (Lyndsay); "but at the moment it's a bit (.)" (Andrew); "I would go there (.)" (Andrew). Andrew and I used vagueness, incomplete sentences, hesitations and silences because we could rely on each other to 'read between the lines', that is, we drew on shared "cultural knowledge" (Edwards, 1997; Tilbury and Colic-Peisker, 2006, p. 666; Mallinson and

Brewster, 2005. p. 794) which did not have to be spoken because it was common or known to both of us as part of our shared whiteness. We could take for granted that there was unlikely to be any confusion because each of us could ‘fill in’ the words omitted by the other (Barnes et al., 2001, p. 333). Durrheim et al. (in press) explain this notion of the unarticulated shared cultural knowledge thus:

Our ability to coordinate our activity in this way depends on the existence of shared implicit knowledge which culturally competent members have access to. To interact successfully, we need to have shared cultural knowledge about the rules, norms and conventions of action, as well as mutual knowledge about what others in interaction know (Edwards, 1997). These two kinds of shared knowledge form the background to social life because our interactions depend on (are grounded in) them even though they are not consciously part of them.

In my interaction with Andrew this tacitly shared white “cultural knowledge” was about many different things: the dangers that black spaces ostensibly posed to our white bodies; the need to ensure specific survival strategies to circumvent these dangers; the need to be able to find ways to be part of these black spaces in some way in order to identify ourselves as ‘different kinds of whites’. This was a form of “self-censorship” and it did extensive rhetorical work so that we could ensure that we were not seen as racist (Barnes et al., 2001) in a conversational context where the nature of our talk could easily be construed as racist. What is apparent with this interactional work is that one of the most significant contributions of discursive work to the study of language and discrimination has been to “explicate the precise manner by which people articulate a complex set of positions that blend egalitarian views with discriminatory ones” (Augoustinos and Every, 2007, p. 138).

A ‘third world’ non-European space

“The effect of apartheid, in the words of H.F. Verwoerd, had been to create a piece of Europe on the tip of the African continent” (Magubane, 1996, p. xvii in Ballard, 2004c, p. 54). This effort to create European enclaves in Africa, “identity-affirming spaces for European settlers within which Europeans would feel *at home*” (Ballard, 2004c, p. 54), manifested in particular in the attempted construction of South African city centres as “centres of civilization and progress” (Ballard, 2004c, p. 53). This was to be achieved “by virtue of the presence of the supposedly civilized (‘white’) people that lived there, but also by the exclusion of ‘uncivilized’ people” (Ballard, 2004c, p. 53). The opening up of city centres to all people in the dying days of apartheid

undermined the European-ness of these spaces and therefore obviously also the identity-affirming nature of them for whites. This is apparent in Brian's talk when he made it clear that he no longer felt 'at home' in the now 'uncivilized' African city. This is also apparent in the discursive work he did when he regularly invoked discourses of the civilized European city and the uncivilized African city through, for example, establishing a connection between the negative aspects of Durban that he had been talking about (crime, congestion, dirt, informal trading on the pavements) with the local government imperative to 'Africanise' the city: "I'm picking up the negative things because they (.) those are the aspects of what I see as (0.2) having happened in the city (.) since it began its Africanisation". He did similar dichotomising (Fozdar, 2008, p. 533) discursive work in this next extract:

Brian (white) and me (white)

B: my aesthetic sensibilities and (0.5) and (4.0) my desire for (0.5) a (0.2) safe (0.2) clean (0.5) beautiful environment (0.2) in which to (0.2) recreate or walk or visit (0.5) that that sort of (.) clashes with (0.5) the practicalities (.) of a (0.5) of a third world (.) country basically [L: mm] which has first world aspects

Here Brian discursively constructed a seemingly unavoidable divergence between his aesthetic desire for a safe, clean and beautiful environment and the practical demands of a third world country (albeit with first world aspects). In the process he personalised his talk ("my aesthetic sensibilities and (0.5) and (4.0) my desire for (0.5) a (0.2) safe (0.2) clean (0.5) beautiful environment") which made it difficult to counter or contradict him (Augoustinos et al., 2005, p. 326) and he recruited positive words such as "aesthetic" and "beautiful", "safe" and "clean" to add rhetorical weight to his 'perspective' in this 'debate'. He continued this rhetorical work in the next extract where he constructed the first world (European) city that he was rhetorically setting this third world city of Durban against:

Brian (white) and me (white)

B: we're not a European city [*heading from West to Smith along the Field street stretch*] with (1.0) three hundred years of history (1.5) and (0.5) a tremendous sense of continuity (0.5) er societally where (2.0) you know you have the same values as your father as your father as you father [L: mm] and (.) you all served on the Council committee and you (.) all make decisions in the same vein (.) and (.) that's why Europe is the way it is (.) that's why those beautiful old buildings are in such good condition (0.5) er (.) that's why the cobbled streets (.) are just fantastic spaces in

which to be (0.5) because (.) they don't allow the (.) Bosnian erm erm the (.) er Serbs to come and and (.) squat (0.5) in their public square and to (.) to (.) sleep under the fountains

In this extract Brian's 'polarizing talk' (Augoustinos et al., 2005, p. 324) romanticised European cities to set up a stark contrast with the third world city of Durban that he (we) had constructed thus far on his tour. For example he described European cities as having a familial continuity of leadership and decision-making, a discourse loaded with notions of traditional values of honour, goodness, trustworthiness, reliability, perspective, common sense and community. This is rhetorically contrasted with a South African city because it is not possible to have the same kind of continuity here given the governance transition in 1994 from a minority (white) government to a majority (black) government. He furthered the contrast with talk about the built environment in Europe where there are "beautiful old buildings ... in such good condition" and "cobbled streets" making up "fantastic spaces in which to be", rather than decaying and polluted by the presence for example of informal trading stalls attached to the buildings and causing congestion in the streets. Also, according to Brian, European cities "don't allow the (.) Bosnian erm erm the (.) er Serbs to come and and (.) squat (0.5) in their public square and to (.) to (.) sleep under the fountains", which, by rhetorical implication, Durban does. Brian's earlier comments about the informal traders who are not tightly managed are in attendance here: a lax approach by city government to the traders in Durban implies a similarly lax approach to street dwellers living in public places. A few steps later Brian conceded his affinity for Europe, directly displaying his yearning for European spaces:

Brian (white) and me (white)

I don't know whether its my kind of (1.0) harking back to a (.) heritage that is kind of way back (.) in terms of whether one carries that with one (0.2) kind of almost at a cellular level (.) but there is a kind of an aspiration (0.2) to (0.5) to live a similar experience in some respects (0.2) to (0.5) I mean European experience [L: mm] I mean I just love going to places like Rome and (0.2) Venice and and (0.2) Paris and and I mean you know fantastically beautiful cities.

This discursive work contributed to the ongoing construction of the contrasting African city of chaos, congestion, crime and decay and the civilised European city of beauty, history, continuity and good city management, again invoking the white talk about 'loss of place' and to the place-identity construction of Brian as a European in

what has changed from a 'European city' to an 'African city'. This evidence of this kind of Othering work is echoed in research done by Dixon et al. (1994) on the discursive ways in which the traditional (white) residents of Hout Bay in Cape Town resisted the presence of squatters in the surrounding areas (partially) through the use of a discourse which incorporated *inter alia* an association between the Other and the "imagery of degradation, overpopulation and disease" (p. 289). This is a familiar discursive source in South Africa designed to "protect whites from a supposedly infectious black populace" and serving to enforce racial segregation (Dixon et al, p. 291).

Lacking quality goods and services

A more restrained and subtle criticism of the city was in attendance in the white participant construction of the city as lacking in services and products of a high or decent quality. This construction is evident in the following extract from Andrew's tour where he and I worked up a story of a city which no longer housed lunch restaurants and cafes that could provide 'reasonable quality' food:

Andrew (white) and me (white)

A: ...there's nowhere to eat in town anymore [*this is not the case of course but it depends on what it is you're looking to eat, what you've grown up accustomed to etc*]

L: Ja (.) that's why I was wondering when you said you eat in town

A: Ahh [*sigh*] don't know (.) we've been talking to (0.2) uh (.) what's his name up in Vause Road with the nursery...he was asking about the possibility of lunch time trade and I think there's a lot of fairly high income people who can afford reasonable quality stuff.

L: Why (.) I mean why (.) I suppose what happens is like where...[*mutual acquaintance*] is (.) they always used to go to (.) what's it (.) Franko's they were bought out [A: Ja (.) Franko's] now they don't make nice food all the time [*actually they make different food now an Indian bloke owns the place!*]

A: No (.) you don't go there anymore. I always used to bump...[*mutual acquaintance*] in Frankos but now where he's going I have no idea [L: Press Club] because we don't know where to go. Press Club's horrible. We [L: That's what he said] we go to we go to um Bangkok Wok [L: Oh (.) there at Maydon Wharf] It's not far. I've got my car in the garage so I just drive up there

Andrew said “there’s nowhere to eat in town anymore” and then clarified this sweeping generalisation by adding that the food in town is “horrible”. This construction of the available food in the city centre as inferior is echoed in my comment that Frankos “don’t make nice food all the time” now that they have been bought out, constructing a kind of white complicity. The ‘white talk’ was again replete with ‘conversational gaps’ such as generalisations (“there’s nowhere to eat in town anymore”), vagueness (“I think there’s a lot of fairly high income people who can afford reasonable quality stuff”), incomplete sentences (“that’s why I was wondering when you said you eat in town”, “Why (.) I mean why (.)”, “I suppose what happens is like where [mutual acquaintance] is (.)”) and hesitations and silences because we are using shared “cultural knowledge” about what it is that ‘white people like to eat’. There was even a direct reference by me to this shared knowledge about white eating habits (and the lack of available places to have these met in town) when I said rather vaguely and incompletely to Andrew “I was wondering when you said you eat in town”.

Later on the tour Andrew again drew on shared cultural knowledge about what constitutes good and bad quality purchases when he commented that “there’s nothing really I can buy” in town because “the fancy stuff” is only available in the suburban malls of Gateway and Pavilion. Andrew and Brian talked about being compelled to shop for quality goods in these malls in the new edge cities to the west and north of Durban. Brian drew on the same “cultural knowledge” about ‘what white people like’ when he comments that “the (.) products that are being sold in the shops [*in town*] (1.0) they don’t (.) they don’t (0.2) appeal to my tastes anymore” and “the informal traders and the newspaper sellers and things have kind of expanded into magazines and the things like that but they’re not the kind of magazines that I want”. Here he was rhetorically oriented to not appearing racist, an accusation which is very possible given that we were indirectly describing the services and products available in the ‘black city’ as inadequate. Bourdieu’s (1990) criticisms of how class distinctions are very subtly made through everyday habits like eating and walking are very pertinent here as we quietly create distinctions between ourselves (all white) and those (mostly black) who eat and shop in town (Shilling, 1993; Rooke, 2007; see also Mallinson and Brewster, 2005). This focus is extended in Chapter 7 where, as part of my efforts to understand more ‘pre-linguistic’ aspects of our participant interaction, I examine more fully this notion of habitus and the ways in which discourse articulates in a three way ‘trialectically’ (a ‘three way dialecticism’) with place and more material practices.

Our talk about the current lack of “decent” places to eat and shop “anymore” directly implied that it once was the case that we could find things we liked to buy and places we liked to eat in town, evoking again a nostalgic ‘loss of place’ and a disruption to our place-identity through no longer having this place (in which we feel comfortable or ‘at home’) with the qualities that have contributed towards the way we have defined ourselves (Rose, 1995, pp. 87-118 in Osborne, 2001, p. 4).

An ‘intriguing’ Otherness

In our constructions of the city Andrew and I also drew on the African urban milieu discourse, although in a more positive way. Our constructions, however, were also ‘patronising’, distanced and voyeuristic at times. For example, when we are walking into the Grey Street area, Andrew commented:

Andrew (white) and me (white)

Now this is the (.) the fun part the weird multicultural part [*as we walk past the shops in Pine/Commercial Roads*] ... We come up to the ANC offices here and its such a nice thing to do (1.5). This is the Durban is Africa thing. [L: Ja] This is like Nairobi (.) you know (.) or some place like that [L: Ja (.) ja] It’s its maybe it’s a bit seedy too but its like a lot more I don’t know it sort of feels like more characterful [L: Mmmm]. It’s not like walking into an Absa [*bank*] branch (.) it’s an airport lobby (1.0). It’s fun ... go in the back the’re a lot of people living above these shops [L: Oh ja?] and you get round the back and there’s families and all sorts of people and funny things like (0.4) sweatshops (.) sewing sewing sweatshops [L: Oh really] things like that (.) like twenty women in a room with sewing machines j-j-j-j-j [*noise of sewing machines*] (1.0) These are great [*pointing into shop with wigs etc*]. All wigs and stuff you can get here. Fun”.

Using the Othering of a kind of ‘Orientalism’ (Said, 1978) Andrew constructed a romantic African city and an intriguing ‘African persona’, someone who is Other relative to him. The Durban of these Others is both familiar and unfamiliar as was evident in the polarizing notions such as “weird” but “multicultural”, “seedy” but “characterful”, “families” and “all sorts of people and funny things like (0.4) sweatshops”. In this discursive work Andrew inverted the traditional positive association with European cities and negative associations with African cities when he described Durban as not formal and orderly like an “Absa [*bank*] branch” but as

diverse and chaotic like an “airport lobby” and as full of novel activities (like sewing sweatshops) and unusual shopping opportunities (like wig-buying). He continued this rhetorical move when he talked about his visits to Kenya, a country that reminds him of South Africa.

Andrew (white) and me (white)

L: and what is it about it [*Nairobi, Kenya*] that’s the same as this country?

A: There’s an energy or something (.) something funny going on which I (.) I can’t pin it down (.) I mean I’ve been to (.) I’ve spent a month in Oslo in Norway and its like terribly clean and clinical you know (.) its like going to the dentist (2.0) bit odd [L: M:::m] but I’m

L: Ja (.) I miss (.) one of things I really miss about working for the city is actually being physically in the city [A: Ja] and partly because it’s so different from Pavilion or Musgrave Centre or anywhere else

A: That’s a trip to the dentist

L: ja (.) ja.

Here Andrew and I set up a contrast between the African cities of Durban and Nairobi and the Scandinavian city of Oslo. Andrew described Oslo as clean and clinical, positioning Durban and Nairobi up as the opposite of this, opposites that would ordinarily connote ‘dirty’ and ‘unsanitised’. However in this context he has construed a visit to the clean and clinical city as being ‘like going to the dentist’, that is, as clean and clinical but *also* associated with pain and stress. The implication of this is that the contrast works in the favour of the African cities, that Africanness is being constructed positively relative to Europe/Scandinavia. In this talk we can see how when we talk of or about “racial others”, we were also always talking about ourselves (Best, 2003, p. 907), constructing our racialised subjectivities through this relative talk of Other/Not other (Frankenberg, 1993, p. 193). In this instance we used a discursive strategy of ‘inversion’ (Fozdar, 2008, p. 533) with this construction of “nonwhite cultures as lesser, deviant or pathological”, conceptualising “the culture of people of color as somehow better than the dominant culture, perhaps more natural or more spiritual”. While “[t]hese are positive evaluations of a sort ... they are equally dualistic” (Frankenberg, 1993, p. 199), and always ‘distancing’ and constructing of difference from the mainstay marker of the dominant white/European. In this positive construction, for example, Andrew invoked his earlier romantic, Orientalist images, and Durban and Nairobi are, by implication, constructed as intriguing and characterful in their seediness, and always distant and other from him. Ironically,

'Africa' was being lauded here for the charming informality and chaos which was the basis on which the African city has also been rejected in white talk on the tour. As is apparent here discourse does not have to be overtly racist to create conversations that have discriminatory, exclusionary and oppressive effects (Wetherell and Potter, 1992). Indeed, "discursive practices that remove overt signs of racism in favour of explanations that maintain, for example, roots in egalitarian discourse possess distinct advantages over classic biological and overt racist discourse" (Augoustinos and Every, 2007, p. 134) as their subtlety renders them invisible and therefore difficult to identify.

The discursive work that Andrew and I did in this interaction is also part of a generic construction of Africanness and Africa which Andrew continued when he said (later) in response to my question about how Durban has changed, "It's [Durban's] turned from Europe to Africa...its got African...I took you up the back of Commercial Road and Pine Street (.) indistinguishable from anywhere else in (0.2) Mozambique or [L: mmm] (1.0) Zimbabwe". This kind of generalisation, as discussed previously, contributed to the ideological homogenising of 'blackness' which in turn easily facilitated racial categorising.

A not-white space

The 'loss of (white) place' narrative is also evident when white participants talked about how whiteness is so unusual in the city now that it is possible to play 'spot-the-whitie', a 'game' wherein one visually searches a crowded place to count any whites in sight. Andrew played this game with me on tour when he said: "let's see how many we can see now (.) one (.) two is us (2.0) Ok (.) that's it". I mentioned to him that this is a game I play too: "[My partner] and I can drive through town on a Saturday morning and play that game (.) I mean what is that (.) you know like we notice whiteness". In another version of this 'game' where whiteness is identified, I commented to Magen on tour that

one of the things that happens to me as a white person when I'm in town is that if I come across a white person another white person (0.2) they (.) acknowledge me which doesn't happen to me in the Pavilion or Gateway or (.) you know anywhere else (.) they look at me and there's like a (0.2) thing like 'oh you're another white person'.

The game 'works' partly because ordinarily whiteness is *not* visible and not marked (Frankenberg, 1993): it has only become visible in the context of a space where it is almost entirely absent.

The construction of whiteness through discourses about the city then and now

Through this all white participants (including me) are able to often successfully, engage in what Reeves (1983) describes as the 'deracialisation of a discourse' "in which racial categories are attenuated, eliminated or substituted and racial explanations are omitted or de-emphasised" (Augoustinos and Every, 2007, p. 133). There are a number of discourses which contributed towards this deracialisation, notably, the discourse of the historical playground city (with its undertone of whiteness) and the discourse of the ugly and dangerous (black) African city), although the later discourse is simultaneously presented as romantic and 'Oriental' (Said, 1978). Both discourses contribute significantly towards an overall discourse of 'loss of (white) place'. I would like to briefly describe these discourses and then look at how the articulation between them works to construct and confirm whiteness.

The (white) historical playground city

The routinisation and regularity of the white childhood practices in the city of Durban evoked a form of 'family ownership' by these participants of these 'public' spaces. This reification of idyllic childhood spaces worked to construct what Gupta and Ferguson (1992) call a "naturalism between people and place" (Wallwork and Dixon, 2004, p. 32) as identified in Wallwork and Dixon's (2004) work on the ways in which "English countrymen" discursively construct a naturalism between themselves and the countryside (as part of their efforts to be allowed to continue the threatened practice of fox-hunting). In this project white participants in Durban constructed a naturalism between whiteness and this city space of their childhood. Through this work it is apparent how "belonging is also a group response, wed to the history of ethnic and racial relations and inflected to its core by political struggles over space and place" (Dixon and Durrheim, 2004, p. 459) and how, for us, the whites in this project, "an integral part of feeling 'at home' may derive from the comforting realization of others' *absence*, as well as from a *disidentification* with the places of others (Sibley, 1995; Cresswell, 1996)" (Dixon and Durrheim, 2004, p. 459). This naturalism also contributed to the (naively privileged) sense of freedom invoked by

white participants' talk about 'their' childhood city wherein they/we alluded to being able to 'play' without any spatial (or other) barriers.

Although apartheid partitioning determined the whiteness of the central city space (and the practices within it) segregation in the white memory-stories is largely unnoticed and unmarked, notably present by its absence, reflecting the construction of the city centre as 'invisibly' white and markedly *free* for white participants. We/they 'see' these childhood practices through a "veil of Whiteness" (Mazzei, 2004, p. 27). Frankenberg (1996) also writes about how whiteness was present in her childhood but not spoken about when she says that when she was growing up: "[w]hiteness seemed not be named, as far as memory tells me [which was] [o]dd really, since there was so much of it about" (p. 5 in Mazzei, 2004, p. 30). White participants remembered the city romantically and nostalgically as an idyllic, carefree, race-free, family playground which they used with such familiarity and regularity that a notion of ownership or propriety is implied. This sense of freedom and ownership of the city in white memory-stories is congruent with the way in which historically the spatial arrangements under apartheid were oriented around securing white access to key social spaces, and simultaneously creating as much geographic distance between white and black people as possible. In this way central aspects of white subjectivity were formed around this 'ownership' of the key public spaces of the white city (cf. Ballard, 2004a) and the attendant freedom it offered through this naïve privileged access to all spaces.

This familiarity with and freedom in the city, the reification of particular places, and the inclusion of the family within these notions, directs our attention away from the erasure of race/whiteness that happened in this talk, an erasure which perpetuates the construction of "raceless subjectivity" (Sin, 2007, p. 482). For these participants, as they told their stories about their (white) childhood in the city, it is not that whiteness is invisible, it is simply, for them, absent, unmarked (Frankenberg, 1993).

The ugly African city

On the tours the city was variably constructed by whites as dirty, congested, chaotic, criminal, third world – and intriguingly Other. All of these constructions were part of a broader overarching, largely negative, construction of the city as African. In addition the discussion about the lack of 'quality' goods available in town drew on colonial notions of the civilised, beautiful and well-managed European City, a notion which

was 'constructed against' the dirty, chaotic, uncivilized African City, that is, the African City provided the trope set up to bring this particular notion of the European city to life (cf. Said, 1978).

In a rhetorical move where whiteness and quality or taste 'discreetly' discursively overlap, white stories about the contemporary city are partly framed around 'taste' (or lack thereof), that is, they are framed around the lack of available products and services to suit what are constructed as (white) participants' 'more sophisticated tastes'. This construction of the city as a place where one can no longer acquire high quality, tasteful products and services is a reflection of what Bourdieu (2000, 2001 in Narvaez, 2006) calls 'symbolic violence', that is, the capacity to ensure that the arbitrariness of the social order is ignored, largely through social actors imposing their cultural productions and symbolic systems as 'natural' and thus ensuring the legitimacy of current social structures (cf. Narvaez, 2006). The construction of the 'city of no/low taste' is also more subtle and distant discursive work than the overt criticisms of a crime filled, congested and dirty city which is a much more obviously racialised image.

Conclusion: whiteness as loss of (white) place

The conversations about informal traders, the physical state of the streets and the dangers of Warwick Avenue all draw on familiar negative tropes about the "African urban milieu" (Popke and Ballard, 2004, p. 104) as poorly managed, crime-ridden, dirty and congested, reinforcing the sense of white participants' 'dislocation of identity' (Dixon and Durrheim, 2000, p. 36). In times of transition, such as in the 'new South Africa' where "the bond between person and place is threatened", 'loss of place' is seen to "provoke strong social and psychological responses precisely because it entails a loss of self" akin to 'dislocation' and 'displacement' (Durrheim and Dixon, 2004, p. 458). This kind of displacement results in the kind of 'disorientation' (Fullilove, 1986 in Durrheim and Dixon, 2005b, p. 185) that is expressed by Andrew and me in our talk about the Warwick Avenue transport hub, and the 'alienation' talk about how the city has been "violated, degraded or appropriated by others" (Durrheim and Dixon, 2005b, p. 185) and is no longer able to provide quality goods and services. Under such circumstances, the city as "a place that was formerly central to self" has now lost "its capacity to provide identity-related meaning and value" (Durrheim and Dixon, 2005b, p. 185).

