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SUMMARY

South Africa has embarked on a journey of transformation since 1994. The ruling ANC has introduced many policies aimed at achieving equality, known as “black empowerment”. The ‘empowerment’ of black women professionals is especially critical in the transformation era.

Empowerment is defined as a process, which “involves individuals gaining control of their lives and fulfilling their needs, …as a result of developing the competencies, skills, and abilities necessary to effectively participate in their social and political worlds” (Kreisberg, 1992:19). From this perspective, empowerment is the essential expression of individualism and self-determination since it embodies the belief that the individual has the ability to effect changes and improve their lives. This individually oriented definition presupposes the importance of constructing one’s ‘self’ as unitary and independent. The ‘unitary self’ is a support of the logic of the ‘Same’, which entails the exclusion of otherness and difference.

In contrast to this approach, the postmodern theory of Julia Kristeva, with its inherent suspicion of doctrines of pure origins and essences, is corrosive of discourses such as ‘empowerment’ that are developed according to the logic of the Same. Kristeva proposes a subject which is always already ‘in process’. Identity is a constructed process, rather than a fundamental essence.

The Oedipal model, extracted from the Kristevan theory of subjectivity, shows how the nine professional women who partook in this study constructed their selves by placing equality and difference in an antithetical relationship. However, a deconstruction of the Oedipal model opens the construct up to its blind spots and, these subjects are shown to base their identities on the splitting off of their feminine capabilities. Instead of being ‘unitary self’, the subjects are subjects-in-process, and they operate both across and within the competing discourses of traditional femininity and masculinity.

As a possible alternative to the positivist paradigm of ‘empowerment’, a Kristevan ‘herethics’ is considered. In South Africa, this is exemplified by the ‘ubuntu’ principle, which entails the recognition of our interdependence. Finally, in order to assist these professional women to embrace the alterity within, whilst competing in a constantly changing and intellectually challenging world, life skills coaching which focuses on the often repressed, emotional aspects, is recommended.

Key terms: Empowerment, black professional women, equality, difference, interdependence, ethics, ubuntu, the Other, subjects-in-process, deconstruction.
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Rien n’est vrai ce qu’on ne dit pas…

(Nothing is true, except what isn’t said.)

Jean Anouilh
Chapter 1. The rationale and outline of the study

1.1 Introduction

The political domination of South Africa came to an end in 1994 with the abolishment of apartheid and the appointment of the country’s first democratic government. Previously, society’s focus was mainly on the impact that apartheid had as it permeated every aspect of political, economic and social structures. This study is situated within the socio-political context of a democratic South Africa and deals with the issue of whether women are (or are not) being advanced as feminine subjects. It is both a feminist and a political project since it focuses specifically on the process of women’s empowerment which, according to Rappaport (1987:130) “…is not only an individual psychological construct, it is also organizational, political, sociological, economic, and spiritual”. The growing interest and awareness of racial and economic justice, equality as well as legal rights in post-apartheid South Africa, are further captured by the concept of empowerment.

Empowerment demands social and personal change, and, in the past decade, South Africa has undergone tremendous socio-political changes. Thus, the concept describes the transformation from individual and collective powerlessness of any person or group who has been subjected to systematic and institutionalized discrimination, to personal, political and cultural power. It is important to acknowledge that, within a postmodernist paradigm, there is interrelatedness between the individual and her socio-political context.

Within the new democracy the issue of black women’s empowerment and equality was given special impetus by the Employment Equity Act of 1998 which provided the legal framework for “implementing affirmative action measures to redress the disadvantages in employment by designated groups, to ensure equitable representation in all occupational categories and levels in the workforce”. This study specifically focuses on black women since, during apartheid, they were doubly stigmatized: both as women and as blacks. Empowering formerly stigmatized persons entails “a process whereby persons who belong to a stigmatized social category throughout their lives can be assisted to develop and increase skills in the exercise of interpersonal influence and the performance of valued social roles” (Solomon, 1976:6).

Through the necessity of confronting and surviving apartheid, black South African women have often assumed positions atypical to those of their white counterparts. The historical pattern of women’s work in South Africa shows that black women have always been heavily involved in the economic production in our country. In contrast to many white women, they have also needed to employ all socio-economic and cultural resources available to them in order to survive. Black women also had to assume economically productive roles as well as retain domestic roles. Professional women are chosen as the subjects of this study, since the high visibility of successful black women serve as powerful role models, also creating a communal sense of responsibility toward their race and their gender.
In many respects, professionals represent the elite cadre of society’s work force. Society has various expectations regarding professionals, and professional prestige is attributed to the fact that these people are highly educated; and are thought to derive a great deal of fulfillment and a large degree of autonomy in their professions. It is against this background that I attend to the research question: namely how do black professional women in post-apartheid South Africa construct their ‘selves’, their subjectivities? This study is explicitly concerned with these postcolonial feminine subjects, with a focus on “…empowering the dispossessed, and the disadvantaged, for tolerance of difference and diversity…”(Young, 2003:113).

Above all, this study stands for “transformational politics…dedicated to the removal of inequality” (ibid.:114). I aim to explicate how black professional women discursively construct a subjective sense of empowerment and agency, within the new South African democracy. In contrast to their conscious construction of themselves according to the normative model of the positivist subject as unified and autonomous, the feminine subject in postcolonial South Africa is found to be a postmodern subject of language, who is able to be creative with the discourses that allow them to resist dominant scripts. Instead of being context-free and independent, she is a discursive product, rooted in historical and cultural influences. Her construction as an ‘empowered’ subject is viewed from the vantage point of a critical approach to psychology, which is inflected by postmodernism, feminism, Foucauldian insights, and psychoanalysis. It is an approach, which aims to eliminate oppression, promote social justice and reshape societal values. It is also representative of an attempt to achieve a better life for the traditionally silenced and marginalized and can be regarded as a political intervention since it aspires to create both new knowledges and new perspectives.