This erosion of this sense of place belonging is what the white participants reflected throughout most of their/our talk about Durban, either evocatively through what once was or evaluatively through what now is. In this sense, then, for these white participants the desegregation of the city has undermined the capacity of the city of Durban to act as a comfort zone “where one can go about daily life in an identity affirming environment where there is little challenge to one’s self-perceptions (Ballard, 2002, p. 5)” (in Durrheim and Dixon, 2005b, p. 186). And significantly this loss of place is shared, performed collectively, establishing a collective subjectivity of whiteness. This is done partially through the way that race is implicated interactively in our implaced talk, through for example, drawing on shared ‘cultural knowledge’ and constructing a ‘loss of (white) place’. This is a version of ‘new racism’ where ‘somehow’ race is being implicated in the talk but it is difficult to put a finger on exactly how and where this is happening. In this way race slides eel-like through our discourse, elusively slipping free from our grasp each time we seem to have hold of it, and still constructing and informing our racialised subjectivities. Brian’s talk about the informal traders and their stands in the city is a good example of the slippery effect of race talk. Even though ‘race’, ‘black’ or ‘white’ (or related words) are not mentioned we can hear that he is not only participating in and reproducing racialised discourses (and subjectivity) whilst talking but also that he is actually (almost concretely) producing discriminatory racialised constructions, doing race work in disparate and elusive ways.

It seems to me that one way to slice into this problem of how it is that whites do this kind of ‘new racism’, how they talk about race without mentioning race, black or white, is to consider the *discourses about place as part of a mosaic*. In this analysis, white participants can be seen to be ‘doing race’ through their disjointed implaced discursive work, that is, through providing a series of separated mosaic pieces in their general talk about the transformed city which, when joined together, constitutes a more complete mosaic picture of ‘race work’; piece by piece this constructs their/our whiteness. Alexander (2004) hints at this notion in his description of whiteness as

not only mythopoetical in the sense that it constructs a totality of illusions formed around the ontological superiority of the European American subject, it is also metastructural in that it connects whiteness across specific differences; it soldiers fugitive, break-away, discourses and rehegemonizes them. (p. 656)

In this white talk about the city therefore it is not useful to consider the key discourses in isolation. It is more useful to consider the articulation between the implaced discourses that are circulating through the talk of the white participants as they move through significant ex-white spaces, through what was the 'race-free' playground city of their childhood and what is now, for them, the ugly contemporary African city. Participant talk about the playground city of their white childhood has to be seen in contrast to the discourse about the ugly African city, both of which are linked to the 'loss of place' for whites in the city. Perhaps by implication this also references the loss of some of the historical status of whiteness, including the pleasures of being racially 'unmarked', and the loss of the sense of 'naïve privilege' associated with this unmarked freedom of a childhood city which welcomed them and offered them unrestricted access. Notably, this interactive discursive work can only be done in a shared, collective, social way. Speakers leave trails of diffuse traces of race in their talk which, when linked together, constitute racialised discriminatory frameworks and subjectivities. In these tours with white participants – if we join the dots between these key discourses about the transformed city – it is possible to recognise one way in which whites, through their discursive racial construction of place, are still 'doing whiteness' more than a decade and a half after the non-racial elections of 1994.

This analysis of the white (discursive) construction of place provides a platform from which to move to a comparative black (discursive) construction of place and the attendant construction of blackness. This is what follows in the next chapter.

Chapter 6: The (black) discursive construction of place-identity

I know that in my case I first discovered my Africanness the day I learned that I was not only black but non-white...From that day onwards I began to regard this prefix *non* with absolute hostility. Everywhere I went in public spaces notices shouted at me 'non-whites only' and every time I read the message it vividly brought to mind the crude fact that in the eyes of the world my life represented something negative, something 'non'. In that small prefix before the word *white* saw the entire burden and consequence of European colonialism: its assault on the African personality; the very arrogance of this assumption. (Nkosi, 1983, pp. 44 – 45)¹³

Introduction

It is evident in Chapter 5 there has been much work done in South Africa (and elsewhere) on the implaced discursive construction of place *by whites* (and the associated formations of white subjectivity). This has been an appropriate focus for anti-racist work as researchers in this field have set out to investigate the impact of these white constructions of place-identity on the perpetuation of entrenched racial and socio-economic power relations. There is, however, limited writing on the implaced discursive construction of place *by blacks*, those who have been historically marginalised and excluded from place. This chapter is an attempt to work in this gap. In order to do this – to present an empirical analysis of the discursive construction of place by black participants on tour with me – I would like to contextualise this work with a focus on the international literature on black constructions of place and identity. A portion of this work focuses directly on discursive constructions of race in place while some of it is more *indirectly* oriented to discursive constructions and therefore functions as a rubric from which I can draw.

In Liverpool, England, Brown (2005) has done extensive studies of the interfacing politics of race, space and identity searching for what she calls the “ideological labors that place is made to perform” (p. 31). In the opening pages of her book documenting

¹³ Lewis Nkosi is a writer who was born in Durban in 1936 and who lived and worked in this city until 1956 when he moved to Johannesburg to work on *Drum* magazine whereafter he moved to England to take up a scholarship.

this research Brown quotes one of her research participants, a 60-year-old Liverpool-born black man, who tells her that “[t]o understand Black people, you’ve got to understand Liverpool” (p. 1). As her book unfolds it becomes evident that Brown too comes to this view although for her this is because his comment refers to Liverpool not as a physical space but as a “signifier” (p. 4), a geographical space onto which racial signifiers have been mapped so as to create the illusion of black Liverpool as a physical rather than social location. One of the ways in which Brown sets out to understand the significance of Liverpool’s racespace is through her investigation of the discursive category, “Liverpool Born Blacks”. This category is used by blacks to describe most of the blacks who live in Liverpool and it is particularly noteworthy because it “has no analog in Britain ... [o]ne is, for example, a Black Londoner, not a London-born Black” (p. 81). Rather unexpectedly, the term ‘Liverpool Born Black’ (LBB) applies to a person of ‘mixed racial heritage’, the most common ‘form’ of black Liverpoolian, that is, a person born to a *white* mother and black father (generally African, Afro-Caribbean or black-British). This ‘biracialism’ is an outcome of the diasporic history of the port city wherein black seamen from Africa and the Caribbean frequently ‘dropped anchor’ in Liverpool and settled down with English or Irish white women living there. This extensive ‘inter-racial mixing’ is unusual partly because there have been and are high levels of racism in Liverpool, akin to other areas of England. The children of this racial mixing were initially mostly self-referred to as ‘half-caste’ and then, after the black power politicking of the 1970s, they began to refer to themselves as ‘black’ (p. 33, p. 159). What is interesting in terms of ‘racespace’ theorising is Brown’s analysis of the various ways in which place impacts and transforms race. For example, in an interview with a young woman living with her white mother and her father of African parentage in Liverpool 8 (the unofficially black area), the young woman answered a question about her racial identity development in the following way:

I never really thought about it. I was brought up in a Black area, so I didn’t really think about the world out there because Liverpool 8 was just Black, really. You got a few people White and your mum White. But I never really looked at me mum as White. Well, that never really came into it. (Brown, 2005, p. 77)

Brown documents how the development of the term ‘Liverpool Born Blacks’ to describe the offspring of white women and black men is an indication of how the white women who, largely shunned in the white areas because of their choice to live with a black husband or partner in Liverpool 8, were accepted as black or race-less largely because they gave birth to the generation known as “Liverpool Born Blacks”

(Brown, 2005, p. 81). In the space of Liverpool 8 “White mothers can become Black or can be positioned outside of race (as “just me mum”) altogether” (Brown, 2005, p. 77). As Brown (2005) points out:

Notwithstanding the prominence of *birth* in that term, the descriptor *Liverpool-born* does not refer simply to place of birth ... The more “Liverpool” rises to the top of the racial agenda, triumphing in the multiply fraught politics of difference ... the more it gets naturalized. Place is an axis of power relations insofar as LBB’s were constructed by it and insofar as they, in turn, used place to specify what kind of Blacks they were. (p. 81)

And “[i]n a fascinating twist of plot, LBB’s wind up monopolizing the category *Black*” (Brown, 2005, p. 127, emphasis in original): they are ‘more black’ than other blacks who were not born in Liverpool. For Brown this is significant because it indicates the centrality of place in the determination of subjectivity:

[S]eemingly, about ten minutes after Black identity made its powerful appearance, “Liverpool-born” was placed right on top of it – as if it had been laying in wait for just the right racial signifier, truly worthy of it. Why not Black Liverpudlian? Or Black British? Or British-born Black? I remain convinced that *place* not race was the more pronounced, palpable “structure of feeling” among the folks who eventually became Black. In its appropriation of “birth”, the term *Liverpool-born Black* shows place dominating race. One is not “born” Black; one is *Liverpool-born*. That place is the more powerful category, I earlier claimed, is suggested by its total naturalization in people’s subjectivity. Everyone in Liverpool 8 can tell you how they became Black. But “Liverpool-born”? (Brown, 2005, p. 248, emphasis in original).

As Brown says, “Liverpudlians, Black *and* White, make race a spatial issue by debating what did or did not happen *here*, in Liverpool. Place is important in these debates because, ultimately, it *explains* (To understand Black people, you’ve got to understand Liverpool)” (Brown, 2005, p. 169)

In Feagin’s (1991) interviews in the USA with middle class black participants about their experiences of discrimination he found that implicated discursive interactions facilitated racial constructions of place and identity. In his research it became apparent that in interactions with strangers and acquaintances in public spaces – sites that participants regarded as presenting the greatest potential for racial discrimination (p. 102) – Feagin’s participants reported using a range of strategies to manage racial discrimination (p. 103). For example they reported employing the following strategies: “careful assessment to withdrawal, resigned acceptance, verbal

confrontation, or physical confrontation” (p. 103). Amongst these strategies, Feagin (1991) found that the most common strategy talked about was ‘withdrawal or a verbal reply’ (p. 104). Indeed often black interviewees reported that they were reluctant to conclude that a particular incident was racially discriminatory. Feagin interprets this as a consequence of their “hope that white behavior is not based on race, because an act not based on race is easier to endure” (p. 103). The participants in Feagin’s research reported that whatever strategy they ultimately settled on to deal with a potentially discriminatory incident, they always had to evaluate whether incidents were racist or not when they were in interracial engagements in public space. One of Feagin’s participants described this hypervigilant approach in the following way:

I think it causes you to have to look at things from two different perspectives. You have to decide whether things that are done or slights that are made are made because you are black or they are made because the person is just rude, or unconcerned and uncaring. So it’s a kind of situation where you’re always kind of looking to see with a second eye or a second antenna what’s going on. (p. 115)

Feagin documents how this sets up an extraordinarily demanding situation wherein blacks must evaluate a potentially racist situation and then, rather than rushing “too quickly to charges of racism” (p. 103) – a common charge against ‘oversensitive’ black people according to participants – they seek to find a way to frame a potentially discriminatory incident as not racist (or they will ignore it or act with resigned acceptance) (p. 103). The need for this evaluative work demonstrates that, in the context of the extensive racialisation of place, “no matter how affluent and influential, a black person cannot escape the stigma of being black, even while relaxing or shopping” (p. 107). In other words, the racialisation of place is a significant determinant of the black experience that “all is race” (cf. Goldberg, 1993) because, unlike whites, blacks cannot escape being black in their interactions in public spaces which are (literally or figuratively) dominantly white.

Day (2006) also does research into (talk about) racial experiences of space in the USA. She interviewed 82 male college students about their experiences of being feared in public spaces and found that 53% of Anglo/White/Caucasian men, 52% of Asian American men, 82% of Hispanic/Chicano/Latino men, and 100% of Black African American men reported being aware of being feared by others in public spaces (p. 574). These findings lead Day to conclude that these experiences of *“being feared (or not) in public spaces intersects with men’s construction of gender and race identities and the ways that men assign racial meanings to public places”*

(p. 570, emphasis in original). All the men favoured individual explanations for the fear of them in public space. These explanations included comments about their personal behaviour and facial expressions or their broader physical characteristics (body shape, size, dress, hair). For example, short men regarded themselves as less feared because of their size (p. 576). All the white men provided these individual explanations for the fear of them in public spaces. Asian men suggested that perhaps they were often not feared because they are stereotyped as feminised, smart and educated, and as “more similar to whites than to ‘minority’ groups” (p. 578). Latino men frequently ascribed others’ fear of them to stereotypes of Latinos as gangsters or as ‘macho’ men who assert domination over women (p. 580). The African American men interviewed drew on personal characteristics and behaviours to explain the fear of them but also attributed this fear of them to situations where there were few other black people. This is what Day calls the ‘limited exposure’ argument (p. 579). The black participants also sought to rationalise the fear of them by explaining that certain situations were “justifiably scary (dark, night, remote, etc)”. Day interprets this as a discursive strategy to reconstruct the fear of others as situationally determined rather than indicative of racial prejudice (p. 582). These black explanations seek to ‘blame’ the situation (with few blacks present or with various environmental challenges) and thereby avoid an easy or automatic analysis of racial discrimination by those who are afraid of them. Day interprets this as part of black research participants’ efforts to “negotiate their identities in ways that minimize perceived differences and stretch boundaries to include themselves” (p. 583). These efforts are reminiscent of the work by Feagin (1991) as discussed above. What Feagin (1991) and Day (2006) demonstrate is that black participants always ‘have their antennae out’ in inter-racial situations, forced through, for example, the obvious fear of others of them in order to evaluate whether a situation is racially discriminatory or not. However they are most often reluctant to reach the conclusion that the interaction is discriminatory because they are then forced to either choose to adopt a passive strategy or active strategy in response to this conclusion. The passive strategy options, such as withdrawing or ignoring the slight, are choices that have negative implications for individual and collective aspects of black subjectivities. Adopting more active strategies entails challenging the perceived discrimination and this then inevitably involves some form of conflict and/or the charge of being racially oversensitive. On the contrary white men, according to Day (2006), did not once mention race in their explanations of why they may be feared in public spaces. As Day remarks whiteness is ‘the norm’ for them and allows their “perspectives and behavior to remain unmarked” (Frankenberg, 1993; Mahoney, 1995)” (p. 577). For

black participants, their blackness, by contrast is obvious and always marked and was directly and indirectly part of black explanations for the stranger fear of them in public spaces. Their blackness was overwhelmingly omnipresent in their implaced experiences.

In her autoethnography about living and working as a Chinese woman in Vancouver, Canada, Lee (2008) writes about this omnipresence of 'race' in public spaces from a Chinese perspective. She describes how she regularly experiences racially discriminatory stranger-attacks in public, attacks that "sabotage her confidence" (p. 896) and make her perpetually race-conscious. Here she talks about one such incident:

"Go back to China," a woman yells from her car window as I cross the street. Her White Whispers soak in and echo. Drench my body like the agony of song. Sting as it raises mental welts. Through my mind like a dirge. A total stranger attacks my face. Dehumanization shreds dignity ... Due to my outer casing I represent a race almost as alien to me as that shrieking shrew. The dynamics of dysfunction. Victimization. Drawn and quartered by a phrase. Face down in a damp stretch of mud ... I enter Starbucks, and my eyes scan the customers. Chinese, Jewish, Indo-Canadian – a multicultural mix of coffee consumers. Citizens of colour are never unaware of ethnicity. (p. 896).

Lee describes how through this kind of verbal attack and through listening to her parents' stories of the white prejudice they have been subject to in Vancouver (p. 897) prejudice as "a leitmotif, snakes through my life" (p. 899). Despite the fact that she has social status as a university academic, despite the fact that her parents are second generation Chinese Canadians born and raised in Vancouver (p. 897), she cannot protect herself from the prejudice of strangers on the street (p. 896).

Working within the ambit of the research conducted by Brown, Feagin, Day and Lee, I would like to present an empirical analysis of how the black participants in my research discursively constructed place, how this was racialised, and hence how it impacted on the racialisation of their subjectivities. As with the chapter on the white discursive construction of the city (Chapter 5) I will first present participants' racial construction of their childhood city under apartheid and then their racial constructions of the current city space which is a space hypothetically racially transformed but which is, according to them, a space still dominated by various experiences of racial exclusion.

Discursive constructions of a segregated childhood in apartheid Durban

Exclusion from place

Where white participants' talk about the Durban of their childhood constructs the city as 'race-less', black participants talk about the Durban of their childhood constructs the city as overwhelmingly racialised in a way that is profoundly about the *exclusion* of blackness from white spaces. The experience of exclusion through racialised spatial segregation is evident in direct black talk about being 'barred' from central city spaces while they were growing up. The language they used to talk about this exclusion is restrictive and prohibitory, for example, "we'd have to walk to the other beach" (Mandla); "I (.) uh (.) never had ... an experience of uh:h the so called white CBD" (Magen); "were never engaged [with the white CBD]" (Magen), "we never ventured into (.) into West Street" (Magen), "you couldn't use streets like West Street" (Menzi); "the beach we were not allowed to go (.) to" (Mandla); "you couldn't use (.) the toilets in the white CBD" (Magen). These are other examples shown in the extracts that follow. In the first extract, Mbuso located his childhood activities of the city in the segregated space of the Indian area of town where Africans were tolerated (there was no African area of town):

Mbuso (black) and me (white)

M: Growing up er (0.2) growing up er I mean I grew up on the heyday of apartheid obviously and er::rm er:rm (2.0) and that constituted the city for me uh::h er::rm (2.0) I mean I knew that the city had (.) had (.) had (.) two (.) had two sections er:r er::::r the white section and the black section ok (0.5) when you're young growing up in the (.) going to movies meant going to Liberty at at (.) Victoria Street [L:m:m] or (.) or (0.2) was a another one

L: Isfahan

M: Isfahan Shah Jahan I mean all those places we used to go to er::rm (2.0) I mean when you started to get into West Street then it became white

With his comment that "the city had (.) had (.) had (.) two (.) had two sections er:r er::::r the white section and the black section" Mbuso articulated the very clear racialisation of the spatial divides in the city. This divided spatial form determined his childhood city practices, such as being able to (only) go to movies at Liberty and

Isfahan Shah Jahan in the Grey Street 'Indian' zone because "when you started to get into West Street then it became white". Mandla's childhood beach practices were also profoundly determined by this segregation of space, as is evident here in this next extract where he talked of how he used to go on a beach outing with the (white) family that his mother worked for as a domestic worker, but when they got to the 'front beach' (the white beach) "then we'd have to walk to the other beach [*the African beach*]" because he was not allowed on this front beach:

Mandla (black) and me (white)

M: Ok um (0.2) [*getting into lift*] I remember when I was young my mother was working at Essenwood as a domestic work and er we used to visit there (1.5) ok sure [*greeting someone*] and um (0.5) we used to visit there and um sometimes then have to go to the beach but when we go to the beach now with the children of that er of of Miss Miss Smith's family (.) we'd go to the front beach and then we'd have to walk to the other beach [*the African beach*]

Black participants do construct strong attachment to those areas of the city to which they were allocated but these stories are often paired with stories of exclusion. In the next extract Mandla talked about his attachment to the Grey Street area:

Mandla (black) and me (white)

M: Victoria Street was very popular to Africans (.) yes (.5) because it had a lot of cinemas (.) cinema Isfahan (.) JJ Jahan (.) it had got Dreamland where the was a lot of karate movies [L: Ok] and er:::r I can te:::ell you it was fun to come here er:::r I can remember a popular spot where we used to buy cheap er bunny chow for beans (.) it was corner Victoria and I forgot this is it Short Road or something and and Grey Grey ... There was places like Shiraz and all those all those all those places but it was er quite a (0.2) fun place to go if you're not going to play soccer on the weekend you then go and to the to the movies (.) you've got five rand and maybe three rand for transport aiayy you reach eight rand (.) maybe you need one rand for (0.5) drink and a bunny chow¹⁴

¹⁴ A bunny chow consists of a half or quarter loaf of bread hollowed out and filled with curry, with the hollowed out bread then pushed back into the loaf on top of the curry. It is usually wrapped up in newsprint or newspaper and it can easily be carried. It is eaten by hand: bread is torn off and dipped into the curry and eaten thus.

Mandla's talk of how "it was fun to come here" and again "it was er quite a (0.2) fun place to go" (Victoria Street in the Indian part of town) which "was very popular to Africans", a "popular spot where we used to buy cheap er bunny chow for beans" and watch "a lot of karate movies" is twinned with stories of racial exclusion from the city centre as a few minutes later he told me about how "we used to go and watch movies ... where Africans could go". This is evident in this next extract:

Mandla (black) and me (white)

M: Ja (.) and then as I was saying I would like to to show you the beach I'm talking about (.) the one we used to go to (.) I wanted to show you the beach we were not allowed to go to which you could walk to because most of the time where we used to go and watch movies (.) where we used to watch the movies er (0.5) which was mostly where Africans could go

Magen also did this association work between place attachment and racial exclusion from space when he described the discriminatory partitioning practices of the city, and then shifted towards a positive place attachment to the 'Indian' part of town when he talks affectionately about the invention of the 'Bunny Chow', a meal which was, he says, was created because of segregation (people did and do not need to sit down to eat a bunny chow, it could be eaten on the move or taken away to where black people were legitimately allowed to sit):

Magen (Indian) and me (white)

M: Well when I was like nine yea:ars eight years (0.2) uh (.) I don't think we were even allowed in the seventies to access (.) uh::h (.) shops I don't think so it was around uh (0.5) it's a good question because I'm just assuming we never had access to (.) because I know the history of the bunny chow for example is that you can't (.) uh (.) restaurants can't serve bunnies you've got to take it away (.) get out of the city centre (0.2)

L: Really? Really?

M: Ja so you just wrap it up and take it away you're not allowed to (0.2) uh ja

L: to sit?

M: Ja in the restaurant so that's the history that's a least one positive spin off hr hr hr

[L: hr hr] of apartheid

L: is the fabulous bunny chow

M: Ja so ja (0.5) particularly that because I would have had uh fond memories of the shopping (0.5) so ja certainly I think that we were just confined to Victoria and Grey and Prince Alfred and Prince Edward [streets]

Mbuso also did this dual construction of place when, after elaborating on the segregation of the city (which “had (.) two (.) had two sections er:r er::::r the white section and the black section) and the impact of this on the spatial racialisation of his childhood practices because they could only take place in the Indian area of town, he then asserted his attachment to this Indian area of town through his talk about the “cool shops ... like Ginger Bhagwandas” (in the Grey Street area). This talk about these city spaces and practices in the ‘black area’ of town is ‘tainted’ with their exclusion from the white city centre, associated with the knowledge that they could not have chosen to engage in their social city practices with any kind of spatial freedom because they were restricted to these ‘black’ areas.

A racial hierarchy of place

Another way in which black participants discursively constructed their retrospective experiences of the city through the lens of racial exclusion was is through their talk about the hierarchical racialised construction of space with the inaccessible white space as superior to black space. For example when Magen drew a comparison between the white and black shopping spaces he talked of never having “had the opportunity to shop” in the white area therefore having to buy all his clothes and see every movie in Grey Street, drawing on this discursive device wherein white spaces are defined as more desirable relative to the accessible black spaces. The hierarchical relationship between black and white spaces is also evident in Mandla’s memory-story of his childhood visits to the beach when he described, as recorded earlier, how sometimes he and his family would get a lift to the beachfront with his mother’s employers, the Smiths, and then they would have to walk from the white front beach used by the Smiths “to the other beach [*the African beach*]”. Segregation structures this memory in a particularly hierarchical way that favours whiteness. To elucidate: Mandla located the white beach as the “front beach” which is a reference to its geographic location at the front of the city, while he referred to the African beach as simply “the other beach”. Here he is constructing the African beach as (always) in relation to the white beach, and also as related in a way that is positive for the white (central) beach and negative for the African (remote) beach. Magen did similar hierarchical relative and comparative work when the talked about “the so-

called white CBD” and “our own CBD”, positioning the white CBD as the CBD when he was growing up. In the process white space is constructed as central and focal, and black space is constructed as peripheral to white space. Mbuso plainly articulated this racial spatial hierarchy too when he talked about the city of his childhood in this way:

Mbuso (black) and me (white)

M: I know that er:::r (1.5) from the point of view of (1.) from a standards of (1.0) from the standards of maintenance and and (.) and (.) and (.) and (.) and affluence I mean (0.5) er the (.) the (.) West Street is the richer part and the main part (.) and the rest is the periphery and and and and and the periphery (0.2) its (1.0) erm (2.0) the cost is at a time (0.2) within my reach and and and the er:::r er:::r even if I knew that possibly even if you can afford to (0.2) to (2.0) to come in in West Street (1.0) either to access goods and services of another sort you still (1.0) are not really wanted (0.5) you know I mean you are not (0.5) you are not as special

Mbuso elucidated the impact of this production of the hierarchically related white centre and peripheral black area on his construction of his racialised subjectivity: even if he could have afforded to shop in white West Street as a black child, the hierarchical relationship between the white centre and black periphery illustrated to him that because he was black he was not ‘as special’ as whites.

Discursive constructions of the ‘transformed’ contemporary city

In the stories told by black participants about the contemporary city space of Durban two discursive constructions of the city space are most striking: firstly, black participants continued to talk about being racially excluded from certain still-white city spaces even though formally/legally all spaces are ‘non-racial’; and secondly, black participants constructed certain city spaces as ‘dangerously other-African’ and therefore, spaces from which they are (self) excluded. What follows is an examination of these two spatial narratives beginning with the continuing black exclusion from private white spaces and then moving onto an analysis of the discursive constructions of those city spaces occupied by black foreigners.

The continuing segregation of privatised (white) spaces

The black participants I toured with are predominantly ‘middle class’ well-paid city workers most of whom live in ex-white-zoned suburbs and socialise in ex-white-zoned social spaces. However they talk about their entry into (certain) privately owned social spaces in these ex-white areas as a highly negotiated source of racial tension between them and those whites ‘owning’ or using these spaces or both. In the extract below this is evident when Nthando talks about the tensions created by the ‘rugby people’ (aka whites watching TV rugby) in Joe Cool’s Sports Bar and Restaurant, an ex-white social venue on the beachfront:

Nthando (black) and me (white)

L: How was it racially Friday night when you were here? *[at Joe Cool’s]*

N: Um::m no no no there was nothing that was er (0:2) that was like er a tension ja ja::a but except that there I mean once you saw these these guys so the rugby people you sometimes used to be a bit scared because you know that once they get drunk maybe their team is not winning then they just look at this side look at search for something that can cause trouble you see ja so

L: And what then they might pick on black guys?

N: Ja ja that’s what they can do they can ja so [L: mm] so those are one of the reasons that we we prefer to avoid these areas

Initially Nthando, when he told me that “Um::m no no no there was nothing that was er (0:2) that was like er a tension”, was – like the black participants in research by Feagin (1991) and Day (2006) – quick to dispel the prospects of this situation being racially discriminatory. Sifiso (initially) does this ‘denialism’ work too when I ask him whether Florida Road (an ex-white space) is “a racially tense place at all” and he replied with much hedging and discursive vagueness, “No no no not really (.) I think within (.) uh::h (0.2) ja”. It seems perhaps that this kind of weak ‘denialism’ is doing work to prevent Nthando and Sifiso from feeling like victims in these powerfully informally segregated ex-white spaces, allowing them to deny the possibility of racial discrimination reflecting perhaps the desire “not to see themselves as excluded, or their desire not to see the world as rife with discrimination and prejudice” (Day, 2006, p. 581). Perhaps too, like Day’s participants, they are reluctant to label the behaviour of whites as racially discriminatory because they want to avoid the negative stigma of being produced as “whiners who blamed racism for their troubles (Feagin, 1991)” (p.

572), and also perhaps in order to “spare [her/my] feelings for guilt for their experiences” (p. 572).

Nthando’s discursive work changed function in the extract as he presented himself as being scared of “these rugby people” who look for trouble if their team loses, which, he implied, may be racial trouble (given that this comment follows on from him explaining that he gets scared of them). Like Feagin (1991) and Day’s (2006) black participants he then talked of various strategies for dealing with this potential conflict, for example, avoiding those places that could involve him in ‘racial trouble’. In the next extract Sifiso did similar discursive work when he listed those strategies he employed to ensure his ‘racial safety’ in ex-white social spaces:

Sifiso (black) and me (white)

L: you don’t find it [*Florida Road, ex-white social space*] a racially tense place at all?

N: No no no not really (.) I think within (.) uh::h (0.2) ja (.) you wouldn’t go to a place that you haven’t heard about (.) I think that’s what is happening (.) that people have been there previously (.) [L: Uhh ok] you tend to pick up those places [L: uhh] ja

L: You mean bl (.) other black people have been there before?

N: ja ja then it feels like a safe place you wouldn’t (1.0) you know there are no (0.2) areas like (0.2) there’s one in (0.5) there’s one in (.) is it Tyger Tyger [L: ja ja] in (0.2) er (0.2) Gre [L: Greyville Race Course] Greyville Race Course ja (.) it’s a no area [L: uh] because we’ve heard bad stories about the place (.) you wouldn’t go to such places [L: uh] so its its its normally the places that we hear people talking about no I’ve been there it’s quite good (0.2) [L: uh] and then you go (0.5) its not like the places that you can walk (.) probably like the Suncoast casino and you see that no (.) this is a good place and then you you can come then you can start coming in

Sifiso’s strategies (above) sought to ensure a smooth transition into ‘white’ places and included avoiding a place he has not heard about, rather choosing to socialise in a place which “people talking about”, a place “that people have been [to]...previously” and about which people say “no I’ve been there it’s quite good”. Later during his tour Sifiso referred to the idea that the racially safe nature of social venues was discussed indirectly amongst black people as a way of co-constructing strategies for managing smooth integration into predominantly white social spaces: “when you talk about these places you never (.) say (0.5) you will never talk about ay come we are accepted here [L: uh] (0.2) we’ll say its happening come”. Nthando also described this strategy of being attuned to public dialogue about social venues when he

mentioned that he scans the press for information on ‘problematic’ social spaces and avoided those places associated with ‘trouble’: “I used to read that on the newspapers no it wasn’t this area that the bouncers were were (.) having tensions with other people if you read the papers stories like that then you get I mean you you you you get shy to go to places like this”. In the last part of this extract (above) Sifiso talked about “the places that you can walk (.) probably like the Suncoast casino and you see that no (.) this is a good place and then you you can come then you can start coming in”. He was describing here a strategy of physically checking out a venue for its racial safety before entering into the venue. On his tour Nthando elucidated what it is that Sifiso was likely to be looking out for in this scanning process: the presence of other black people in the venue because this constituted an indicator that black people are welcome or at least tolerated in that particular venue. So, for example, Nthando talked about how when he was at Joe Cool’s the previous Friday, “ther:::re [were] many other blacks that were inside there there enjoying themselves” and again later on he said of the same venue: “we were comfortable because I was explaining there were some (0.2) maybe two or three people that were sitting at front because we were sitting at the front there so we saw some black people see and then [L:hr hr hr] you can see that no we are not going to be thrown away”.

This idea of ensuring a smooth racial integration into place through arriving in large groups of black people (representing safety in numbers) was also present in Sifiso’s talk about visiting Joe Cool’s Bar with many friends: “whenever we’ll visit Joe Cool’s (0.5) we’ll be:::e an entourage of about fifteen or twenty (0.5) just to be on the safe side”. Another reported strategy for managing a successful negotiation into white space was to match or out-class white participants with demonstrations of wealth. Sifiso talked about this during our tour of the Florida Road area:

Sifiso (black) and me (white)

S: so it’s the same with these places [*restaurants on Florida Road, previously white places*] I think when they see (0.5) this black people coming into this places they think oh these are (.) different breed [L: hr] uh (0.5) these (0.5) uh we can accept (0.5) because they have fat pockets hr [L: hr] so (0.2) you know [L: I’ll just drive in] ja (0.5) so with the cars these people also drive I think ee ee (0.2) they start feeling differently (0.2) they’re treating us differently ja

L: because you drive the same cars as them

S: ja (0.2) or better cars sometimes

Another reported strategy for managing the whiteness of space is apparent in Sifiso's polarising talk about white spaces as patronised by *either* bad/racist *or* good/racially integrated whites: he constructed a contrasting picture between 'die-hard' white segregationists in sports bars like Joe Cool's and a younger, 'integrating' generation of whites socialising with blacks in trendy night time social venues. He described the segregationists as: "macho kind of guys ... who would drink draft beer and (0.2) so on (.) they tend to be rough in terms of how they talk they dress ... [in their] late thirties old early forties" not having "transformed at all". In contrast he talked about young whites who have "studied with a lot of other races [L: uh] (.) at school [and] ... started to accept them". The effect of this construction of the heterogeneity of whiteness was to construct (some) 'unsegregated spaces' where black socialites can participate without any potential racial trouble, can enter and participate perhaps without the burden of an overwhelming sense of their blackness. This strategy therefore, as with the others listed above, functioned to manage black participants' integration into these potentially discriminatory, exclusionary, racially hierarchical spaces. This extensive listing of strategies for managing access into the whiteness of space demonstrated just how much the black research participants are living within the shadow of race. They cannot elude their blackness. It is a primary determinant for them of their experiences as they move about in 'inter-racial' social spaces.

A black and Other-African city

Oddly and ironically this spatial exclusion for these participants extends beyond 'white spaces' to the largely 'black spaces' in the city centre.

Black participants constructed the city centre as black, a discursive task that they achieved largely through their talk about the absence of whiteness in the city. Some of the examples of this include the following:

front beach [*in the City Centre*] is no more popular for whites and er::r its basically (0.5) like a blacks beach (.) the whites have moved to the northern and the southern beaches um:m maybe the more quieter beaches for them because we come in crowds when we come in when we go to beaches...the whites just moved away because er::r they said er they don't see why they must bathe with us (.) they moved away from the beaches and they started going to these er er no::on-crowded beaches" (Mandla)

there are very few white people...so over the last say ten years there's been a massive (0.2) uh transformation of the of the city centre (Magen)

there are some people who...may be seeing you as an Eskimo in a desert because they they they've never seen a white person around here [*in Albert Park*] (Mbuso)

Point Road Gillespie Street that area there...its very rare you see an Indian guy walking there or er a (.) white person I think that area is regarded as the black area now you know they are dominating it (Menzi)

These constructions of the black city as not-white illustrate the ways in which blackness and whiteness, in a Fanonian way, are always co-implicated, co-present. I will move onto looking at the negative ways that black participants constructed these 'black spaces' but would like first to present a positive view of black space in order to recognise the variability in this construction of black space by these black participants.

A good example of the construction of a positive black space in the city is Nthando's description of the Meat Junction which is a restaurant on the corner of Point Road and West Street. The name of the place is derived from the practice where patrons choose raw meat from the display cabinet which is then cooked by the staff and either eaten in the café or eaten as a take away. A large part of the attraction of this space for Nthando is that it is black and not white. He made this apparent when he contrasted Joe Cool's with the Meat Junction:

Nthando (black) and me (white)

if you ask for Mandoza¹⁵ [*at Joe Cool's*] they will tell you wait we'll bring it tomorrow hr hr [L: hr hr hr] Ja (1.0) so::o that's one of the reasons we don't come to this area but there are some areas next to corner Point and West Street there is an area there that they sell the meat you know that we like red meat red meat they'll fry it for you then they'll give it to you and then they have got another space for if you want to drink and things like that

¹⁵ Mandoza is a famous (black) South African kwaito musician.

Nthando set up the contrast between the disconcerting lack of access to a Mandoza song in Joe Cool's and the familiar and comforting eating practice of the Meat Junction which he regarded as an extension of the township (or 'location') practice of eating. He explained the pleasure of the continuity of this familiar eating practice in this way: "if you are here [*at the Meat Junction*] its like you are in the location you see so::o it has got everything I mean the the meats that they pay that they cook the the the what you call this its pap you see we we we like to eat things like that you know in our location". He elaborated further on this connection to the (black) township again when he described the history of this eating practice in his neighbourhood:

Nthando (Black) and me (white)

N: next to my my my home at KwaMashu (0.2) so we used to have a er butcher and er a bottle show we used to call it an NBS a nearest bottle store [L: hr hr] hr hr so that's how we abbreviate it so you go there and buy your meat you er cook your meat there because they've got these these braaiing stand they've got it just for you free of charge so you just ask to and then they also sell this this stuff you buy and then you eat and so this area [*The Meat Junction*] was one of those areas

For Nthando this kind of eating space generally (and the Meat Junction more specifically) is a black space in the way that Joe Cool's is a white space and indeed he made this point to me explicitly when he said that the Meat Junction is "owned by one of the guys from KwaMashu so it's a black person so he has done his marketing research and he realise that's our particular need". The explicit racialisation of the space was overt too in his comment that "most of the people who are inside there also so its an opposite of that place we were in Joes Cool ja ... I mean its mostly I (.) there are blacks most of the time [L: ja] unlike the Joe Cool they are its mostly white." This space is positive for Nthando largely because of its connection to (black) township practices.

However during the tours black participant construction of the black city spaces was largely negative, constructed through a discursive linking of the blackness of the city to criminal activity. In the following extract we can see how Nthando made this connection between blackness (as absent whiteness) and criminality:

Nthando (black) and me (white)

N: During the week no I'll I'll just go to work and then maybe if I need something like going to The Workshop [*city mall*] then I can pump in and go there to workshop then I

buy that thing then I come back but I'm telling you you'll be seeing a lot of things you see a person running away with the cellphone of somebody else I mean its like else you get back to work and you you are now you are I mean you are not feeling ok by that time you have seen something bad you see and in most of the times if you can go there at the city centre going there at like lunch time you can hardly see a white person see because of that crime

Similarly in his tour Sifiso describes the need to be hypervigilant when driving through the transport hub in the Warwick Avenue area, where, he said, it is necessary to watch out for the "mainly young African guys" who are likely to smash a window and steal from a car, or steal through an open car window. However this lack of specificity about blackness (of local or foreignness) is unusual: most often the construction of black criminality in the city is, in fact, a construction of *black-foreign* criminality. While this construction of the dangerous African city by black participants is very similar to that work done by white participants, what is different is that white participants generally homogenised blackness whereas black participants overtly distinguished between blackness as local or foreign. This negative construction of the black immigrant spaces in the city is where I turn now to demonstrate the exclusionary experiences of black participants in this context.

Black participants constructed those spaces in the city centre associated with foreign/immigrant blacks (namely Albert Park and the Point Road) in powerfully negative terms. Here are three extracts which did this work:

Nthando (black) and me (white)

N: here in Point Road I think (0.5) what I can say about this area is that well I'm not used to it because of this uh uh crime I think they are trying to improve it I mean upgrade it the the this building the the Wheel but because of the of the black people coming from outside so they've just made it a place that is not safe because its very rough you see I mean over the weekend and during the night so it's a it's a bit rough so (0.5) the ... mostly the (0.2) the the the people from other countries of Africa Nigeria Rwanda they they come in and there's a lot of er::r smuggling happening here [L: is it] ja the drugs things taking place

Mandla (black) and me (white)

M: if you go to places like Point Road and all that (.) you see a lot of people that are loitering on the road er::r and ... its quite disturbing people may not be working but

the way they will stand in the road ... its disturbing because ... its it's a high activity of drug activity

Menzi (black) and me (white)

M: the place I hate most about Durban (0.5) ... its filthy all the time, the buildings are (0.5) old and (.) they don't look nice you know [L: mm] and even people staying here you got drug dealers and all these (.) street kids scattered all over [L: mm] ja (1.0) and there's a lot of a lot of whatyoucall gangsterism around here in this place ja (2.0) ... its here [*we are driving through Point Road*] and its also if you go up there by Albert Park.

The negative construction of these black spaces is discursively done through, firstly establishing the credibility of the speaker in a range of ways, and then through discrediting the spaces and the people in these spaces. The first rhetorical device employed to construct Nthando, Mandla and Menzi with credibility entailed their discursive self-construction as uncategorical and hesitant, and therefore as reasonable and considered (cf. Billig, 1988). Nthando's did this when he set himself up as not particularly familiar with this area ("I'm not used to it") and then he made extensive use of the disclaimers and the rhetorical devices of vagueness, hesitations, hedging, repetition, pausing: "I think", "what can I say about this area", "uh uh", "I mean", "It's a it's a" "the the" "they they" "er::r". Mandla and Menzi's talk was also peppered with these disclaimers and hesitations: "and all that", "a lot of people", "er::r", "it's it's" (Mandla) and "you know", "whatyoucall" "ja" (Menzi). This is also evident in their unfinished and disrupted sentences: "what I can say about this area is that well I'm not used to it" (Nthando) and "you see a lot of people that are loitering on the road er::r" (Mandla). Nthando's talk about efforts to improve and upgrade the area recruited support for his ideas from 'professional others' who have also recognised the need for formal interventions in Point Road when he said: "I think they are trying to improve it I mean upgrade it the the this building the the Wheel but because of the of the black people coming from outside so they've just made it a place that is not safe". With the professionals on his side Nthando's viewpoint acquired strength, framing his views as perhaps majoritarian and reflective of the views of others (Fozdar, 2008, p. 533).

The negative construction of this space of the immigrant Others is presented through Nthando's view that the Point Road area where the immigrants live is *that* bad that it needs extensive work. Through the simple use of the word 'but' in his comment "I

think they are trying to improve it I mean upgrade it the the this building the the Wheel but because of the of the black people coming from outside so they've just made it a place that is not safe", he was able to use this space to denigrate these other-Africans further with the suggestion that they undermined the efforts of professional to upgrade the area. When he named these outsiders as originally hailing from Nigeria and Rwanda this place-specificity lent authenticity and 'objectivity' to his argument: they are not just any amorphous outsiders but instead they have a specific regional identity. He then loosely linked these people from Nigeria and Rwanda to smuggling and drugs through the linking word 'and' when he says: "mostly the (0.2) the the the people from other countries of Africa Nigeria Rwanda they they come in and there's a lot of er::r smuggling happening here [L: is it] ja the drugs things taking place". This connection, albeit it loose rather than definitive, was enough to associate other-African foreigners in this area, especially those from Nigeria and Rwanda, with illegal criminal activity. Mandla also did this work with his comment that "its quite disturbing people may not be working but the way they will stand in the ro:oad ... its disturbing because...its it's a high activity of drug activity", slackly (but effectively) making this connection between the people in the streets of Point Road and drug activities. He shored up this concern with use of the emotional adjective '*disturbing*' (repeated for double impact) and this contributed further to the categorical generalisation about foreigners as criminals. The effect of this is that these categorical generalisations were attributed the status of Fact or Truth.

In a move which achieved a 'blaming of the victim' outcome, the discursive use of 'crime', 'smuggling', 'drug dealing', 'street kids' and 'gangsterism' as 'naming tactics' (Fozdar, 2008, p. 535) constructed these areas as associated with problematic 'social facts' (Tileaga, 2005, p. 618).

Menzi also did the categorical generalising of foreign blacks living in these spaces when he constructed an association between these foreign-blacks and the decay and disintegration of the area where they live when he said that: "it's filthy all the time, the buildings are (0.5) old and (.) they don't look nice you know". Later on his tour Mandla did the same discursive work when he conflated refugees and immigrants with unrelated city management problems such as the road behaviour of public taxis and a general increase in traffic in the city:

Mandla (black) and me (white)

M: the city of Durban have dramatically changed ... there is a lot of um (1.0) people that came in either as refugees or:::r illegal immigrants that have taken most of the space yes that have taken up most of the space the taxis are making it not nice to come to the city you don't even own the piece of road you come you you're driving in because they push you over at anytime they want to come in front of you (.) there's a lot of traffic

This discursive tactic of associating foreign blacks with traffic chaos thus expanded the scope of the denigration of the refugees and immigrants who live in Point Road and Albert Park. In addition, Mandla's description (above) of these immigrants as "illegal" furthers the discursive work of criminalising them.

In this negative production of foreign-black space Nthando, Menzi, Mandla and Mbuso discursively constructed a divergent Self and Other which facilitated the construction of a positive self and negative Other presentation thereby reducing the stigma of blackness associated with (local) blackness by projecting this stigma onto the other-blacks (through the very negative construction of them and the places they live), a stigma which is evident in the need for the development of strategies to facilitate access to 'white social spaces' (wherein blackness is tacitly bad or otherwise these strategies would not be required) and in the related omnipresence of blackness. In Kleinian psychoanalytic terms then black participants are able to displace their internalised sense of 'blackness as badness' onto/into foreign-born blacks who have less status than they do. This is what Malawian scholar Paul Zeleza describes as the "racialised devaluation of black lives" (2008, p.2) amongst black South Africans who were profoundly and multiply devalued by apartheid and whose everyday actions (like all South Africans) continue to be structured by racialised notions of superiority and inferiority (Pillay, 2008, p.15; cf. Zeleza, 2008, p.2). This devaluation of blackness is what Zeleza recognises as the enactment of a situation in which "shades of blackness have become a shameful basis for distinguishing African immigrants among black South Africans" (Zeleza in Pillay, 2008, p.15). It is this context of hierarchical racial difference that provides the conditions of possibility for the xenophobic aggression of black South Africans towards blacks from other parts of Africa. So while the xenophobic attacks on foreign blacks by South African blacks in May and June 2006 may have been motivated by the rage of hunger the choice of targets and the extreme level of violence that was perpetrated on other blacks was

largely a consequence of the negative ways in which race and racial categorising continue to dominate the South African political and socio-economic landscape.

Conclusion: The discursive construction of blackness through the continued segregation of cityspaces

A striking feature about black participants' constructions of the city in post-apartheid Durban is how racial segregation *continues* to structure and determine many of their spatial experiences of the city despite the repeal of spatially racist legislation more than a decade ago. When talking about 'privatised' social spaces such as bars and restaurants black participants' experience of these spaces was as exclusionary, requiring numerous strategies to negotiate their relatively untroubled entry. Black participants also positioned themselves as excluded from the city centre which they now regarded to be a space for black foreigners/immigrants.

There is much that is significant about this discursive construction of the city of exclusion, not least the way it impacts on the subjectivity of black participants rendering them – as with Feagin (1991) and Day's (2006) black participants – always hypervigilant about the possibilities for racial exclusion in space. Space thus exposes the omnipresence of black subjectivity for participants who could not historically, and cannot contemporaneously, experience a sense of spatial freedom in the purportedly 'non-racial' city. The associated construction of black subjectivity is always constructed in relation to the white privilege (Waymer, 2008, p. 977) of spatial freedom and (racial) control over those private spaces desirable to these black participants. So ironically where white participants now experience a 'loss of place' in the city centre, black participants still see whites as beneficiaries of spatial privilege through their (continued) 'ownership' of the desirable (social) spaces. Within the context of this research this negative construction of these foreign-black spaces further emphasises the sense of spatial exclusion which black participants experience in the city.

Chapter 7: The enactment of race through spatio-embodied practices (and discourse)

Look a Negro! It was an external stimulus that flicked over me as I passed by. I made a tight smile.

'Look, a Negro'. It was true. It amused me.

'Look, a Negro!' The circle was drawing a bit tighter. I made no secret of my amusement.

'Mama, see the Negro! I'm frightened! Frightened! Frightened!'

Now they were beginning to be afraid of me. I made up my mind to laugh myself to tears, but laughter became impossible

I could no longer laugh, because I already knew that there were legends, and above all *history*, which I had learned about from Jaspers¹⁶. Then, assailed at various points, the corporeal schema crumbled, its place taken by a racial epidermal schema. (Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks*, 1986, [1952], pp. 111-112)

Introduction

In Chapters 5 and 6 I sought to demonstrate the racialisation of place-identity through the various ways in which the participants, black and white, constructed the racial nature of city spaces through discourses in and about these spaces. This place-identity writing has taken us so far but it is only part of the story because, as became apparent in my research, race was not only being 'done' through our talk as we moved through the city but it was also being *performed* immediately and directly in the *material interactions* between the participants and me (and sometimes between us and outsiders that we engaged with during the tour). In other words race was also 'done' in our activities and interactions outside of our talk. The materiality of this interactive work, the focus of many great philosophers and theorists, is vexingly difficult to describe and offers all kinds of intellectual traps. However this does not mean we should not try to engage with it because clearly these material interactions

¹⁶ Karl Jaspers (1883-1969) was an influential German psychiatrist, psychologist and philosopher. He wrote revolutionary work on whether paranoia was an aspect of personality or the result of biological changes.

have significant power in the construction of race and racialised subjectivities, as I hope to demonstrate in the empirical work in this chapter. This is particularly the case when these material aspects of our interaction interface, or articulate, with our discursive and spatial practices in a trialectic of racial power, an idea which I will elaborate on as this chapter progresses. Firstly though it is useful to consider some theoretical positioning on the materiality of social interaction.

Materiality: what is outside talk and text?

Most discursive analysts interpret Derrida's (1976) maxim that "that there is nothing outside of the text" to mean *not* that there is no material reality, but rather that we have no access to material reality except through text/talk/words. This perspective is captured in Hall's (1988d) explanation that:

events, relations, structures do have conditions of existence and real effects, outside the sphere of the discursive; but that it is only within the discursive, and subject to its specific conditions, limits and modalities, do they have or can they be constructed within meaning. (p. 27 in Potter and Wetherell, 1992, p. 63)

However despite their stated commitment to the belief that there is more to life than talk most discursive analysts (and here I include discursive psychologists) effectively focus on "the way that 'attitude objects' are constructed", expressing an implicit "agnosticism about an ontology beyond or before language" that Durrheim and Dixon (2005a) refer to as "the anti-realism of discursive social psychology" (p. 448). This reverence for the discursive is captured in Hall's (1988d) comment that

while not wanting to expand the territorial claims of the discursive infinitely, how things are represented and the 'machineries' and regimes of representation in a culture do play a constitutive, and not merely a reflexive after-the-event, role. (p. 27 in Potter and Wetherell, 1992, p. 63).

The problem with this discursive fixation when working in the (anti)race project, as Goldberg (2005) and others have made clear, is that knowing how race is constructed by discourse often does not actually take us significantly closer to changing the difficult material conditions that race engenders in society. Goldberg (2005) critiques the social constructionist approach to race on the grounds that

the now imperative critical confession that race is a 'social construction' quite regularly ends with silence about what sort of social construction it is, how its constructedness might differ across time and place, what the material

implications are. The taken-for-grantedness of anti-essentialist jibes repeatedly leaves us guessing about how to read race, and reduces to silence critical analysis of racism, their range and restrictions. The easy resort to the language of 'racialization' is a primary case in point. The social world is racialized in various ways, we are told, though often not exactly how and in what ways. Does it mean, simply descriptively, that racial meanings, value, and significance are markers of some other social formation? Does it entail that social members are possibly, likely, inevitably going to act in their name, on their terms? And if so, to what conceivable or actual ends, to whose benefit and to whose disvalue? (pp. 218-219)

Frankenberg (1993) similarly highlights the (potential) impotence of a discourse-only analysis of race when she makes the point that "the contradiction that discursive repertoires on race address – that between an ontological human equality and the political context of racial inequality – can be exposed or obscured linguistically, but not resolved" (p. 190). Other writers like Shotter (2006), also working now beyond traditional discursive versions of social constructionism, talk about the move from discourse-only to materiality as shifting from "a world of dead, mechanically structured activities to a world of living, embodied beings, spontaneously responsive to each other" (p. 1). Here Shotter is 'recognising' that "there is some material reality knowable independently of our ability to construct it discursively" (Burkitt in Hepburn, 2003, p. 115) which is more alive than dead and therefore a good place to work. The linguistic/discursive turn then has served often to

cut us off from much that is most interesting about human practices, most especially their embodied and situated nature, by stressing certain aspects of the verbal-cum-visual as 'the only home of social knowledge' (Curt, 1994, p. 139) at the expense of the haptic, the acoustic, the kinaesthetic and the iconic (Claasen, 1993; Serres, 1986). (Thrift, 1996, p. 7)

Even though some forms of discourse analysis emphasise contextualisation "there is always a tension in discursive work that involves the risk of attending to language at the expense of a material analysis" (Capdevila and Callaghan, 2008, p. 2).

Although there are implicit suggestions in the critiques of Goldberg and others that a discourse-only approach might malignantly 'distract' or 'disrupt' efforts to effect racial change, it is more productive to acknowledge that work on the discursive construction of race has been useful but is insufficient or incomplete – especially in the face of the continually mutating and intransigent formation/s of race – and that we

need to also analytically consider practices outside language. Durrheim et al. (in press) explain why this should be an additional focus for a critical psychology of race:

This is because race and race groups are not only constructed in language, but also in other kinds of located and embodied interactions. Racial segregation, for example, is a material practice in which embodied and spatially located persons live, work and school in different places. Similarly, racial profiling involves recognising people as members of a race category and discriminating against them in various ways, such as police search and arrest. In fact, the system of racial inequality which critical psychology seeks to challenge is constituted from an array of such racial practices ranging from rude gestures, being followed around in stores while shopping, to being denied employment and accommodation, and even to being shot at or threatened with violence (Feagin, 1991). Although such acts are often accompanied by talk, they need not be.

When we accept that there is more to life than talk this ‘materiality’ can be exasperating to investigate leaving us with the sense that we can only access other aspects of embodied practices “through approximations, a constant search to move beyond (*meta*) what is known” (Soja, 1996, p. 57). According to Lefebvre (who was writing about the difficulties of studying social space) this is because we can only use language as a filter to understand (mainly) non-linguistic media, milieu and intermediaries such as social space (Lefebvre, 1991) (and I would add, other forms of embodied activity). Lefebvre expressed his concerns in the following way:

To date, work in this area [understanding social space/place] has produced either mere descriptions which can never achieve analytical, much less theoretical status, or else fragments and cross-sections of place. There are plenty of reasons for thinking that descriptions and cross-sections of this kind, though they may well supply inventories of what *exists in* space, or even generate a *discourse* on space, cannot ever give rise to a *knowledge* of space. And, without such a knowledge, we are bound to transfer onto the level of discourse, of language *per se* – i.e. the level of mental space – a large portion of the attributes and ‘properties’ of what is actually social space. (Lefebvre, 1991, pp. 7-8)

The question then is how do we work with the materiality of race other than through the references to the embodiment of race in our talk which can be rather limited and limiting? In making this decision about where and how to work beyond ‘talk’

Alexander and Knowles (2005) point out that since “race is created by, inscribed on, and performed through, *matter*” (p. 2, emphasis in original) the two most obvious ‘mechanisms’ to work with are the body and space. Alexander and Knowles justify this choice in the following way:

Bodies, for example, are the physical matter through which race is signalled (as in Du Bois’ blood and skin notions of race), the material base on which power is inscribed, and the substance through which individuals can lay claim to their own sense of embodied identity and resistance. Similarly, space is a physical environment that materially inscribes racialised meanings, exclusions and dangers; that is claimed and transformed through its use and reimagination. (2005, p. 2)

Indeed this choice to work with social space and the body/embodiment seems particularly relevant in the South African context if we consider that, in the wake of the colonial racialisation of space and the body, the architects of apartheid utilised space (through racial segregation) and the body (through racial categorisation) extensively as part of the pervasive structuring of race and racial subjectivities and relationships in South Africa. As Posel (2001) says:

The *modus operandi* of the classification system depended upon a ‘bioculturalist’ version of race, drawing upon readings of socio-cultural and bodily differences. Bodies became signifiers of status, power and worth in a hierarchy that privileged whiteness (as both a biological and social condition) at its apex. (p. 64)

According to Ratele and Schefer (2003), “[t]he body, then, in a manner of speaking, is the space on which the battle for South Africa, or South Africa’s soul, was waged” (p. 89).

Given that the focus in this thesis thus far has been on the impact of the spatial practices of place-identity on race, I would like now to consider the constructive power of the ‘bodily’ practices of race. To begin with perhaps it is helpful to consider what it is that we are able to do because we are embodied/bodily beings:

The broad answer is – to engage the world so as to fashion semblances and configure social worlds: in short, to symbolize. It is the capacity to do such things as mime, flirt, play at, invite moods or close off possible futures. (Radley, 1996, p. 569)

Embodiment in this framework is thus “about social worlds, not just those which are material and extant, but also those which are ephemeral and possible” (Radley, 1996, p. 560). A focus on embodiment then is a focus on the ways in which “specific

social worlds invest, shape, and deploy human bodies” (Wacquant, 1995, p. 65 in Wainwright, Williams and Turner, 2007, p. 308).

The ontological shift to analysing embodiment has recently become relatively commonplace within the geographical and sociological imaginations. This is particularly evident in the work of cultural geographers such as Nettleton and Watson (1998) who explain their interest as follows: “If one thing is certain, it is that we all have a body. Everything we do we do with our bodies – when we think, speak, eat, sleep, walk, relax, work and play – we ‘use’ our bodies. Every aspect of our lives is therefore embodied” (p. 1 in Hubbard et al., 2002, p. 97). Merleau-Ponty, a phenomenological philosopher writing in the 1940s, was one of the first to articulate a radical ontological theorising of the sociality of our bodies which is based broadly on the idea that

Our bodies are our only means of knowing the world; our experience is given to us through our bodies. We inhabit the material world, we live *in* it and are not observers of it. (Burr, 1999, p. 120 emphasis in original in Gillies et al., 2004, p. 101)

At the time that Merleau-Ponty was writing, scholarly challenges to the Cartesian mind-body dualism were taking hold all over the academy, arising in large part from an interest in our everyday *practices*, in what Heidegger referred to as “what people do, not what they say they do” (Dreyfuss and Hall, 1992, p. 2 in Thrift, 1996, p10). So

[r]ather than thinking of action as based on beliefs or desires, Heidegger describes what actually goes on in our everyday skilful coping with things and people and how we are socialised into a shared world. Thus, like Wittgenstein, Heidegger finds that the only ground for the intelligibility of thought and action we have or need is in the everyday practices themselves, not in some hidden process of thinking or of history. (Dreyfus and Hall, 1992, p. 2 in Thrift, 1996, p. 10)

This interest in practices became an interest in embodiment, for, as May (2005) states,

[s]ocial practices are the sedimentation of history at the level of the body. When I teach, when I write this article, when I run a race or teach one of my children how to ride a bicycle, my body is oriented in particular ways, conforming to or rejecting particular norms, responding to the constraints and restraints of those practices as they have evolved in interaction with other practices over time. (p. 524)

In fact this fashionable new turn to the body follows a line of thinkers “which stretches from the early Heidegger and the later Wittgenstein, through Merleau-Ponty, to, most recently, Bourdieu, de Certeau and Shotter, who have tried to conjure up the situated, pre-linguistic, embodied, states that give intelligibility (but not necessarily meaning) to human action – what Heidegger called the primordial or pre-ontological understanding of our common world, our ability to make sense of things, what Wittgenstein knew as the background, what Merleau-Ponty conceived of as the space of the lived body, or, later, ‘the flesh’, and what Bourdieu means by the habitus” (Thrift, 1996, p. 9).

Through phenomenological writing about the socio-historical ‘body-subject’ (Crossley, 1996, p. 101) and the related (often feminist) interest in our everyday ‘practices’ various European social scientists gradually embraced this corporeal subjectivity including most famously Foucault and Bourdieu. For Foucault (1989), who commented that “the essence of being radical is physical” (in Pasquino, 1996 p. 191) our bodies are indeed the basis of our subjectivity. Indeed it was the construction of the body-discourse in the “transformation of eighteenth-century medicine from charitable aid to a policing of health” in the modern hospital which provided the basis for Foucault’s theoretical work (Turner, 1996, p. 161), a genealogical project which aimed to “expose the body totally imprinted by history and the processes of history’s deconstruction of the body” (Foucault, 1984, p. 63 in Hall, 1996, p. 24). For Foucault then our bodies are ‘tattooed’ (cf. Grosz, 1994) with the practices of contemporary power-politics: “the phenomenon of a social body is an effect not of a consensus but of the materiality of power operating on the very bodies of individuals” (Foucault, 1980, p. 55 in Crossley, 1996, p. 106). In Foucault’s account of bio-power the body is a key site of the circulation of power in society. Power is inscribed through institutional discourses ‘onto’ our bodies (manifesting in our practices or techniques) and through the techniques of our bodies we reproduce and reinforce these circulating power relations, facilitating “the regulation of the body in the interests of public health, economy and political order” (Shilling, 1993, p. 81). For Foucault the body therefore “constitutes *the* link between daily practices on the one hand and the large scale organization of power on the other” (Dreyfus and Rabinow, 1982 in Shilling, 1993, p. 74, emphasis in original).

Bourdieu (1990, 1994 in Wainwright et al., 2007; see also Rooke, 2007), writing at a similar time to Foucault, eloquently articulated the power of our “physical capital (body shape, gait and posture)” to produce social distinctions “through, for example,

sports, food and etiquette” (p. 310). Merleau-Ponty and Foucault’s writings about embodied practices influenced Bourdieu’s notion of class-based embodied subjectivity as articulated in *The Logic of Practice* (1990) and *Distinction: a social critique of the judgement of taste* (1994). In a theoretical move which articulates a mutuality between embodied materiality and the social, Bourdieu “captures the ways in which culture is habitually inscribed on the body and the ways in which individuals develop a practical mastery of their situation, which is grounded in the social” (Rooke, 2007, p. 232). This is at least partly through what Bourdieu termed *habitus*, a powerful but elusive term which refers to our bodily dispositions as a kind of social ‘muscle memory’, as encoded cultural understandings (Taylor, 1999, p. 42). These habits are largely unintentional and acquired through childhood ‘socialisation’ generating practices which are ‘regular’ without being deliberately co-ordinated or governed by any explicit rule and which reflect the social conditions within which they were acquired (Thompson, 1991 in Painter, 2000, see also Rooke, 2007). Bourdieu argues with this concept of ‘habitus’ that “every aspect of our embodiment – from the way we hold our cutlery to the way we walk – articulates and reproduces our social location through our habitus” (Valentine, 2001, p. 25) and in this way the social order is inscribed in our bodies (Denzin, 2007, p. 429). Within this framework our subjectivity is constructed as “embedded in cultural and social currents, constructed through social histories, and internalized by the individual as habitus” (Norris, 2007, p. 657).

Durrheim et al. (in press) extend this notion of ‘habitus’ with their idea of the ‘distributed mind’ which is a concept that works at the interface of the ideas of habitus and Edwards’ (1997) idea of ‘cultural knowledge’. Durrheim et al.’s (in press) reference to the distributed mind encapsulates the ways that we routinely and ‘intuitively’ interact and act with others on the basis of a implicit, shared, mutual knowledge. We can take this ‘knowledge’ for granted when interacting with ‘the familiar other’, someone who shares the same unintentionally acquired social habits and ways of behaving through, for example, being of the same class, race or gender. These cultural habits are what de Certeau (1984) calls the “mute processes that organize the establishment of the socio-economic order” (p. xiv), the practices that form an active background to social life, informing and directing the explicit or public things we say and do in the social ‘foreground’ (which can also then, dialectically, ‘adjust’ our habitual dispositions) and which determine that “we never write on a blank page but always on one that has already been written on” (de Certeau, 1984, p. 43). The concept of the ‘distributed mind’ embraces this “relationship between

foreground and background, explicit and implicit knowledge, performance and habitus” (Durrheim et al., in press). It is thus “a set of rules and relationships that are commonly held by members of a particular culture” with “both an explicit and an implicit dimension” (Durrheim et al., in press) and which facilitates the endurance of social facts like racism “because its roots are out of view in the implicit background of social life” (Durrheim et al., in press).

The articulation between space, embodiment – and discourse

Barad (2003) made the point a few years ago that in the academy, “Language matters. Discourse matters”, and “the only thing that has not seemed to matter is matter” (p. 801 in Hanson, 2007, p. 71). Well, as we now know, matter does matter. However, matter does not matter on its own. This is the key point I would like to make in this thesis: that we need to consider *how the various mechanisms involved in the production of race work together*. To elaborate: the case for the constructive power of discourse has been persuasively made by discourse analysts who have shown that talk is action and that talk provides an analysis of the constructive work of language in social life generally and in the reproduction of various social formations, such as race. But an understanding of race as a discursive construction is simply insufficient because “[i]t regularly ends with silence about what sort of social construction it is, how its constructedness might differ across time and place, what its material implications are” (Goldberg, 2005, p. 218). I believe that the embodiment of race is working in a *trialectic* (to appropriate a beautiful word from Lefebvre) with discourse and social space. By trialectic I wish to incorporate the interactive mutualism of the Marxist notion of dialecticism and extend this further to include a notion of ‘co-constitutionality’. I am suggesting that embodiment, discourse and space/place exist in a tri-constitutive relationship, that they are not one but they are not separate, they are “locked in mutually reinforcing relations, each acting as the condition of possibility and constraint for the other” (Durrheim and Dixon, 2005a, p. 456, talking about the relationship between talk and spatio-temporal activities). Where one goes, there go the other two. What we can say and do (with our bodily and linguistic practices) is spatially contingent, and spatial relations are determined by what is said and done in those spaces back then and right now.

I wish now to demonstrate how this trialectical engagement between embodiment, discourse and place contributed towards the enactment of race and racialised

subjectivities during the tours I did with participants for this project. I will demonstrate this through an analysis of four trialectical movements during the tours: the *racial familiarity of spaces*; the *routines of racial interaction and recognition* (by which I mean, who talks to whom (racially)); through an *embodied fear of blackness and black space*; and through an *embodied celebration of whiteness/white space*.

The discursive and spatio-embodied practices of racially familiar spaces

At the most visible level the discursive and spatio-embodied construction of race on tour is reflected in the *racialisation of place familiarity/unfamiliarity*, that is, in the fit between the place and each of us in places which are historically racially aligned with black or white practices. For example, when Mandla asked me to stop off at the ex-African beach where he spent much of his childhood, I had to ask him for directions on where to stop because, having never been there before, I did not know which beach was the ex-African beach, even though it is a very central beach adjacent to other (white) beaches that I have visited throughout my life. When on Mbuso's tour through Albert Park I pointed to a building and commented that it is new, Mbuso corrected me, telling me "no its been here for a long time". In this move he establishes this once-white now-black space as a space he is familiar with and I am not. As we drove past this building towards the Tropicale restaurant car park in Albert Park, I assumed Mbuso's (black) familiarity with this (black) place when I asked him where I should park – even though the car park is enormous and there is only one vehicle parked in it. This differential spatio-embodied relating serves to heighten racial difference and contributed to the enactment of race between us.

There are many more examples of racialised place familiarity/unfamiliarity. While on tour in the ex-Indian Grey Street Complex with Magen, I told him how my (white) friend Cherise is going to "take me and show me" where she finds cheap and interesting bargains in this ex-Indian area that he and I are touring. The point here is that, in order for me to engage in these shopping practices, Cheris has to physically escort me to the shops to source bargain-buys. It would not be possible for her to describe to me where to find them on my own because we are white and this place embodies blackness. She and I do not have markers (least of all a familiarity with street names) to enable her to direct me to particular shops. In contrast when Mbuso was giving me the directions to a trendy new café called The Store in the ex-white suburb of Musgrave I know how to get there before he has finished explaining. I could even help him by naming a particular road when he cannot remember it in the

direction-giving process. The area is familiar to me because it is my space: The Store is in a road where I have lived and it is adjacent to a restaurant where I have regularly eaten. It is, in fact, a central place for the spatio-embodied practices of whiteness.

This racialised place familiarity/unfamiliarity is stark during the tour that Gregory takes me on through Chatsworth, an ex- and still mostly Indian residential and light commercial area about 10km south of the city. I have been to the edges of Chatsworth for a tour of the Hare Krishna temple and more than one million Durbanites live here yet being on tour in Chatsworth for me is like being on tour in a foreign country where nothing is familiar. When we drove past the massive site of a sprawling market which he referred to as 'Bangladesh' Gregory asked me if I had "ever heard anything about Bangladesh". He described the size of the market in this way: "on a Friday and a Saturday (.) you wouldn't be able to drive in this portion [L: really?] this is actually the area where there would be (0.2) its buzzing (.) a hive of activity that takes place over here." For him the Bangladesh Market looms so large in Chatsworth that it seems possible that, even though he knows I have never been in Chatsworth, I might have heard of Bangladesh, but I have not. My obvious spatio-embodied foreignness (as implied partly by my whiteness in this Indian space) was also evident in this next extract from Gregory's tour where we encountered someone who assumed (correctly) that I was a foreigner in Chatsworth and that Gregory was giving me a tour of this space:

Gregory (Indian) and me (white)

G: This is the minister from the other church next door [*about man walking towards our car where we are parked looking at Gregory's church*] Hi Pastor Clark (0.2) how are you keeping? [*he comes up to the car window to talk to us*]

L: Hi nice to meet you I'm Lyndsay

G: This is Pastor Clark (.) this is Lyndsay

L: Nice to meet you

G: We're actually just er taking uh (.) taking a drive

Pastor: Having a look at Chatsworth

G: er ja (0.2) ja just just (.) thank you bye

L: Great hr

G: Ok then (.) bye

L: Bye (3.0) hr he acts like this is a familiar thing people do (0.2)

Pastor [*returns to car*] he's gone to town (.) he didn't park here [*referring to the Minister of Gregory's church*]

G: ok that's fine (.) thanks Pastor thank you

L: I'm white and so therefore I'm having a tour

G: Yes yes I'm giving a tour hr [L: hr hr] actually you should have said no no actually I'm giving him a tour

L: hr hr that definitely wouldn't have made sense

G: would have thrown him hey hr hr

When Pastor Clark interpreted our presence here as “Having a look at Chatsworth”, he is referring to me as being the person ‘having a look’ because he knows that Gregory lives here. His assumption was that I am not familiar with this highly racialised space because I am white and not Indian and that therefore I must be on a tour, learning about the area. The racialisation of the space deeply racialised our interaction, and simultaneously our interaction racialised this space further. Gregory and I joked with each other after this exchange with Pastor Clark about how we should have said that I was the one giving Gregory a tour. The humour we shared in considering this potential conversation with the Pastor highlighted the subversiveness of this notion and, by implication, how much this is an Indian space and not a white space.

In a corresponding example, I asked a white car guard for directions to Joe Cool's when Nthando, who was in the car touring the city with me, was taking me to Joe Cool's to show me this venue where he had been socialising the previous week. Nthando knows the way but I did not ask him for directions because I did not associate Nthando with the historically white space of Joe Cool's. This practice of mine, assuming white familiarity with an ex-white place, is another example of how the spatio-embodied racial practices associated with place contributed further to the construction of racialised subjectivities in those places.

In another moment (already quoted in the methodology Chapter 4) Magen and I were standing on a street corner over the road from a branch of Game Discount World Stores, which is situated on the border between the ex-Indian and ex-white area of town. Through our talk about this store we recognised for the first time the historical racialisation of this store that we both shopped at when we were children *but* from different entrances, me through the entrance on white West Street (which Magen refers to as the bayside of town) and Magen through the entrance in the Indian part

of town. Our talk about the racialisation of this particular space is reflective of how this space is literally familiar to Magen and me in different ways. The way that Magen and I stood, side by side, staring at this space because it was so racialised, is an *embodied* enactment of race between us. Here it is possible to see how space, discourse and embodiment articulate, how they circuitously facilitate each other so that what can be and is said and done about race is constrained and enabled by the racialisation of this space we are in (and indeed also 'imprinted' constitutively in this space). In this sense discourse and space and embodied activity are indelibly connected and indeed co-constitutively contribute to the enactment of race on tour.

Another way in which a familiarity with the racial embodiment of spatial practices is used on tour to construct subjectivity is in the efforts by white participants to construct ourselves as 'different kinds of (historically) (non-racist) whites' through establishing our spatio-embodied familiarity with black spaces. This happened in tours between me and other whites and between me and Indians and blacks. For example, I did this 'white' work when Magen and I were touring the ex-Indian Grey Street complex. I said to him that I would like to visit the Madressa Arcade in this area because, I said, this is "where I used to hang out when I was a teenager". The spatio-embodied association with this historically black space positioned me as one who was different from mainstream apartheid-supporting whites who only stayed on the white side of the city partition. A few steps further on the tour I tried again to assert my historical association with blackness when I told Magen about my practices in this part of town years ago and how "I used to shop at Ideals [*a chain store in the Grey Street complex*] when I was a student". Later while still on tour with Magen I worked to extend the 'value' of this spatial association with the practices of the Grey Street area by identifying the building (which we walk past) "where we had all our ANC meetings in the early nineties". My lack of 'genuine' familiarity with this space is reflected in my surprise when Magen referred to the building where I had all these meetings as 'Lakhanis' and I am confused because this name was not familiar to me. I did the same work on tour with Mbuso when I point out Emmanuel Cathedral to him, telling him that "we used to come here (0.2) for political gatherings". By repeatedly locating myself within these black spaces through the practices I engaged in, I attempted to construct myself as a white who was (historically) familiar or present here and therefore, a white of non-racial practices. The outcome of this discursive work is that I effectively dredged up the segregated black/white histories of participants, stamping myself with whiteness as I used the blackness of these spaces in the construction of

my subjectivity, interactively perpetuating racialised subjectivities and racial difference.

I did this with Andrew (who is white) too. For example, when we were walking past the Virgin Active gym in town – a space occupied exclusively by black gym patrons – I located myself firmly in the activities of this black space when I tell Andrew: “it’s a great gym (.) I used to use it”. Then, while walking on the edge of the ex-Indian Grey Street complex, Andrew and I both tried to produce ourselves as whites who are familiar and comfortable with the practices of this black space in the days when few whites would have ventured there. I said to Andrew that “I spent my teenage years shopping around here” and he responded by saying “Ja (.) it’s cool” and he went on to expound on the “charming quiriness” of the place. This work we did was an attempt to associate ourselves with the historical practices of this ex-black part of town as part of our efforts to construct ourselves as different from most whites but, as mentioned in a previous chapter, our pleasure here was expressed within an Orientalising discourse (Said, 1978) wherein we constructed a romantic exotic ‘Other’ against which to assemble ourselves. The ironic outcome of this discursive move was that we set ourselves apart from the area as whites who are not of this place but who visited here as practicing voyeurs.

I also used the familiarity of practices in particular black spaces to racially construct the subjectivity of Magen and Mbuso (and their children) when I suggested to both of them that they ‘owe’ it to their children to bring them to this ex-black part of town to give them a sense of “the story of their parents” (said to Magen). This is the conversation I had with Mbuso about this:

Mbuso (black) and me (white)

L: do your children ever come into town, Mbuso?

M: uh:::hm (3.0) no:::ot really (0.5) ok because they are still fairly small it doesn’t work to bring them to town (0.2) ok the main place they come to when they come to town would be (0.5) not very far away from where I work (0.5) erm:::m erm:::m the place that that (0.5) I feel comfortable (0.2) maybe is the malls their mother (.) you know (0.2) feeling much more safer as well (0.5) is the Pavilion Mall or (.) Gateway Mall (0.2) so that’s that’s the place that they like to frequent [L: mmm] er:::m but I mean I take them a lot to Umlazi

L: to see your Dad

M: yes exactly so that they kind of like [L: they're used to that] (0.5) life is not just about only suburbs (.) [L: mm] you know (.) they know other places (.) they know that every Sunday they go to Umlazi

L: and how do they respond (1.0) to you um:::m

M: (0.5) I mean I think kids they love it they love it (.) I mean one thing they love about Umlazi is because there are so many kids er:::r that they meet you know [L: uhh] (0.5) unlike at home where there's just the (0.2) two of them

In both instances I initiated this line of conversation asking Magen “So you gonna bring your daughter here anytime?” and asking Mbuso “Do your children ever come into town, Mbuso?” With these questions I used the blackness of this space to hitch Mbuso and Magen to idealised and stereotypical notions of a cohesive, continuous, family-oriented, interdependent black Community. Even this construction of grandparents as bearers and conveyers of family history and family memory is a slice of the romantic discourse of black communities in which the wise black grandparent passes on the family and community memory to succeeding generations. I drew again on this stereotypical notion about the black grandparent as memory holder or conveyor when Mbuso told me that on Sundays he takes his children to Umlazi township (where he grew up), and I immediately responded with a comment loaded with assumptions when I say in response: ‘to see your Dad’. This stereotype of black communalist practices re-confirms blackness (and related or attached whiteness) and effected the further perpetuation of race and racial difference on our tours.

This co-constitutional relationship between discourse, embodiment, and racialised space (and the racialising consequence of this on our interactions on tour) was also evident in our interactions with others while on tour. For example, while on tour with Mandla he took me around the municipal infrastructural engineering plant where he worked when he was first employed in the municipality. While we were walking through the extensive warehouses of this plant Mandla had much lighthearted banter with the black men that he knew when he worked there as an artisan during his five years in this plant. The banter centred around the signs of success that Mandla, now a senior manager in the municipality, was seen by these men to be exuding. These signs include his walking with a ‘white woman’, showing evidence of eating well, and being a ‘bossman’. Much of this banter took place in isiZulu, some of which I could understand, some of which Mandla translated for me and much of which he just laughed at as we moved onto the next section of the plant. Here are some extracts

from this section of the tour which illustrate the bantering about Mandla and 'his' white woman:

Mandla (black) and me (white)

M: all the steel components (.) are manufactured here (.) Sanibona [*Mandla greets a group of workers and they talk in Zulu - 67:18 - including a reference from the workers in Zulu to "Ntombi yakho" meaning "your girl", to which Mandla replies "yebo, Ntombi yami" meaning "yes, my girl" and he puts his arm around me and I laugh and we walk around like this for a while*] Ok (.) this is basically where I spent (0.2) my first five years in the Municipality...

Mandla (black) and me (white)

M: these are the old vehicles and everything (.) when you you fix the stepladders for the trucks and all that [*conversation with worker in Zulu 77.20*] hr hr hr

L: What is he teasing you about?

M: He's teasing me about I've got a white girl hr hr hr

L: Oh hr hr hr why's that so like a big deal?

M: No (.) for them he wishes to be where I am.

Mandla (black) and me (white)

Worker: No (.) him and I were running apartheid better. You keeping well? [*shaking hands with Mandla*]

M: Hr hr hr Ja (.) I'm keeping well. This is Lyndsay Brown I'm just going through an interview (.) yes (.) ja (.) hr hr hr (.) I'm ok sharp sharp

Another worker: Ay (.) you've got a partner now hey

M: Ja (.) ja (.) this is my partner

L: Hr hr hr

M: Ja (.) hr hr hr.

The talk in the plant was sexualised and racialised partly by the social space that we moved through: a place where large groups of men work together on manual labour projects, where the almost exclusively African male staff utilised racialised, colonial and macho discourses about the 'excessive sexual prowess' of African men (Frankenberg, 1993) and the (sexual) desirability of 'restrained, civilized' white women (Frankenberg, 1993), even hinting perhaps at the covert theories of desire underpinning 19th century discourses of 'miscegenation' (Young, 1995) and at Fanon's idea of a negritude, of how whiteness inspires a black man's desire to be

that which he is not (Bhavnani et al., 2005). Drawing on the ‘cultural knowledge’ of these blackman/whitewoman discourses, Mandla made full use of humour as a “nonthreatening way to introduce sensitive racial issues into a conversation” and as a way to legitimise the racialisation of the banter through giving the impression that he was not “preoccupied with race” and through keeping the atmosphere lighthearted and portraying his “inferences to race as harmless and playful rather than intentional comments against people of other race groups” (Barnes et al., 2001, p. 327). However what was also influential in the production of race particularly in the way the connection between Mandla and I was sexualised was the *embodied activity* in our interactions in this space. Race (and gender) were (also) produced here in and through the embodied activities of the workers when they laughed and gesticulated towards us, when they hailed others to come over and see Mandla and me together, in the way that they shook Mandla’s hand. Mandla contributed to this embodied racial activity with his light-hearted ‘hamming it up’ for the commentators and the observers, putting his arm around me, and laughing at their comments. I contributed too when I good-humouredly walked with Mandla’s arm around me (even though this is not a familiar practice in our friendship) and laughed at the obviously sexualised jokes about Mandla and me (his humour partly ensuring that my laughter is the most appropriate response). My limited understanding of the isiZulu language did not get in the way of me understanding the ribald jokes made about us in isiZulu. Indeed I understood the jokes largely through the associated embodied activity.

Mandla’s success as a black man (without a white woman) was also embodied as we walked through the warehouse. He walked freely and with a sense of ownership through the warehouses of this plant despite the fact that he did not have official permission to do this tour. This freedom of movement in a tightly controlled plant signified his power and authority. He created a stir. People wanted to shake his hand. He was the subject of the gaze of all those around him. His smart casual clothes, his well-fed belly, his professional freedom to choose his daily agenda, the way he walked comfortably and commandingly: all of these embodied activities and practices produced him as a successful black man who had managed to take over a mantle previously worn almost exclusively by white men in local government.

The discursive and spatio-embodied routines of racial ‘recognition’

The routines of racial interaction were most pronounced in our (brief) engagement with outsiders where we engaged with them using old racial practices, that is, whites

talked to whites, Indians talked to Indians, and blacks talked to blacks. Below is an example from my tour with Magen (Indian) when we stopped off for lunch in the Victory Café lounge in the ex-Indian Grey Street complex and Magen took on all the activities associated with ordering, paying for, and organising our food in this 'Indian space' where 'Indian food' is served:

Magen (Indian) and me (white)

M: Uh:::h shall we try here? [*Victory Lounge café*] [L: ja] I mean lets just uh see first

L: Is there seating?

M: I think there is you know just

L: ja ja ja ja [*we look around the restaurant inside*] (4.0)

M: you ok here or is it a bit dodgy?

L: No no no as long as there's puri patha I'm happy (3.0 as we look for puri patha)

M: Nah don't think so (3.0) do you have puri patha? [*to person behind counter*] Ok

L: Ah there you go hey

M: Ja (1.0) One two?

L: I don't know (.) how many you gonna have? One

M: Ok

L: Two

M: Two

L: and water (2.0). You don't want to take sweetmeat for your daughter (.) too much sugar?

M: too much sugar. Check if they stock Aquelle or (8.0) Can I have four puri patha please? [*To the person serving behind the counter*] [*It's clear Magen will do the ordering – this is his place. We did find water but I felt very culturally embarrassed when Magen asked me to check if they stock water. Something so bourgeois about me wanting to buy water to drink*]

L: Juice?

M: Ah:::h juice (10.0)

L: Which kind do you want Magen?

M: U:::mm Tropicana (.) orange (.) ok (5.0) and four puri patha's [*to cashier*] (6.0) Sorry?

L: Sit at the big table (.) don't want to sit next to the smooching couple (8.0)

M: Can you manage there? Ok (4.0)

L: Are they going to bring it or we'll fetch it?

M: No (.) I'm sure they're going to bring it (3.0) who would have thought (.) thirty years later sitting here ... we need some serviettes, hey? Serviettes? [*requesting serviettes from the shop helper*]

Here again I tried to establish myself as a 'different kind of white' by expressing a strong preference to eat puri patha (a traditional 'Indian' meal) but Magen's racial familiarity with this place and the routines of racial interaction and recognition between him and the staff further entrenched this 'Indian' restaurant as 'his' place and not mine. Of course that this is Magen's place historically makes it more likely that he will take charge of our order, pay the cashier, and ask staff for assistance. But the routines of racial interaction and recognition determined that it was like this wherever we went in the ex-Indian part of town: Magen asked directions from African street vendors, Indian shop keepers approached him and not me when we went into their stores. His/my skin colour and associated racial history determined a racialised recognition, a black-to-black connection through familiar, historical and well-worn (black-to-black) practices in these spaces.

These routines of racialised interaction and recognition happened extensively on the tours. When I am touring with Nthando for example he and I had a number of encounters with white men, namely, the builder at the gate to the ex-white school that we visited, the karate instructor in the school hall at this school, and the bouncer at the ex-white Joe Cool's bar where we go for a drink. On each occasion, the practice was that I (white) engaged with these others (all white). For example, near the end of our tour, when Nthando and I walked up the long entrance stairs at Joe Cool's bar and we noticed that there were two (white) bouncers gate-keeping at the top of the stairs, Nthando, who had been here the previous Friday, asked me, who has not been here in years, "Are they charging?" (he is referring to a cover charge for entrance). When we got to the top of the stairs this white-white practice continued and I negotiated our entrance by asking the white bouncers: "Are you charging? Can we just have one drink?" In all these instances, the casual connection was made around our embodied whiteness in this ex-white space.

A similar situation arose when Mbuso and I visited the Isaac Sithole art gallery at the BAT centre as part of Mbuso's tour of this harbourside development. A young black man is curator of the gallery and as we walked around the gallery together, Mbuso took it upon himself to enquire from this man – whose name he discovered is Delani – about the gallery and the art on display. Of course the connection between Mbuso

and Delani is more likely than one between Delani and me because they both speak isiZulu, but this is a tourism site and I could hear Delani easily talking in English to other visitors. The connection between Mbuso and Delani is something that they both do automatically, at least partly because it is a familiar and routinised interaction around embodied blackness. The same embodied black-to-black racial practice happened when Mbuso and I visit the Victoria Street Market and Mbuso and I both assumed that he (rather than I) would engage the black/African *muthi* seller about the benefits of the animal parts that he is selling, even though his stand is attached to a tourist centre which is marketed both to locals who use traditional medicine and to (mostly) English-speaking tourists.

The discursive and spatio-embodied fear of blackness and black space

The spatio-embodiment enactment of race on the tours is also evident when we toured through those parts of the city where poor, black immigrants live, particularly the Point Road area and the Albert Park area, and we *exuded our embodied fear of these black spaces*. For example, when Magen and I walked through Point Road as part of his first tour we walked particularly quickly, leaving the area as soon as possible. Here are my field notes about this part of the tour:

Magen and I walked along part of Point Road and he talked about how Menesh's research shows that this is where dangerous dealings happen (he mentioned at the same time that this is where lots of Nigerians live) and we talked about how people don't walk there much [I guess we didn't want to say 'people like us' because lots of people do walk there] although certainly he and I did and I felt we were quite tense there and happy to leave this space – I think we were getting heckled a bit in a low grade way at one point which felt quite threatening.

Our fear of blackness was embodied in the way we walked quickly and tensely through this poor, black space, happy to leave it as soon as we could. Walking with much trepidation through a poor black immigrant area is what Mbuso and I did too when we toured Albert Park. We drove into the area (in my car) and I suggested we get out and walk. Mbuso was hesitant and it seemed that he had anticipated that we would tour from my car rather than tour 'on foot'.

Mbuso (black) and me (white)

L: mm where shall I park [*what am I on about – the huge car park is empty, deserted except for one council looking vehicle but really I am quite lost and unsure of myself*]

here in this space which doesn't feel safe, near the bridge where all the traffic light smash and grabs happen]

M: park anywhere (.) maybe where there's a there's a slight shade hr hr hr (2.0) yes yes

L: right so

M: shall we start hr

L : Shall we walk and talk (.) what do you want to do?

M: (0.5) Uhh [*hesitant*]

L: You decide.

M: ah we can walk I think its safe as well [*I am relieved at the time that Mbuso also feels unsafe as it makes me feel my response is less about race but is that true since we are both feeling unsafe because ??? is it because the area is dominated by black people?? And black people are to be afraid of when they are poor??? I relax too because I think that I am not the only one who is being hypervigilant about our security, we are both watching out for us]*

Mbuso was not convinced it was safe (he says "I think its safe") but did agree to walk around the area and so we did this although our tour of the area was quick and superficial as we ventured down only one of many possible streets before we retraced our steps and returned to my car. Below are extracts from this walk illustrating our embodied discomfort and hypervigilant fearfulness in this black space:

Mbuso (black) and me (white)

M: ...but what we also see is that (4.0) [*he is distracted by people walking and talking past us in the street partly because we are both being hypervigilant about our safety]* there is er::r um (0.5) I mean (3.0) the change in the (3.0) in the in the in the okay you can look this is this is very bad [L: mh mh mh] [*looking into lobby of block of flats which is totally flooded with doors hanging loose and the lift jammed]*

L: Water everywhere o:::oh god

M: yes exactly (0.5) ja

L: no its terrible man

M: Ja ja (0.2) I mean uh (0.5) I think there is a this (1.0) possibly (1.0)

In the extract above there are a number of distracted pauses in Mbuso's inputs and my input "Water everywhere o:::oh god" makes reference to my profound shock at the state of the dilapidated building that we peered into. During these pauses our attention was drawn to loud noises or large groups of people walking past us on the

pavement, or to scenes of urban decay. We were both being particularly hypervigilant, 'doing race' through these assorted spatio-embodied responses to this 'black' place. This is continued when, as is available in the next extract, Mbuso commented on my obtrusive whiteness in this black space:

Mbuso (black) and me (white)

M: a young person growing up (0.5) in an (.) area like this er (0.5) which does feel (.) somewhat economically depressed as well [L: uh::h] er erm::m (0.5) what such feelings may induce er::r erm is a feeling that hey who frequents this place (0.5) I'm sure (0.5) there are some people who are wondering who may be seeing you as an Eskimo in a desert because they they they've never seen a white person around here hr hr [L: hr hr] *[My race is this obvious – I am an Eskimo in this desert, racialising the space as we move through it]*

Much of the enactment of race between the two of us happened through our embodied practices (including our talk and spatio-embodied practices) during this visit to Albert Park, present in the hypervigilant way that we walked in the area, in our shocked gazing into the lobby of a flooded and decaying block of flats where people were living, in the way locals were staring at me because of my whiteness, in the way we paused regularly during our conversation because we were closely watching what was happening around us, and in the way I watched the hands of young men around us for any indications of trouble. This is complex here though because Mbuso is black too, although both of us are privileged relative to the poor blacks living in this area. As Day points out "[f]ear in public spaces is a key mechanism through which race privilege is constructed" (Day, 2006, p. 571).

My embodied fear about the situation is captured in my summary email notes to my supervisor written a few hours after the tour and in my field notes written directly after the tour:

We went to Tropicale and Albert Park where I have to confess I felt quite threatened and anxious about my security, anticipating being mugged, very hypervigilant, watching the hands of the young men around us. It was terrible. Even when we walked into Albert Park, we really skirted around the edges, not going deep in. I think Mbuso felt apprehensive too. It is the first time I have felt worried about my personal security in any of these interviews. (Email notes to supervisor).

Hoping that he will not choose to walk through the notorious park but he does. Just starting to walk into Albert Park proper – up Park Street – and immediately things feel quite differently hostile and decaying and I feel vaguely afraid and hypervigilant. (Field notes after Mbuso's tour)

This fear of embodied blackness is enacted even more directly at the outset of Menzi's tour when he walked up to my car and I misrecognised the weekend clothing he is wearing as gangster (*tsotsi*) gear and was briefly afraid of him. This is illustrated in my field notes post the tour with Menzi:

We met at 08h00 at the BP garage in Moore Road as he lives close by. I sms'd him about ten minutes beforehand to tell him what car I drive and where he could find me (also a way to remind him about the interview!). He arrived and walked up to the window where I was sms'ing a friend and gave me a fright as he was dressed in a tracksuit and a beanie and I didn't recognise him at first (he was wearing typical kind of *tsotsi* [gangster] gear so I guess my initial brief fear reaction was a race based one. Hmmm)

The discursive and spatio-embodied celebration of whiteness and 'white space'

In a scene that contrasts heavily with the embodied enactment of race in poor, black immigrant spaces, the embodied enactment of race ensued in the tours with white participants at the largely white space of the Durban Yacht Mole. The Yacht Mole, where large local and international recreational yachts are moored, is a quiet, well-maintained and sparsely peopled city space.

Brian (white) and me (white)

B: ...aggh that cloud's beautiful isn't it (0.2) what a beautiful day [*walking towards the wooden boardwalk at the entrance to the yacht mole facing Café Fish*]

L: I (.) someone took a photo the other day (.) he lives on the Victoria Embankment (.) it was on Saturday morning there was a huge storm [B: mm] and the cloud was just there (.) and it was like enormous and it had lights behind it [B: mh (.) marvellous it was just beautiful (0.2) I love this part of the city [B: yes] I really really love it

B: Now why is that Lyndsay? [*Standing near the corner where we could walk up towards Café Fish*]

L: I don't know (.) it makes me feel profoundly happy being here (.) I can't really explain (.) I can't really explain (0.2) it's the water [K: yes] um (0.5) I suppose (0.5) um [B: it's the beauty] (0.5) its its just very very beautiful [B: ja] and (1.0) I mean I come here (.) if I go anywhere here from Bat down here to Wilson's Wharf [B: yes] I'm always happy being here in this space [B: yes ja] (0.2) I (.) really I don't know

B: Does it feel safe? (1.5) it's open [*these are the things that matter to him about this space – its safe and mostly empty (open)*]

L: I suppose (.) ja (.) I suppose it does feel safe to me (0.2) I mean I never felt unsafe here (.) I've never really thoughts about it [B: ja] um (0.5) I don't know (.) I mean sometimes when you (0.5) I mean I wouldn't walk underneath these tunnels [B: no no hr] people who don't have homes live under there

B: hr hr they smell bad [*hectic thing to say, very old racialised story about unclean Africans. Hectic hectic*]

L: ja (.) they would smell and you know the people would be (.) I wouldn't feel safe there but I mean (.) above board I mean [B: yes] I love it love it love it love it

Embodied race is more intangible, more easily veiled in this pristine, de-peopled, wealthy space but there is no doubt that it is present when Brian and I were walking and talking here. Perhaps it was present largely through the absence of blackness, in the whiteness of this small space amidst the expanse of a black city, through the contrast with our earlier discussions about the decaying (black) city centre. The embodiment of race is certainly obliquely present in the distasteful way in which I described how “I wouldn't walk underneath these tunnels [K: no no hr] people who don't have homes live under there” and Brian laughingly concurs, saying “they smell bad”. Given the interface and articulation of race and class in South Africa these homeless people living in the tunnels are highly likely to be black. The construction of our whiteness (relative to poor blackness) was done by Brian and me in the discursive practices of moving away from “tabooed topics, jointly protecting what cannot be uttered” (Billig, 1997, p. 151 in Mazzei, 2004, p. 31), thereby achieving the effect of having the unsayable present in its absence. So while Brian and I endlessly celebrated and co-constructed our subjectivity in this well-appointed space, our pleasure had a racialised undertone which was happening largely at an embodied level where we stopped regularly and admired features of the physical environment that affirmed our sense of ‘place’. This continued when Brian set up a distinction between the space we were in (which he is effusive about) and the ‘crime and grime’ of the city centre that we had just been in:

Brian (white) and me (white)

B: ...I think the backdrop of the city is [*we both look at this backdrop*] (0.5) this is probably one of the most pleasing backdrops [L: uhh] (0.2) if you look at it you don't (.) there's no (.) you don't see crime and grime in that backdrop you see (1.5) ah you know (.) there's a modulation there's (1.5) there's different colours and and textures that are coming to you (0.2) and (.) actually if you look at these buildings (.) they're probably some of the best maintained buildings in the city ...and if you look at that that (0.2) rail over there [*fence along the yacht basin and harbour which is shaped like a perpetual wave*] (0.2) what do you call it (0.2) [L: its so clever the way] I mean that's Nadus van Heerden the way (.) I mean I think that's fantastic [L: uh] because it serves a purpose (.) but its aesthetically pleasing

This part of the tour seemed to pass so slowly as we wandered around the area, stopping a lot, gazing with much admiration at parts of the place we were in. There was something intangibly white about the way that Brian and I were transfixed and relaxed here as though somehow this was a (white) oasis. Perhaps it is the contrast with our earlier responses to the black city, for example, the way we regarded the informal trader stands against the colonial post office building. The Yacht Mole area is a place that is also important to Andrew, also white: as we approached the Yacht Mole on his tour he mentioned that this “view over the bay is what makes Durban what it is so if [he] did bring anyone here to walk around who doesn't know it too well (.) [he'd] take a little trip into the yacht mole and go and stand by the yachts”.

Conclusion

What is apparent on examination of the interactional work on the tours is that the enactment of race is a complex process not only happening at a discursive level but also at the level of (other) embodied practices and that the location or space is determinant of this interaction in space. In all of these examples above race flowed in and through our bodies and we simultaneously and actively performed and constructed race and our racialised subjectivities through ‘socialised’ embodied practices in places that facilitated, encouraged and demanded these practices. In this the embodiment of race is therefore working in a *trialectic* with discourse and social space. For example race in the warehouse with Mandla was highly spatialised: this particular space where large groups of black men are doing manual labour with their bodies and their activities facilitated our embodied behaviour as we walked through these warehouses. When Magen and I walked into the Victory Café Lounge the way

that historical Indianness is imprinted with historical and contemporary racialised practices is highly salient in the way that we embodied race in the racialised routines of interaction and recognition. The poor black immigrant areas and the warehouses of black artisan workers prompted particular kinds of racialised embodiment. Placement is highly salient to embodiment and discourse is highly salient to embodiment so when walking in the warehouses with Mandla, the black men working there utilised (and perhaps slightly subverted) historical racialised macho, sexual discourses about African men and discourses about the desirability of white women as ‘trophy’ of success. These discourses interpellated Mandla and me in particular embodied forms and facilitated the way we could and did embody race here in this relational space. Indeed, embodiment and social space is often available to us primarily through the traces and references to embodiment in our language. These conversational references to practices and patterns are what Durrheim and Dixon (2005a) call the “deictic referentiality of talk” (p. 453). What we can say and do (with our bodily and linguistic practices) was spatially contingent and the spatial relations were determined by what was said and done in those spaces as we moved through them, and as others had done when moving through them previously.

Chapter 8: An end point for now

The geography of the city is about the movement of actual bodies through the streets, where the streets constitute the moving body by making them 'in place', 'out of place', 'on the move' and so on. Moving or still, the body maps the spaces of social power. (Keith and Pile, 1996, p. 381 in Popke and Ballard, 2004, p. 105)

A key factor motivating efforts to understand the intricacies of the enactment of race is that race as a social formation has transmogrified considerably since it was first seriously mooted a few centuries ago as a way of differentiating between people. Indeed, as I (and others) have said, race as a social formation is peculiarly adaptable, a resistant virus which has become embedded in bodies, practices, spaces, subjectivities, interactions and in our theories and it changes form where necessary to survive. In this way it can be conceived of "as a chain of contingency, in which the connections between its constituent components are not given, but are made viscous through local attractions" (Saldanha, 2006, p. 18).

This project, an investigation into the continued construction of the racialisation of space and the related formation of racialised subjectivities in a post-apartheid city, could have proceeded in a number of directions given that there were many ways in which blackness and whiteness were constructed on the tours I did with these research participants in this city. However I focused my energies on the construction of these racialised subjectivities through discourse, place and embodiment exploring how these three practices function as racialising mechanisms and how they articulate in what I have called a *trialectic*.

In order to create the context for the presentation of the idea of this trialectic I firstly set out to detail the well-recognised (and effective) discursive constructions of racialised subjectivities. I did this through a demonstration of how black and white subjectivities are intersubjectively discursively constructed (and reinforced) *through place*, that is, through how they are formed in/through/with the social relations that make up place/s in the city of Durban. This relationship between place and identity is notably dialectical:

We are still, even many years later, *in the places to which we are subject* because (and to the extent that) *they are in us*. They are in us – indeed, are

us – thanks to their incorporation into us by a process of somatization whose logic is yet to be discovered. They constitute us as subjects. (Casey, 2001, p. 688, emphasis in original)

The social relations we ‘introduced’ into spaces through our intersubjective engagements on the tour impacted on the space, racialised and reracialised the space, entrenching existent spatial relations of race imbued in these spaces and introducing ‘new’ racial space relations, or amendments to ‘old’ spatial relations. All of this racialising work served to reinforce or amend current racialised social relations (and even, rather esoterically, those historical racial relations through how we remember them when we are in these spaces.) This phase of the analytical investigation detailed how whiteness was discursively constructed in place through an examination of the discourses of white place-identity that prevailed in the tours through the comparison established between the wondrously paradisaical white childhood city of Durban and the current ‘transformed’ city which is construed as a third world/African, black city with a lack of ‘quality’ food and services. What became apparent in the way that these discursive comparisons were set up between the city then and now is the construction of whiteness through *implaced talk*: how the conditions for the construction of whiteness became possible through talking obliquely about the city then and now. In this way whiteness was affirmed and composed not directly in/through/with each discourse but *in the spaces between* the discourses about the cityspaces I have mentioned (and others too no doubt). We can think of this as a magical trick or illusion where whiteness is not visible (like the rabbit or the colourful long scarf in the magicians’ hat) but which we know is ‘in there somewhere’. Whiteness circulates in the spaces between the discourses about space here, in the elision as it were, able to exist because each of the implaced discourses creates the conditions for the other. It is like a child’s join-the-dots picture – only we do not need to join the dots because there is a tacit agreement between us about what the picture will look like anyway. This kind of discursive trickery is a familiar practice for the intersubjective construction of whiteness because it is circulating, ready for usage, in the spaces which are stamped white or black, it is at least partly the implicit ‘cultural knowledge’ we draw on when we are talking, when not everything has to be spoken aloud to be spoken between us. So whiteness was constructed and reinforced ‘in-between’ the white talk about the city. The segregated nature of space in the city of Durban historically and now also feeds into and supports this discursive work because we know how to discursively practise whiteness in those segregated spaces. We know how to do/make ourselves racially

in/through/with space because there are place-memories in these spaces which we have been part of constructing through our racialised practices in those spaces. Space/place is critical here then to understanding how we are doing this constructive work. In this process then whiteness is discursively constructed relative to blackness partly through the racialisation of place, through imprinted practices of racial segregation then and now. Even the talk of the childhood playground city is done relative to blackness because this talk of the white city is so romanticised, so idyllic, so very white that blackness is glaringly present in its absence. The deletion of blackness, or blindness to blackness, marks this talk as white (Frankenberg, 1993) and constructing of whiteness.

Blackness is also constructed in relation to whiteness, only this is more obviously so given the negative impact white space has on the formation of blackness and black space. Here in this writing about the construction of blackness I proposed that blackness is also formed through place, and in particular through the racialised, 'segregated' spaces in Durban. When black participants talk of the childhood city of Durban their talk is overwhelmingly of racial segregation. It is this aspect of place that defined their youthful subjectivity: the formal structuring of the zones of whiteness and blackness in the city, and now through the remaining segregation of the city between foreign and local blacks, and the way black participants feel excluded from some of the privatised social places on the edges of the city that are still largely 'white' in practice and patronage, where blackness is not seen to be easily accommodated because it can be seen to be a transgression of the whiteness of the place. So the discursive construction of blackness through place is through the continued experience blacks have of segregation from their apartheid childhood to their post-apartheid adulthood, revealing an overwhelming omnipresence of race for black participants.

The discursive ways in which blacks construct foreigners as 'other-blacks' as part of their efforts to displace the negative impact of continuing segregationary practices on their subjectivity also suggests how it is that the recent xenophobic attacks on foreign blacks in South Africa were possible; illustrating how race and xenophobia are "always about people who are different, usually identified by the colour of their skins, who are given a rough time, discriminated against or even killed" (Boateng, 2008, p.11).

However although these discursive constructions of racial selves through place and the discursive constructions of racial place through racialised practices of self in place are powerful they do not provide a sufficient explanation for racialised subjectivity. It is not enough to propose that race is perpetuated simply through the continuous discursive practices of our racialised subjectivities in place (and the simultaneous racialising of space). This is not simply because racetalk is so concealed, censored, awkward, and guarded that it has layer upon layer of rhetorical strategies and ideological justifications to 'protect it'. Teo's (2000) thesis that "one way by which the people's hearts and minds could be changed is through constant exposure to discourse that tints our perceptions in a subtle, almost subliminal way" (p. 9) is inadequate after nearly a century of anti-racist work in the Western world. This was evident in the interaction on the tours where there was clearly more to the enactment of race than discursive practices: on many occasions on the tours race was unmistakably 'happening' (also) through other embodied activities (not only discursively embodied practices), as I demonstrated in Chapter 7. Much of this was reflected in the way that our conversations were more distracted and disrupted than usual when we were hypervigilantly tuned into the environment/s we were in. Our racialised subjectivities were being formed in these often-infinitesimal physical movements, gestures, voice tones, conversational pauses. But the embodied experiences were also often 'pre-linguistic': on every tour there were many instances where participants and I enacted race in these ways, affirming whiteness or blackness, a fear of black space, a love of white space, a fear of white place, a fear of whiteness and a fear of blackness.

What I have proposed is that in order to develop a comprehensive picture of how race is enacted we need to interpret the practices of talk, space and embodiment, and to do so not in their separate capacities, but in the way that they *articulate*. This is what I refer to as a trialectical analysis: an analysis of the particular articulation between discourse, space and embodiment, a process which is profoundly integrated, intertwined, interdependent, mutually imbricating/facilitating, in other words, trialectical. Indeed discourse, space and embodiment are best described as tri-constitutional because of the ways in which they provide the conditions of existence for each other. This was elaborated in chapter 7 where I demonstrated that through this amorphous and elusory process of the trialectic of discourse, space and embodiment we reinforce and reform and newly form our distinct and separate racialised subjectivities, and thus race circulates (and reproduces), often 'invisibly', in this trialectical engagement between our discursive-spatio-embodied practices.

There have been significant theoretical challenges to racialised embodiment but there has been “very little empirical exploration of the ways in which racial categories impact upon the body as a *material object* and of the complex and contradictory ways in which identities are *actually* lived out at the level of embodied experience” (Alexander and Knowles, 2005, p. 10). Perhaps this kind of empirical work could allude to how and where the embodiment of race continues to live, contributing to the ongoing racialisation of subjectivities and the perpetuation of race. This is at least partially what this particular research project has attempted to do through an exploration of how embodiment, discourse and place are conjoined, co-constitutive, mutually imbricating. Working with this co-constitutionality in all its machinations is highly generative particularly with a complex social form like race which is a “constantly evolving phenomenon” (Solomos and Schuster, 2002, p. 50) adept at mutating, “able to switch to a new ‘theory’ once the old one is worn out” (Rathzel, 2002, p. 23). One way to counter the adaptational ability that race has is to work with the interdependency of embodiment, discourse and relational space always keeping our empirical and theoretical eye on all three at once thereby making it difficult for race to escape to one of these three ‘corners’ when either of the other two corners is under a bright light. For example, if we are only focused on discourse then when certain discursive racialisms become socially unacceptable as they do a few things will happen: new discursive constructions of race will slowly start to emerge and race will slide deeper into bodily practices or spatial practices or both, and work even harder at reproducing there. There is always somewhere for race to thrive if we only work with one aspect of race. And besides these aspects are co-constitutive so working with only either the discursive, spatial or embodied formations of race provides us with only a partial lens. Entering into the trialectic of embodiment, discourse and social space and working within the machinations of this triadic nexus in our empirical work can facilitate insight into the separate, historicised aspects of spatial, embodied and discursive practices without losing sight of the fact that they work together as agents for the production and transformation of race and racialised subjectivities.

It is my view that an understanding of this trialectical engagement can assist us to understand the kind of racial ‘incidents’ that arise on a regular basis in the South African landscape. For example earlier this year a video emerged in the public sphere that demonstrated, among other things, how the enactment of race was facilitated by the trialectical connection between space, discourse and embodiment.

The video was produced by white students of the Reitz residence at Free State University in 2007 and documents a group of white students, in the genre of the television series 'Fear Factor', instructing black workers to get onto their hands and knees on the ground outside the residence and to eat food that appears to be dog food (and which one of the students 'pretended' to have urinated on in an earlier frame of the video) (Mail and Guardian online, 26 February 2008; Mail and Guardian, 29 February-6 March, 2008; Independent on Saturday, 1 March, 2008). While we are watching the video we know that we are witnessing a degrading 'lord of the flies' game being played by overgrown boys who might have chosen any victims yet we are also aware that their performance is directed by race (and gender). We know that race is salient here because of the embodiment of race in this video, because of the "somatization of social relations of domination" (Wacquant in Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p. 24 in Sampson, 1998, p. 48). This is because race has been historically inscribed on the different bodies of these two groups of people: the students are young and white, the workers are middle-aged and black, the students are standing over the women who are on their knees eating the 'dog food'. Their bodies are "maps of meanings and power" (Haraway, 1990, p. 222 in Walker, 2007, p. 3). We recognise the racialisation in the scene because the way that the participants have embodied race is familiar to us, congruent with the way that we have seen race carved into bodies in South Africa, through law and through social practices. Their positions could not be reversed. The boys are standing over the women because they are *white*, and because their victims are *black*, because submission is "lodged deep inside the socialized body" (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p. 172 in Sampson, 1998, p. 48). As Bourdieu has argued the social order inscribes itself on our bodies, our "muscles carry the message of social class, [b]ody movements and gestures tell one's life story" (Sampson, 1998, p. 49). The example illustrates clearly too how "the meanings of these embodied identities vary with place" (Day, 2006, p.580) for it is the spatial politics of this still whites-only residence in the supposedly non-racial South Africa that make it possible for these black and white bodies to 'behave' in these particular ways. In addition the talk of the students facilitates the video as they instruct the workers to go about the various denigrating activities and when they summarise the reason for the video at the end: *Op die einde van die dag dit is rerig wat ons van integrasie dink* [At the end of the day this is what we think of integration]. In analysing this video, the workings of the trialectical arrangement between talk, embodiment and place/space in the enactment of racialised power relations, is, in my view, critical.

There are many positive ways that this notion of the trialectic can be constructively employed. For example, local government officials could ensure that public spaces are designed or renovated in such a way that positive racialised subjectivities are formed through judicious application of this trialectic.

The mobile methodology of the tour was an extraordinarily apt and productive format for the 'exposure' of this trialectical relationship because interacting while moving through space allowed me to recognise how we, the participants, were enacting race in a range of ways. This was particularly so because, as a methodology, moving through moving spaces facilitates less 'controlled' and 'pre-determined' ways of interacting given that there are so many distractors around that demand attention and comment and hence can undermine formulaic responses. It is a powerful methodological option which offers opportunities to 'witness' the enactment of race and racialised subjectivities in novel and unrefined forms. This is useful given the layers of 'sophistication' that race and racial interactions have acquired through centuries of defensive work. There are researchers working in other interesting way within the mobilities field which could be also useful in race research. For example, the use by participants of digital cameras (taking still and moving 'pictures') to record (racialised) activities and experiences in their daily lives seems to offer much potential for productive analyses.

I would also like to suggest that it may be productive to do this kind of work collectively, working with the interactive responses of groups of participants asked to analyse certain enactments of race. The interaction between participants could potentially be highly generative. This is certainly something I would like to have done with this research: engage with the participants collectively in an analysis of my analysis after the tours. I think that this kind of interaction could render another very interesting and productive layer for investigation. I also wonder about the possibilities of doing a meta-methodological study in which researchers analyse the interactive work of groups of researchers who are working on race-based analyses of, for example, video productions of the enactment of race. Race is so elusive that we need to constantly invent new places to seek it out, a perspective which paraphrases a legendary observation attributed to Einstein: that we cannot solve the problems of the day by using the same kind of thinking we used when we first recognised the problems. It seems to me that it is central for those of us committed to doing race research to be always in search of new ontological, epistemological, and methodological ways to investigate (and challenge) the construction and realities of

race. To this end, I have pursued the idea of a mobile methodology as a way of exploring the enactment and reproduction of race through the trialectical connection between space, discourse and embodiment.

In retrospect, I wonder if it would have been useful to interview women as well and to have considered the similar and different ways in which women move through and talk about the city historically and contemporaneously. This would comprise an interesting future study. Another area that bears further exploration is the ways in which this analysis could positively impact on racialised subjectivities of the citizens of Durban through particular design and construction or renovation of public spaces by local government officials.

At the time ~~that~~ of the tours – March to May 2007 – the city government had not yet renamed the streets of Durban. By the time I was writing up the final draft of my thesis, the street signs had been (re)signposted with these new ‘signifiers’. If ~~these~~these streets had been renamed at the time I did the tours, ~~these~~ changes would inevitably ~~been~~have impacted on our talk as we walked through the newly named streets, potentially impacting on the ways we would have done ‘race’ through what we were saying and doing because what we can do and say is partially dependent on the signifiers and practices of the spaces we move in and through. For example, moving and talking in a space named after a founder-leader of the ANC, Dr Pixley KaSeme, rather than a colonial leader, like Sir Martin West, would change that space in various ways over time. What we need to consider, as part of the process of changing racial interactions and subjectivities, is how we can change the practices of social spaces and in this way shift the associations and activities of these spaces, and hence who we can be when we are in these spaces.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Digital voice recorder

The Olympus 2200 digital voice recorder (DVR) is designed for, inter alia, interviews where it can pick up both sides of a conversation with equal clarity. It has 4 hours of stereo quality recording available, noise cancelling features for easy transcribing, user-friendly PC data transfer ability and DSS Player Pro Software for easy file management.

The DVR proved to be a highly successful recording device and was largely unobtrusive although I often had to check that the light on the lapel microphone was on (this indicated that the DVR was recording). I did notice that some of the participants were, in fact, quite conscious of being recorded. Brian, for example, often reminded me to stand on the left side of him so that I was facing the microphone.

Appendix 2: Ethical considerations summarised

There are four key philosophical principles that every researcher must incorporate into the research design and implementation process. These are autonomy and respect for the dignity of the person, nonmaleficence, beneficence and justice (Wassenaar, 2006). I will briefly explain each of these principles and how I sought to uphold these principles in my research.

1. Autonomy – This principle “finds expression in most requirements for voluntary informed consent by all research participants” (Wassenaar, 2006, p. 67).

The aims and purposes of the study were verbally explained in detail to the participants over the phone and again by email. The racialised focus of the research was made explicit. When I met each participant for the tour I gave him a consent form which asked him to consent to participate. The consent was verbal so that participants could not be linked to my research via a signature. The consent letter (Appendix 8) made it clear that they could withdraw from the research at any time, that their transcripts (and other material) would be safeguarded in a locked environment once transcribed, that I alone would be responsible for transcribing, that the names of the interviewees would be changed to pseudonyms immediately (with key identifying information obscured too) and their identities protected at all times, that the electronic and audio data would be stored in a safe file on my computer (and on back-up disks) only and destroyed within a year of the completion of my PhD, that the raw data containing participants personal details would be securely stored and destroyed once the data had been analysed, and that I would be available by telephone or email to answer participant's questions at all stages of the research.

Most participants did not read the consent form carefully. This was probably because they knew me. Those participants I met in their offices glanced briefly at the consent form I gave them and then either put the sheet of paper down and ignored it or brought it along on the tour where it was ignored. A number of participants met me in my car so I gave them the consent form at that point. This also was not all that effective and often they did not read it. In the end, I emailed the consent forms to all participants once the tours were over. In retrospect I should have ensured that each participant read the form, or that I read it to them, and that they understood its contents before consenting to participate.

As I knew many of the men whom I approached to participate I was concerned that some of them may have felt obliged to participate. I was particularly careful to explain that I had a number of other people on my possible participant list and that there was no obligation on them to participate.

Choosing to work with men who were relatively powerful and privileged (well educated, employed, semi-professional and professional) limited the risks of participant exploitation to some extent: they were more autonomous because they were not poor, uneducated or powerless (Emmanuel, Wendler, Killen and Grady, 2004, p. 933).

When the relevant university committees accepted my research proposal I decided that it was appropriate to get permission to interview the city workers from the City Manager, even though I was intending to interview senior local government officials whose seniority meant that they had the professional freedom to talk to a researcher without seeking 'permission' from someone higher in the organisational hierarchy. I had known the City Manager as a 'political acquaintance' ('comrade') for many years but he was very busy and gaining access to him was difficult. Fortunately we had a chance social encounter at that time and I was able to explain my research proposal to him, including details about the kind of people I was intending to interview. He was interested and supportive, telling me about a related research project he had completed with some of his students when he was a university academic in the local Town and Regional Planning Department in the 1980s.¹⁷

2. Nonmaleficence – This principle “supplements the autonomy principle and requires the researcher to ensure that no harm befalls research participants as a direct or indirect consequence of the research” (Wassenaar, 2006, p. 67).

In this research, the obligation of nonmaleficence was primarily ensured by the maintenance of strict confidentiality, as the participants were senior local government officials whose words (especially given the racialised nature of our discussions) could potentially be damaging to their positions in the public sphere if quoted out of context. In addition, giving participants clear procedural guidelines (including information

¹⁷ He had asked his black and white students to draw the city of Durban and had worked with them to analyse their heavily racialised representations of the city, that is, what they included and excluded spatially and how these decisions were racialised.

about the focus on racialised talk) hopefully enabled them to make a choice to participate or not based on their own assessment of the potential harm of the research to them psychologically or professionally.

The line of inquiry approach of the tours was partly intended to challenge participants' possibly naïve realism: their 'belief' in essential truths and singular realities (Rosenblatt, 2003, p. 227). This approach is a reflection of my own social constructionist ontology but it is also a way of encouraging those participants who may read my research in the future – and potentially feel misrepresented – to recognise that my writing about the tours is *my* subjective construction of reality and that there are others. I also followed up on the tours with emails thanking participants and making myself available for follow-up questions and discussions.

3. Beneficence – This principle “obliges the researcher to attempt to maximise the benefits that the research will afford to the participants in the research study” which include, inter alia, better access to facilities, better skills or better knowledge of the topic in question (Wassenaar, 2006, p. 67).

It is my contention that any research which attempts to contribute to the body of literature which seeks to impact positively on race relations in South Africa is of benefit to our society broadly. I am interested in considering ways of disseminating my research findings in the popular media that will not compromise the research participants (or the institution of local government) but which will highlight both pervasive and negative racial practices, and positive findings. My intention is also to submit parts of the research project to academic journals for publication. An article, co-authored with my supervisor, is currently in press and two others are drafted.

The novelty of the tours – mobile interviews through the city – seemed to engage the participants and there was often a sense that they (and I) were both learning from and enjoying the tour conversations.

4. Justice – This principle in general requires that researchers “treat research participants with fairness and equity during all stages of research ... Justice also requires that those who stand to benefit from the research should also bear the burdens of the research, and vice versa” (Wassenaar, 2006, p. 68).

Participants were informed explicitly that the research project aimed to look at racialised changes in the city and in this way they were treated with honesty and openness in terms of my research objectives. In addition, my construction of the tour as a co-production means that I, as the researcher, did, to some extent, bear the burdens of the research engagement. For example, following my pilot interviews, I was conscious that I had been involved in conversations about race, which, at times, had not been comfortable and easy. The inter-active nature of the tours was a very demanding experience for me as a co-creator of an active interview which seemed appropriate and relatively 'fair'.

Appendix 3: Transcription codes¹⁸

Of the conventional/traditional transcription codes, I used only those that were useful to my research purpose. The mobility of the tours ensured endless auditory and visual distractions for the participants and so most of the complex conversation analytic codes were unsuitable. For example, I could not read much into a lexical hesitation because it could be less a function of the conversational work and more a function of a noisy truck driving by or another pedestrian walking between us and briefly interrupting the conversation. Like Verkuyten (2005), my choice of transcription mode was made on the basis that my interest is in the “interpretative accounts used by the participants rather than on the fine-grained sequential organization of the material” so “details such as timing and intonation have not been included” (p. 228).

In all the extracts L refers to me, the researcher, Lyndsay Brown. Participants are referred to by pseudonyms.

One or more colons indicates the extension of the previous sound e.g m:::m
Laughter is marked by hr. The number of hr is a rough marker of duration of the laughter.

Numbers in parentheses, e.g., (0.5) indicate pauses in tenths of a second specified in incremental units 0.2, 0.5, 0.8, 1.0, etc.

(.) indicates a micropause of less than 0.2 seconds

(inaudible) marks inaudible speech, time specified in seconds

[text in italics] denotes reflections and observations inserted after the tour from field notes about where we were when walking and talking or what else was going on at that particular time. I have also included notes entered while I was transcribing the tours.

¹⁸ Based loosely on transcription conventions used by Durrheim and Dixon (2005), which are based “on a simplified version of the Jefferson conventions” (p. 221).

Appendix 4: Email with Mandla

Hi Mandla

Thanks for agreeing to an interview.

When I come and find you on Wednesday morning I was wondering if we could take a walking talking tour of Durban with you showing me and telling me about the places that have been important to you in this City, as a child and as an adult? I am particularly interested in those places which are racialised in any way. We don't have to rush around as I am more interested in focused conversations about a few places rather than a rushed discussion of many places.

We can drive or walk somewhere, whatever would work best, but generally we need to stay in the Durban CBD as this is my area of study.

I will bring along a lapel mike and tape-recorder so if possible please would you wear a shirt with a pocket so we can put the tiny taperecorder in there?

See you Wednesday at 9. Phone me if you have any problems making that time. My cell no is...

Love Lyndsay

Appendix 5: Informed consent letter [on letterhead]

I am a student at the University of KwaZulu-Natal and I am interested in finding out how the city of Durban has changed in the last ten years or so. I am particularly interested in those places in Durban that are racialised in some way. I would be most grateful if you would agree to participate in my research. Please understand that your participation is voluntary and you are not being forced to take part in the study. The choice of whether to participate is yours alone. However I would really appreciate it if you would share your thoughts with me. If you choose not to take part in answering any of my questions, you will not be affected in any way whatsoever. If you agree to participate, you may stop at any time and discontinue your participation. If you refuse to participate or withdraw at any stage, there will be no penalties and you will not be prejudiced in any way.

I would like to do an audio recording of this interview. These recordings will be kept securely in a locked environment and will be destroyed or erased once data capture and analysis are complete. I will not record your name and no one will be able to link you to the answers you give. Only I will have access to the unlinked information. The raw data (and identifying details) will all be destroyed within a year of the completion of my studies.

In order to ensure your name is not linked to my research I will not ask you to sign an informed consent form. **Your participation in my research will be an indication of your consent to participate.**

The interview will last about one and a half hours. I will be asking you to take me on a walking or driving tour of Durban and request that you are as open and honest as possible in your talk about the city and in your answers to any questions. You may choose not to answer these questions. I will also be asking some questions that you may not have thought about before, and which also involves thinking about the past and/or the future. I know that you cannot be absolutely certain about these answers but I do ask that you think about them as there are no right or wrong answers. If I ask you a question or if we have a conversation that makes you feel sad or upset, we can stop talking about it. There are also counsellors whom I can put you in contact with, who are willing and able to talk with and/or assist you.

If you have any questions about this research you may contact my supervisor, Professor Kevin Durrheim, at the University of KwaZulu-Natal in Pietermaritzburg on 033 – 2605348. If you have a complaint about any aspect of this study you may also contact the ethics committee of the University of KwaZulu-Natal on 031 – 2603587. Please feel free to contact me at anytime to discuss this research. My details are lyndsaybrown@worldonline.co.za and ... (cell/mobile number).

Many thanks

Lyndsay Brown

Appendix 6: Detailed routes and dates of tours

The tours were conducted in 2007. They included

- A driving and walking tour with Nthando on Monday 15 May: from Smith Street, along Point Road to Addington Primary School, along Marine Parade to Joe Cool's bar and then along Point Road again to the Meat Junction café.
- A walking tour with Andrew on Tuesday 16 May through the central business district including West and Smith Street, Pine and Commercial Street and along the Victoria Embankment with Andrew.
- A driving and walking tour of the Grey Street complex with Magen (second tour) on Friday 19 May: from Smith Street through West Street, Pine Street and Commercial Street to the Grey Street Complex including Victoria Street, Grey Street, Queen Street, Prince Albert Street and Prince Edward Street.
- A driving and walking tour with Menzi on Saturday 20 May: from Moore Road along the Victoria Embankment and Point Road to the Point Harbour development
- A driving and walking tour with Mbuso on Monday 22 May: from Smith Street along Broad Street to St Andrews Street, into Park Street (Albert Park), along the Victoria Embankment to the Bat Centre and then through the Grey Street Complex (including Grey Street, Queen Street and Victoria Street) to the Victoria Street Market area.
- A driving tour of Chatsworth with Gregory on Tuesday 23 May
- A walking tour with Brian on Wednesday 24 May: from Smith Street to Gardiner Street and Field Street to West Street then along the Victoria Embankment to the Yacht Mole, back along Aliwal Street to Old Fort Road.
- A driving (and stopping) tour of the 'golden mile' beachfront area with Meenesh on Friday 26 May
- A driving tour with Sifiso on Tuesday 30 May: from Old Fort Road along NMR Avenue to the restaurants and clubs in Florida Road and Stamford Hill Road, including a café visit to Tribeca in Florida Road.

In addition, the pilot tours with Magen and Mandla became part of my 'data':

- A driving and walking tour of the beachfront with Mandla on 15 March: from Smith Street along the Marine Parade via Blue Lagoon to a City infrastructural

depot and warehouse complex, then via Umngeni Road Station and the Grey Street complex and West and Smith Street.

- A walking tour with Magen on 7 March of the central business district and Point Road area

Appendix 7: Street names

Table detailing changed street names as referenced in this thesis

OLD NAME	NEW NAME	TYPE	SUBURB
ALBERT ST	INGCUCE	ROAD	CBD
ALIWAL STREET	SAMORA MACHEL	STREET	CBD
FIELD ST	JOE SLOVO	STREET	CBD
GARDINER ST	DOROTHY NYEMBE	STREET	CBD
MARINE PARADE	O R TAMBO	PARADE	DURBAN BEACH FRONT
MASONIC GROVE	DULLAR OMAR	GROVE	CBD
MOORE RD	CHE GUEVARA	ROAD	BULWER
PINE ST	MONTY NAICKER	ROAD	CBD
PRINCE ALFRED STREET	FLORENCE NZAMA	STREET	CBD
PRINCE EDWARD	DR GOONAM	STREET	CBD
QUEEN ST	DENIS HURLEY	STREET	CBD
SMITH ST	ANTON LEMBEDE	STREET	CBD
VICTORIA STREET	BERTA MKHIZE	STREET	CBD
WARWICK AV	JULIUS NYERERE	AVENUE	WARWICK
WEST ST	DR PIXLEY KASEME	STREET	CBD
VICTORIA EMBANKMENT	MARGARET MNCADI	AVENUE	CBD
NMR AVENUE	MASABALALA YENGWA	AVENUE	CBD
POINT ROAD	MAHATMA GANDHI	STREET	CBD
BROAD / GREY	DR YUSUF DADOO	STREET	CBD
COMMERCIAL STREET	DR Z B XUMA	STREET	CBD

Source: <http://www.durban.gov.za/durban/government/mayor/renaming/new-names/final>

References

- Agnew, J.A. and Duncan, J.S. (1989). Introduction. In J. Agnew and J. Duncan (Eds.), *The power of place: bringing together geographical and sociological imaginations*. Boston: Unwin Hyman.
- Alexander, B. (2004). Black Skin/White Masks: The performative sustainability of whiteness (with apologies to Frantz Fanon). *Qualitative Inquiry*, 10(5), 647-672.
- Alexander, C. and Knowles, C. (2005). Introduction. In C. Alexander and C. Knowles (Eds.), *Making race matter: bodies, space and identity*. Hampshire: Macmillan.
- Ambler, C. and Crush, J. (1992). *Liquor and labour in Southern Africa*. Athens: Ohio University Press.
- Anderson, B. [1983] (1991). *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism* (2nd edition). London: Verso.
- Anderson, J. (2004). Talking whilst walking: a geographical archaeology of knowledge. *Area*, 36(3), 254-261.
- Appiah, K. A. (1992). *In my father's house: Africa in the philosophy of culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Atkinson, P. and Silverman, D. (1997). Kundera's *immortality*: The interview society and the invention of the self. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 3, 304-325.
- Augoustinos, M., Tuffin, K. and Every, D. (2005). New racism, meritocracy and individualism: constraining affirmative action in education. *Discourse and Society*, 16 (3), 315-340.
- Augoustinos, M. and Every, D. (2007). The language of 'race' and prejudice: a discourse of denial, reason and liberal-practical politics. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 26(2), 123 – 141.

Back, L. (2005). 'Home from home': Youth, belonging and place. In C. Alexander and C. Knowles (Eds.), *Making race matter: bodies, space and identity*. Hampshire: Macmillan.

Baerenholdt, J. and Simonsen, K. (2004). Introduction. In J. Baerenholdt and K. Simonsen (Eds.), *Space Odysseys and social relations in the 21st century*. Aldershot, England: Ashgate.

Baker, C. (2003). Ethnomethodological analyses of interviews. In J. A. Holstein and J. F. Gubrium (Eds.), *Inside Interviewing: New lenses, new concerns*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ballard, R. (2002). *Desegregating minds: white identities and urban change in South Africa*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Wales, Swansea.

Ballard, R. (2003). *The elephant in the living room: the denial of the importance of race by whites in the new South Africa*. Paper presented at the History and African Studies Seminar Series, University of Natal, Durban.

Ballard, R. (2004a). The Ant and the Grasshopper: Rationalising exclusion and inequality in the post-apartheid city. *Theoria*, 105, 64-87.

Ballard, R. (2004b). Middle class neighbourhoods or "African Kraals"? The impact of informal settlements and vagrants on post-apartheid white identity. *Urban Forum*, 15 (1), 48-73.

Ballard, R. (2004c). Assimilation, emigration, semigration and integration. In N. Distiller and M. Steyn (Eds.), *Under construction: 'race' and 'identity' in South Africa today*. Johannesburg: Heinemann Publishers.

Ballard, R. (2005a). *Slaughter in the suburbs: testing white South-Africans' 'non-racism'*. Paper presented at International Critical Psychology Conference, Durban.

Ballard, R. (2005b). *Bunkers for the psyche: how gated communities have allowed the privatization of apartheid in democratic South Africa*. Dark Roast Occasional Paper Series, 24. Cape Town: Isandla Institute.

Barnes, J. (1998). *England, My England*. London: Jonathan Cape.

Barnes, B., Palmary, I. and Durrheim, K. (2001). The denial of racism: the role of humor, personal experience and self-censorship. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 20 (3) , 321-338.

Bauman, Z. (2004). *Identity: Conversations with Benedetto Vecchi*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Best, A. (2003). Doing race in the context of feminist interviewing: constructing whiteness through talk. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 9(6), 895-914.

Bhavnani, R., Mirza, H.S. and Meeto, V. (2005). *Tackling the roots of racism: lessons for success*. Bristol: Polity Press.

Billig, M. (1988). The notion of prejudice: Rhetorical and ideological aspects. *Text*, 8, 91-110.

Billig, M. (1991). *Ideology and Opinions*. London: Sage.

Billig, M., Condor, S., Edwards, D., Gane, M., Middleton, D. and Radley, A. (1988). *Ideological dilemmas: a social psychology of everyday thinking*. London: Sage.

Boateng, P. Message of welcome. *In Violence and Xenophobia in South Africa: Developing consensus, moving to action*. Human Sciences Research Council. Retrieved from: http://www.polity.org.za/article.php?a_id=145962, 10-11.

Boesak, A. (2008, July 30). Ashley Kriel Memorial Youth Lecture, University of Western Cape. Cape Town. Retrieved from <http://historymatters.co.za/2008/08/01/%e2%80%9call-here-and-now%e2%80%9d-the-politics-of-hope-or-the-politics-of-delusion/>

Bolam, B., Murphy, S. and Gleeson, K. (2006). Place-identity and geographical inequalities in health: a qualitative study. *Psychology and Health*, 21(3), 399-420.

Bonnett, A. (1996). Constructions of 'race', place and discipline: geographies of 'racial' identity and racism. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 19(4), 864-883.

Bonilla-Silva, E. and Forman, T. (2000). "I am not a racist but...": mapping White college students' racial ideology in the USA. *Discourse and Society*, 11(1), 50-85.

Brown, A. and Humphreys, M. (2006). Organisational identity and place: a discursive exploration of hegemony and resistance. *Journal of Management Studies*, 43 (2), 231-257.

Brown, J. N. (2005). *Dropping anchor, setting sail: geographies of race in black Liverpool*. Princetown: Princetown University Press.

Brown, L. and Durrheim, K. (in press). *Different kinds of knowing: generating qualitative data through mobile interviewing*.

Campani, G. (2002). The role and forms of education. In E. Preckler, C. Castille and C. Evens (Eds.), *Europe's new racism: causes, manifestations and solutions*. Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Capdevila, R. and Callaghan, J. (2008). 'It's not racist. It's commons sense'. A critical analysis of political discourse around asylum and immigration in the UK. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 18, 1-16.

Carter, J., Dyer, P. and Sharma, B. (2007). Dis-placed voices: sense of place and place-identity on the Sunshine Coast. *Social and Cultural Geography*, 8(5), 755-773.

Casey, E. (2001). Between geography and philosophy: what does it mean to be in the place-world? *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 91(4), 683-693.

Chang, T.C. (2005). Place, memory and identity: imagining 'new Asia'. *Asia Pacific Viewpoint*, 46 (3), 247-253.

Clement, M. (2006, September). *Botanic gardens and place identity: informing a more relevant educational practice*. Paper presented at the 6th International Congress on Education in Botanic Gardens, London, England.

Retrieved from <http://www.bgci.org/educationcongress/pages/authors.htm>

Condor, S. (2006). Public prejudice as collaborative Accomplishment: Towards a dialogic social psychology of racism. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 16, 1-18.

Cresswell, T. (2004). *Place: a short introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Crossley, N. (1996). Body-Subject/Body-Power: Agency, inscription and control in Foucault and Merleau-Ponty. *Body and Society*, 2 (2): 99-116.

Davies, B. and Harré, R. (1999). Positioning and Personhood. In R. Harré and L. Van Langenhove (Eds.), *Positioning Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Day, K. (2006). Being feared: masculinity and race in public space. *Environment and Planning A*, 38, 569-586.

De Certeau, M. (1984). *The practice of everyday life*. California: University of California Press.

De Fina, A., Shiffrin, D. and Bamberg, M. (2006). Introduction. In A. De Fina, D. Shiffrin and M. Bamberg (Eds.), *Discourse and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. (2000). The interview: from structured questions to negotiated text. In N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Denzin, N. (2003). The cinematic society and the reflexive interview. In J. Gubrium and J. Holstein (Eds.). *Postmodern interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Denzin, N. (2007). Review: of *Body and Soul: Notebooks of an apprentice boxer* by Louis Wacquant. *Cultural Sociology*, 1(3), 429-430.

Dixon, J., Foster, D., Durrheim, K. and Wilabraham, L. (1994). Discourse and the politics of space in South Africa: the 'squatter crisis'. *Discourse and Society*, 5(3), 277-296.

Dixon, J. and Durrheim, K. (2000). Displacing place-identity: a discursive approach to locating self and other. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 39, 27-44

Dixon, J. and Durrheim, K. (2004). Dislocating identity: Desegregation and the transformation of place. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 24, 455-473.

Douglas, J. (1985). *Creative Interviewing*. Beverley Hills: Sage.

Durrheim, K. and Dixon, J. (2000). Theories of culture in racist discourse. *Race and Society*, 3, 93-109.

Durrheim, K. and Dixon, J. (2001). The role of place and metaphor in racial exclusion: South Africa's beaches as sites of shifting racialization. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 24(3), 433-450.

Durrheim, K. and Dixon, J. (2005a). Studying talk and embodied practices: toward a psychology of materiality of 'race relations'. *Journal of Community and Applied Psychology*, 15, 446-460.

Durrheim, K. and Dixon, J. (2005b). *Racial Encounter: the social psychology of contact and desegregation*. Hove: Routledge.

Durrheim, K. (2005). Socio-spatial practice and racial representations in a changing South Africa. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 35(3), 444-459.

Durrheim, K. (2006). Research design. In M. Terreblanche, K. Durrheim and D. Painter (Eds.), *Research in Practice* (2nd edition) (pp.34-59). Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press.

Durrheim, K., Hook, D. and Riggs, D. (in press). *Race and Racism*.

Edwards, D. (2003). Analysing racial discourse: the discursive psychology of mind-world relationships. In H. van den Berg, M. Wetherell and H. Houtkoop-Steenstra (Eds.), *Analyzing race talk – multidisciplinary approaches to the interview*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Edwards, I. (1994). Cato Manor: cruel past, pivotal future. *Review of African Political Economy*, 61, 415-427.

Emmanuel, E., Wendler, D., Killen, J. and Grady, C. (2004). What makes clinical research in developing countries ethical? The benchmarks of ethical research. *Journal of Infectious Diseases*, 189, 930-937.

Essed, P. and Goldberg, D. (2002). Introduction. In Essed, P. and Goldberg, D. *Race critical theories*. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers.

eThekwini Municipality (2007). *Employment Equity Report as at end of March 2007*. Durban: EMA.

eThekwini Municipality (2008). Final street renaming list. Retrieved from <http://www.durban.gov.za/durban/government/mayor/renaming/new-names/final>

Every, D. and Augoustinos, M. (2007). Constructions of racism in the Australian parliamentary debates on asylum seekers. *Discourse and Society*, 18(4), 411-436.

Fanon, F. (1986) [1952]. *Black Skin, White Masks*. London: Pluto.

Feagin, J. (1991). The continuing significance of race: antiblack discrimination in public places. *American Sociological Review*, 56, 101-116.

Felonneau, M. (2004). Love and loathing of the city: urbanophilia and urbanophobia, topological identity and perceived incivilities. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 24(1), 43-52.

Fontana, A. and Frey, J. H. (2000). The interview: from structured questions to negotiated text. In N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fozdar, F. (2008). Duelling discourses, shared weapons: rhetorical techniques used to challenge racist arguments. *Discourse and Society*, 19(4), 529-547.

Franchi, V. and Swart, T. (2003). Identity dynamics and the politics of self-definition. In K. Ratele and N. Duncan (Eds.), *Social Psychology: Identities and Relationships*. Cape Town: UCT Press.

Frankenberg, R. (1993). *White women, race matters: the social construction of whiteness*. London: Routledge.

Freund, B. (2002). City hall and the direction of development: the changing role of the local state as a factor in economic planning and development in Durban. In B. Freund and V. Padayachee (Eds.), *Durban (V)ortex: South African city in transition*. Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press.

Freund, B. (2007). *The African city: a history*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Freund, B. and Padayachee, V. (2002). Durban: Structures from the past, pressures in the present, prospects in the future. In B. Freund and V. Padayachee (Eds.), *Durban (V)ortex: South African city in transition*. Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press.

Gergen, K. (1994). Mind, text and society: self-memory in social context. In U. Neisser and R. Fivush (Eds.), *The remembering self: construction and accuracy in the self-narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gillies, V., Harden, A., Johnson, K., Reavey, P., Strange, V. and Willig, C. (2004). Women's collective constructions of embodied practices through memory work: Cartesian dualism in memories of sweating and pain. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 43, 99-112.

Gilroy, P. (2000). *Against race - imagining culture beyond the color line*. Cambridge MA: Cambridge University Press.

Godlewska, A. (2004). Place and identity: the life of Marie de l'Incarnation (1599 – 1672). In T. Mels (Ed.), *Reanimating places: a geography of rhythmns*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Goldberg, D. (1993). *Racist culture: philosophy and the politics of meaning*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Goldberg, D. (2005). Afterwards. In C. Alexander and C. Knowles (Eds.), *Making race matter: bodies, space and identity*. Hampshire: Macmillan.

Goodings, L., Locke, A. and Brown, S.D. (2007). Social networking technology: place identity in mediated communities. *Journal of Community and Applied psychology*, 17 (6), 463-476.

Gospodini, A. (2002). European cities and place-identity. *Discussion paper series*, 8(2), 19-36.

Govinden, B. (2008). *A time of memory: reflections on South African writings*. Durban: Solo Collective.

Grosz, E. (1994). *Volatile bodies: towards a corporeal feminism*. St. Leonards: Allen and Unwin.

Gubrium, J. and Holstein, J. (2003). From the individual interview to the interviewing society. In J. Gubrium and J. Holstein (Eds.), *Postmodern interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Haapala, A. (2003). The urban identity: the city as a place to dwell. In V. Sarapik and Tuur, K (Eds.), *Place and Location*. Estonia: Estonian Academy of Arts.

Hall, S. (1996). Introduction: Who needs identity? In S. Hall and P. du Gay (Eds.), *Questions of Cultural Identity*. London: Sage.

Hall, T., Lashua, B. and Coffey, A. (2008). Sound and the everyday in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 14, 1019-1040.

Hanson, J. (2007). Drag Kinging: embodied acts and acts of embodiment. *Body and Society*, 13(1), 61-106.

Hauge, A. (2007). Identity and place: a critical comparison of three identity theories. *Architectural Science Review*, 50, 4-51.

Havik, K. M. (2003). Towards a site specific-practice: reflections on identity of place. In V. Sarapik and K. Tuur (Eds.), *Place and Location*. Estonia: Estonian Academy of Arts.

Henriques, J. (1984). Social psychology and the politics of racism. In J. Henriques, W. Hollway, C. Urwin, C. Venn and V. Walkerdine (Eds.), *Changing the subject: psychology, social regulation and subjectivity*. London: Methuen.

Henriques, J., Hollway, W., Urwin, C., Venn, C. and Walkerdine, V. (1984a). Introduction: The point of departure. In Henriques, J, Hollway, W., Urwin, C. Venn, C and Walkerdine, V. (Eds.), *Changing the subject: psychology, social regulation and subjectivity*. London: Methuen.

Henriques, J., Hollway, W., Urwin, C., Venn, C. and Walkerdine, V. (1984b). Introduction to section 1: From the individual to the social: a bridge too far. In J. Henriques, W. Hollway, C. Urwin, C. Venn and V. Walkerdine (Eds.), *Changing the subject: psychology, social regulation and subjectivity*. London: Methuen.

Hepburn, A. (2003). *An introduction to critical social psychology*. London: Sage.

Hepburn, A. and Potter, J. (2006). *Transcription*. Retrieved from <http://www-staff.lboro.ac.uk/~ssjap/transcription/transcription.htm>

Hindson, D. and O'Leary, B. (2003). *Durban's changing racial geography: 1985 – 1996. A GIS based analysis of changes in the socio-spatial structure of the metropolitan area between 1985 and 1996*. Durban: EMA press.

Hofmeyr, M. (2003). *White Afrikaner identity in post-apartheid South Africa*. Retrieved from <http://home.concepts-ict.nl/>

Holloway, J. and Kneale, J. (2000). Mikhail Bakhtin: dialogics of space. In Crang, M. and Thrift, N. (Eds). *Thinking Space*. London: Routledge.

Hook, D. (2003). Frantz Fanon and Racial Identity in Post-Colonial Contexts. In K. Ratele and N. Duncan (Eds.), *Social Psychology: Identities and Relationships*. Cape Town: UCT Press.

hooks, b. (2000). *Feminist theory: from margin to center* (2nd edition). London: Pluto Press.

Hopkins, N. and Dixon, J. (2006). Space, place, and identity: issues for political psychology. *Political Psychology*, 27(2), 173-185.

Hubbard, P., Kitchin, R., Bartley, B. and Fuller, D. (2002). *Thinking geographically Space, Theory and Contemporary Human Geography*. Continuum: London.

Human Sciences Research Council (2008). Introduction. *In Violence and Xenophobia in South Africa: Developing consensus, moving to action*. Human Sciences Research Council.

Retrieved from: http://www.polity.org.za/article.php?a_id=145962, 4-8.

Jackson, P. and Penrose, J. (1993) *Constructions of Race, Place and Nation*. London: UCL Press.

Johnson, J. and Weller, S. (2001). Elicitation techniques for interviewing. In J. Gubrium and J. Holstein (Eds.), *Handbook of interview research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Julier, G. (2005). Urban designscapes and the production of aesthetic consent. *Urban Studies*, 42(5/6), 869-887.

Karljalainen, P.T. (2003). On geobiography. In V. Sarapik and K. Tuur (Eds.), *Place and Location*. Estonia: Estonian Academy of Arts.

Kipfer, S. (2007). Fanon and space: colonization, urbanization, and liberation from the colonial to the global city. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 25, 701-726.

Kitchin, F. (2002). *Desegregation, resegregation and centre/periphery in Durban*. Retrieved from http://www.pacte.cnrs.fr/IMG/pdf_32_Kitchin_2.deseg.pdf

Kleiner, B. (1998). The modern racist ideology and its reproduction in "pseudo-arguments". *Discourse and Society*, 9(2), 187-215.

Knowles, C. (2005). Making whiteness: British lifestyle migrants in Hong Kong. In Alexander, C and Knowles, C. (Eds.), *Making race matter: bodies, space and identity*. Hampshire: Macmillan.

Kong, L. and Law, L. (2002). Introduction: Contested landscapes, Asian cities. *Urban Studies*, 39(9), 1503-1512.

Kong, L. and Yeoh, B. (1995). The meanings and making of place: exploring history, community and identity. In L. Kong and B. Yeoh (Eds.), *Portraits of place: history, community and identity in Singapore*. Singapore: Times Editions.

Korpela, K., Hartig, T., Kaiser, F. and Fuhrer, U. (2001). Restorative experience and self-regulation in favorite places. *Environment and Behaviour*, 33(4), 572-589.

Kuper, L., Watts, H. and Davies, R. (1958). *Durban – a study in racial ecology*. London: Jonathan Cape.

Kvale, S. (1996). *InterViews: an introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks California: Sage.

Lapadat, J. and Lindsay, A. (1999). Transcription in research and practice: from standardization of technique to interpretive positionings. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 5(1), 64-86.

Larsen, S. (2004). Place identity in a resource-dependent area of British Columbia. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 94(4), 944-960.

Lee, K. (2008). White whispers. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 14 (6), 896 – 900.

Lefebvre, H. [1977](1991)]. *The production of space*. Oxford: Blackwells. Translated by Nicholson-Smith, D.

Liotard, J. (1984). *The Postmodern Condition*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Maharaj, B. (2002). Segregation, desegregation and de-racialisation: racial politics and the City of Durban. In Freund, B. and V. Padayachee, V. (Eds.), *Durban (V)ortex: South African city in transition*. Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press.

Mallinson, C. and Brewster, Z. (2005). 'Blacks and bubbas': Stereotypes, ideology and categorization processes in restaurant servers' discourse. *Discourse and Society*, 16(6), 787-807.

Manzo, L. and Perkins, D. (2006). Finding common ground: the importance of community participation and planning. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 20(4), 335-350.

Mare, G. (2003). 'Non-racialism' in the struggle against apartheid. *Society in Transition* 34(1), 1-25.

Mason, D. (1994). On the dangers of disconnecting race and racism. *Sociology*, 28(4), 845-858.

May, T. (2005). The change the world, to celebrate life: Merleau-Ponty and Foucault on the body. *Philosophy and Social Criticism*, 31(5-6), 517-531.

Maylam, P. (1996). Introduction: The struggle for space in twentieth-century Durban. In P. Maylam and I. Edwards, I. (Eds.), *The People's City: African life in twentieth century Durban*. Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press.

Maylam, P. (2001). *South Africa's racial past: the history and historiography of racism, segregation and apartheid*. Hampshire: Ashgate.

Mazzei, L. (2004). Silent listenings: deconstructive practices in discourse-based research. *Educational Researcher*, March, 26-34.

Mbeki, T. (1996, May 8). Statement on adoption of Republic of South Africa's Constitutional Bill.

Retrieved from <http://www.anc.org.za/ancdocs/history/mbeki/1996/sp960508.html>

McCarthy, J. (1991). Class, race and urban locational relationships. In M. Swilling, R. Humphries and K. Shubane (Eds.), *Apartheid city in transition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McGuinness, M. and Spinney, J. (2006). *Mobile Methodologies: researching mobile experiences*. Abstract obtained from Royal Geographical Society Annual International Conference 2006 Programme Book.

Miles, M. B. and Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis* (2nd edition). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Miller, G. and Fox, K. (2004). Building bridges: the possibility of analytic dialogue between ethnography, conversation analysis and Foucault. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice*. London: Sage.

Milligan, M. (2003). Displacement and identity discontinuity: the role of nostalgia in establishing new identity categories. *Symbolic Interaction*, 26(3), 381-403.

Mishler, E. (1986). *Research Interviewing*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Mlaba, O. (2005). *Renaming of Martin West building and M4 highway, Durban*. Retrieved from http://www.durban.gov.za/durban/government/mayor/mayor/speeches/2005/renaming_mwest

Narvaez, R. (2006). Embodiment, collective Memory and time. *Body and Society*, 12 (3), 51-73.

Neill, W. (2005). *Berlin Babylon*: the spatiality of memory and identity in recent planning for the German capital. *Planning Theory and Practice*, 6(3), 335-353.

Neocosmos, M. (2008). *The politics of fear and the fear of politics*. Retrieved from: <http://www.abahlali.org/node/3616,1-2>

Nesvag, S. (2002). The development of mass street trading in Durban: the case of *muthi* trading. In B. Freund and V. Padayachee (Eds.), *Durban (V)ortex: South African city in transition*. Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press.

Njoh, A. (2008). Colonial philosophies, urban space, and racial segregation in British and French colonial Africa. *Journal of Black Studies*, 38(4), 579-599.

Nkosi, L. (1983). *Home and exile and other selections*. UK: Longman Publishers.

Norris, S. (2007). The micropolitics of personal nationhood and ethnicity identity. *Discourse and Society*, 18(5), 653-674.

Nylund, K. (2000). Place and cultural identity in the segregated city. *The Finnish Journal of Urban Studies*, 38(3), 8-27.

Oakley, A. (1981). Interviewing women: a contradiction in terms. In H. Roberts (Ed.), *Doing feminist research*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Obama, B. (2008, May 18). *We the people, in order to form a more perfect union*. Transcript in International Herald Tribune. Retrieved from <http://www.ihf.com>

Omi, M. and Winant, H. (1995). *Racial Formation in the United States – From the 1960's to the 1990's* (revised edn). Great Britain: Routledge.

Orum, A. and Chen, X. (2003). *The world of cities: places in comparative and historical perspective*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Osborne, B. (2001). *Landscapes, memory, monuments, and commemoration: putting identity in its place*. Paper commissioned by the Dept of Canadian Heritage for the Ethnocultural, Racial, Religious, and Linguistic Diversity and Identity Seminar. Retrieved from http://epe.lac-bac.gc.ca/100/200/300/citizenship_and_immigration_canada_metropolis/landscapes_memory-e/putinden.pdf

Painter, J. (2000). Pierre Bourdieu. In M. Crang and N. Thrift (Eds.), *Thinking space*. London: Routledge.

Pasquino, P. (1978). Clarifications on the question of power. In Lotringer, S. (Ed.), *Foucault Live: Collected Interviews, 1961 –1984*. New York: Semiotext(e).

Parker, I. (2002). *Critical discursive psychology*. London: Halgrave.

Pascale, C. (2008). Talking about race: shifting the analytical paradigm. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 14(5), 723-741.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). Designing qualitative studies. In M. Patton (Ed.), *Qualitative Research Methods* (2nd edition). Newbury Park: Sage.

Perakyla, A. (2004). Reliability and validity in research on naturally occurring social interaction. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice* (pp. 283-304). London: Sage.

Phalane, T., Hoddinott, G., Parker, G. and Richards, J. (2007). *Being a foreign student in the alien racialized space of the University of KwaZulu-Natal, Pietermaritzburg campus* (in press).

Phillips, D. (2006). Parallel lives: challenging discourses of British Muslim self-segregation. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 24, 25-40.

Pillay, S. (2008). Xenophobia, violence and citizenship. In *Violence and Xenophobia in South Africa: Developing consensus, moving to action*. Human Sciences Research Council.

Retrieved from: http://www.polity.org.za/article.php?a_id=145962, 12-28.

Pile, S. (2008). Where is the subject? Geographical imaginations and spatializing subjectivity. *Subjectivity*, 23, 206-218.

Pomerantz, A. and Zemel, A. (2003). Perspectives and frameworks in interviewers' queries. In H. van den Berg, M. Wetherell and H. Houtkoop-Steenstra (Eds.), *Analyzing race talk – multidisciplinary approaches to the interview*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Popke, J. (1997). *Post-colonialism, the question of identity and the South African Transition*. Paper presented at the History and African Studies Seminar Series, University of Natal, Durban.

Popke, J. and Ballard, R. (2004). Dislocating modernity: identity, space and representations of street trade in Durban, South Africa. *Geoforum*, 35, 99-110.

Posel, D. (2001). What's in a name? Racial categorisations under apartheid and their afterlife. *Transformation: Critical perspectives on Southern Africa*, 27, 50-74.

Potter, J. and Wetherell, M. (1994). Analyzing discourse. In A. Bryman and R. Burgess (Eds.), *Analysing Qualitative Data*. London: Routledge.

Potter, J. (1998). Discursive social psychology: From attitudes to evaluative practices. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 9, 233-266.

Potter, J. (2003). Discursive psychology: between method and paradigm. *Discourse and Society*, 14, 783-794.

Potter, J. (2004). Discourse analysis as a way of analysing naturally occurring talk. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative Analysis: issues of theory and method* (2nd edition). London: Sage.

Potter, J. and Hepburn, A. (2005). Qualitative interviews in psychology: problems and possibilities. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 2, 281-307.

Potter, J. and Mulkay, M. (1985). Scientists' interview talk: interviews as a technique for revealing participants' interpretative practices. In M. Brenner, J. Brown and D. Canter (Eds.), *The research interview: uses and approaches*. London: Academic Press.

Potter, J. and Wetherell, M. (1995). Discourse analysis. In J. Smith, R. Harre and R. van Langenhove (Eds.), *Rethinking methods in psychology*. London: Routledge.

Pretty, G., Chipuer, H. and Bramston, P. (2003). Sense of place among adolescents and adults in two rural Australian towns: the discriminating features of place attachment, sense of community and place dependence in relation to place identity. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 23, 273-287.

Proshansky, H. (1978). The city and self-identity. *Environment and Behavior*, 10(2), 147-169.

Proshansky, H., Fabian, A. and Kaminoff, R. (1983). Place-identity: physical world socialization of the self. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 3, 57-83.

Radley, A. (1996). Displays and fragments: embodiment and configuration of social worlds. *Theory and Psychology*, 6(4), 559-576.

Ratele, K. and Schefer, T. (2003). Bodies and apartheid. In K. Ratele and N. Duncan (Eds.), *Social Psychology: Identities and relationships*. Cape Town: UCT Press.

Rathzel, N. (2002). Developments in theories of racism. In E. Preckler, C. Castille and C. Evens (Eds.), *Europe's new racism: causes, manifestations and solutions*. Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Razack, S. (2002). Introduction: When place becomes race. In Razack, S (Ed.), *Race, space and the law: unmapping a white settler society*. Toronto: Between the Lines Publishers.

Reavey, P. and Brown, S. (2007). Rethinking agency in memory: space and embodiment in memories of child sexual abuse. *Journal of Social Work Practice*, 21(1), 5-21.

Relph, E. (1976). *Place and placelessness*. London: Pion Limited.

Rhodes, C. (2000). Ghostwriting research: positioning the researcher in the interview text. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 6(4), 511-525.

Robinson, J (1997). The Geopolitics of South African Cities: States, Citizens, Territory. *Political Geography*, 16 (5), 365-386.

Rosenblatt, P. (2003). Interviewing at the border of fact and fiction. In J. Gubrium and J. Holstein (Eds.), *Postmodern interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. London: Penguin Books.

Saldanha, A. (2006). Reontologising race: the machinic geography of phenotype. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 24, 9-24.

Sampson, E. (1998). Establishing embodiment in psychology. In H. Stam (Ed.), *The body and psychology*. Sage: London.

Sheller, M and Urry, J. (2006). The new mobilities paradigm. *Environment and Planning A*, 38, 207-226.

Shilling, C. (1993). *The body and social theory*. Sage: London.

Shotter, J. (2008). *John Shotter's homepage*.
Retrieved from <http://pubpages.unh.edu/~jds/>

Silverman, D. (2005). *Doing qualitative research* (2nd edition). London: Sage.

Sin, C. H. (2007). Ethnic matching in qualitative research: reversing the gaze on 'white others' and 'white' as 'other'. *Qualitative Research*, (4), 477-499.

Skinner, D. (2007). Groundhog day? The strange case of sociology, race and 'science'. *Sociology*, 41(5), 931-943.

Soja, E. (1996). *Thirdspace Journeys to Los Angeles and other real-and-imagined places*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Solomos, J. and Back, L. (1994). Conceptualising racisms: social theory, politics and research. *Sociology*, 28(1), 143-161.

Solomos, J. and Schuster, L. (2002). Hate speech, violence and contemporary racisms. In E. Preckler, C. Castille and C. Evens (Eds.), *Europe's new racism: causes, manifestations and solutions*. Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Stedman, R. (2002). Towards a social psychology of place: predicting behavior from place-based cognitions, attitudes and identity. *Environment and Behaviour*, 34(5), 561-581.

Steinbeck, J. (1951) [1970]). *The East of Eden letters: Journal of a novel*. London: Pan Books.

Steyn, M. (2001). "*Whiteness just isn't what it used to be*": white identity in a changing South Africa. New York: State University of New York Press.

Swanson, M. (1965). The rise of multicultural Durban: urban history and race policy in South Africa 1830 – 1930. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Harvard University, Boston.

Tappan, M. (2005). Domination, subordination and the dialogical self: identity development and the politics of 'ideological becoming'. *Culture and Psychology*, 11 (1), 47 – 75.

Taylor, A. (2000). 'The sun always shines in Perth': a post-colonial geography of identity, memory and place. *Australian Geographical Studies*, 38(1), 27-35.

Taylor, C. (1999). To follow a rule... In R. Shusterman (Ed.), *A critical reader: Bourdieu*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Taylor, R. and Foster, D. (1999). Advancing non-racialism in post-apartheid South Africa. In Palmberg, M. (Ed.), *National identity and democracy in South Africa*. Cape Town: HSRC (SA), Mayibuye Centre (UWC) and Nordic Africa Institute.

Teo, P. (2000). Racism in the news: a critical discourse analysis of news reporting in two Australian newspapers. *Discourse and Society*, 11(1), 7-49.

Thrift, N. (1996). *Spatial formations*. London: Sage.

Tilbury, F. and Colic-Peisker, V. (2006). Deflecting responsibility in employer talk about race discrimination. *Discourse and Society*, 17(5), 651-676.

Tileaga, C. (2005). Accounting for extreme prejudice and legitimating blame in talk about the Romanies. *Discourse and Society*, 16(5), 603-624.

Tileaga, C. (2006). Discourse, dominance and power relations. *Ethnicities*, 6(4), 476-497.

Till, K. E. (2005). *The new Berlin: Memory, politics, place*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Torr, L. (1996). Lamontville: a history 1930 – 1960. In P. Maylam and I. Edwards (Eds.), *The People's City: African life in twentieth century Durban*. Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press.

Tuan, Y. (1974). *Topophilia: a study of environmental perception, attitudes and values*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Tuan, Y. (2004). Sense of place: its relationship to self and time. In T. Mels (Ed.), *Reanimating places: a geography of rhythmns*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Turner, B. (1996). *The body in society: explorations in social theory*. Sage: London.

UNESCO (1950). The Race Question.

Retrieved from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001282/128291eo.pdf>

Utz, H.L. (2001). Collective identity in Appalachia: place, protest and the AEP powerline. Unpublished Masters thesis. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia.

Valentine, G. (2001). *Social geographies: space and society*. Essex: Prentice Hall.

Van der Riet, M. and Durrheim, K. (2006). Putting design into practice: writing and evaluating research proposals. In M. Terreblanche, K. Durrheim and D. Painter (Eds.), *Research in Practice* (2nd edition). Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press.

Vargas, Y. (2008). Marco said I look like charcoal. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 14 (6), 949-954.

Verkuyten, M. (2005). Immigration discourses and their impact on multiculturalism: a discursive and experimental study. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 44, 223-240.

Veronis, L. (2007). Strategic spatial essentialism: Latin Americans' real and imagined geographies of belonging in Toronto. *Social and Cultural Geography*, 8(3), 455-473.

Waage, S.A. (2001). (Re)claiming space and place through collaborative planning in rural Oregon. *Political Geography*, 20, 839-857.

Wainwright, S.P., Williams, C. and Turner, B. (2007). Globalization, habitus and the balletic body. *Cultural Studies, Critical Methodologies*, 7(3), 308-325.

Walker, R. (2007). An alternative construction of identity: a study of place-based identity and its implications. *American Communication Journal*, 9(3), 1-15.

Wallwork, J. and Dixon, J. (2004). Foxes, green fields and Britishness: On the rhetorical construction of place and national identity. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 43, 21-39.

Walters, R. (2007). Barack Obama and the politics of blackness. *Journal of Black Studies*, 38(1), 7-29.

Wassenaar, D. (2006). Ethical issues in social science research. In M. Terreblanche, K. Durrheim and D. Painter (Eds.), *Research in Practice* (2nd edition). Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press.

Waymer, D. (2008). A Man: an autoethnographic analysis of black male identity negotiation. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 14 (6), 968-989.

Wetherell, M. (1998). Positioning and interpretative repertoires: Conversation analysis and post-structuralism in dialogue. *Discourse and Society*, 9, 387 – 412.

Wetherell, M. (2003). Racism and the analysis of cultural resources in interviews. In H. van den Berg, M. Wetherell and H. Houtkoop-Steenstra (Eds.), *Analyzing race talk – multidisciplinary approaches to the interview*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wetherell, M. and Potter, J. (1992). *Mapping the language of racism: discourse and the legitimation of exploitation*. Hertfordshire: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Williams, A. (1936). A sunlight city by the seas. In A. Macmillan (Ed.), *Durban past and present*. Durban: Brown and Davis.

Wilson, K. and Peters, E. (2005). “You can make a place for it”: remapping urban First Nations spaces of identity. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 23, 395-413.

Young, R (1995). *Colonial desire: hybridity in theory, culture and race*. Routledge: New York.

Yuen, B. (2005). Searching for place identity in Singapore. *Habitat International*, 29, 197-214.

Zezeza, P. (2008). *The racialised complexes of xenophobia*. In The Zezeza Post. Retrieved from:

<http://zezeza.com/bloggng/african-affairs/racialized-complexes-xenophobia>

Newspaper articles

Xenophobia like apartheid racism. Independent Online, 21 May 2008. Retrieved from http://www.iol.co.za/index.php?set_id=1andclick_id=3069andart_id=nw20080521184230237C290136

The violence spreads. Independent Online, 21 May, 2008. Retrieved from http://www.iol.co.za/index.php?set_id=1andclick_id=3045andart_id=nw20080521172556148C550140

Go back to Mozambique, Durban residents hear. Independent Online, 20 May 2008. Retrieved from http://www.iol.co.za/index.php?set_id=1andclick_id=3045andart_id=vn20080520060537797C487378

Zuma blames poverty for xenophobia. The Times, 22 June 2008. Retrieved from <http://www.thetimes.co.za/SpecialReports/Xenophobia/Article.aspx?id=788808>

Thanks, but no thanks – refugees. The Times, 30 June 2008. Retrieved from <http://www.thetimes.co.za/SpecialReports/Xenophobia/Article.aspx?id=775889>

Smit tackles racists. The Times, 3 September 2008. Retrieved from <http://www.thetimes.co.za/News/Article.aspx?id=835359>

Racist video surfaces at the University of the Free State. Mail and Guardian online, 26 February. Retrieved from <http://www.mg.co.za/article/2008-02-26-racist-video-surfaces-at-the-university-of-free-state>

Racist video: 'FF+ must take rap'. Mail and Guardian, February 29 – March 6, 2008.

~~From West Street to Dr Pixley KaSeme Street:
How contemporary racialised subjectivities are produced in the city of Durban~~

Reitz had been home to troublemakers. Mail and Guardian, February 29 – March 6, 2008.

Campus a timebomb: students receive death threats. The Independent on Saturday, 1 March 2008.

Name changes: debate ranges on. Sunday Tribune, 23 July, 2006.