1.2. The outline of the study

Empowerment is viewed as “inextricably linked to both the ability and opportunity to make decisions and to act for oneself. Thus, empowerment is egalitarian in nature, stressing the competence and right of people to take charge of their own destinies” (Staples, cited in Weissberg, 1999:17). In Chapter Two human subjectivity is discussed from the vantage point of a modernist psychological paradigm since the nine subjects who were interviewed in this study, have been found to consciously construct themselves as ‘empowered’ professionals, according to the model of the Cartesian subject. This positivist subject is characterized by autonomy, separateness, rationality, disembodiment and agency. However, this taken-for-granted Cartesian model of subjectivity will be shown to be a historical product which has been constructed in “the seventeenth century and is a consequence of clearly identifiable historical, political and philosophical influences” (Hekman, 1995:110).

The second section of this chapter clearly illustrates that the construction of the ‘empowered’ postcolonial subject as independent, unitary and autonomous is fictive and illusory. And, whereas the Cartesian subject posits a “disembodied, autonomous, abstract agency, (i) it is an agency that has little relevance for most subjects in the contemporary
world, particularly marginalized by race, class, and/or gender” (Hekman, 1995:110 – 111).

Because a positivist construction of the human subject cannot adequately explain the fragmented and contradictory nature of the human subject, Chapter Two elaborates on the contributions of postmodernism and feminism as two major influences, which contribute to the critical paradigm of psychology within which this thesis is situated. Since the subjects are women, specific attention is paid to the influence of feminism, which celebrates the feminine as a political project in its own right and expresses women’s ontological desire, that is, their need to posit themselves as female subjects. Postmodern feminism rejects the concept of an essential and unified human nature, in contrast to the normative, taken-for-granted liberal humanist assumptions of the unified, rational ‘self’, and of woman as defined only in terms of her relation to the male subject, as his Other. Instead, the traditionally ‘male’ subject of knowledge is critiqued and replaced with a different knowing subject, thus challenging the very foundations of traditional knowledge.

The specific postmodernist, feminist theory, which informs this thesis, is the processual subjectivity as developed by Julia Kristeva. In contrast to the positivist paradigm, her critical approach to psychology can be viewed as “a commitment to empowerment, collaboration and cultural pluralism” (Drew et al, 2000:173). It is the site for praxis, which aims at affirming alternative perspectives and suggests new modes of being and of configuration, which no longer function on the basis of exclusion. Its aim is not to erase difference, but to inscribe it in non-oppositional terms.

Chapter Three discusses the Kristevan theory of processual subjectivity (the sujet-en-procès) in detail as it illuminates the discursive construction of the ‘empowered’ professional woman as subject in all its complexity. The sujet-en-procès is a ‘politics of difference’ and a fully discursive challenge to the traditional Lacanian understanding of the Other. It designates human identity as a constructed process and undermines and subverts the notion of a unified subject, by claiming that alterity is within the subject. The Kristevan subject-on-trial as political project is to “question the foundations of modern theories of sexual difference… It further sets out to show how foundationalist categories such as the body, [and] nature …are discursively produced and are effects of power” (Weedon, 1999:116).

Kristeva rewrites the Lacanian Imaginary as a feminine pre-Oedipal phase, and so privileges the child’s identification with the mother over a specular identification. She further expands the notion of the pre-Oedipal/Imaginary in opposition to castration, Oedipalization and the Lacanian Symbolic. Her formulation of the pre-Oedipal is an attempt to locate a creative space outside the Symbolic, which alters the Lacanian idea of subjectivity by reinscribing language within the material body. Signifying practice (signification: the meaning produced by the semiotic in conjunction with the symbolic) is constituted by and within this play between the semiotic and the symbolic. The subject-on-trial is a composite, a rejection of the Cartesian dualism of body and mind. This Kristevan subject, regardless of sexual difference, contains the Other and difference. It
therefore “embodies a kind of lived contradiction; literally an unliveable state of crisis” (Boulous Walker, 1998:107).

Chapter Four describes the specific methodology applied in the thesis. The Oedipal model that is applied to the textual analyses in this study is informed by Kristeva’s theory of the *subject-in-process*. It focuses specifically on the binary opposition between identity (an identification with the symbolic realm) and difference (a denial of the semiotic, bodily realm). The main discourses which illustrate this binary model are identified as “I am similar to the Law of the Father” and “I am different from the (m)Other”, where identity (similarity) is viewed as the positive, valued term and difference is regarded as the absence of identity.

The first reading of the text reveals the dominant interpretation, or the intended meaning of the text. This dominant construction is associated with the Symbolic realm of the Kristevan theory of subjectivity, along with the traditional value assumptions of rationality, order, autonomy and independence. However, a double reading is then applied which reveals the text’s blind spots/ellipsis and brings the text into contradiction with itself, opening against its intended meaning onto an alterity. It is shown to be wholly other, and cannot be reduced to what the text wants to say. As such deconstruction provides us a way of rethinking common conceptions of struggle, politics and power by insisting that no discourse can be as *monolithic* as it attempts to represent itself. The second reading is closely associated with Kristeva’s semiotic (feminine) realm, with the traditional associations of emotionality, irrationality and dependency, amongst others.

The deconstructive approach further reveals that the primary term (a symbolic, unitary identity) derives its identity from the suppression and curtailment (the sacrifice) of the opposite, the devalued, ‘marked’ (the maternal) term. However, this repression is not effective, the unitary subject is ‘haunted’ by the unconscious parts of its ‘self’. And, because of the eruptions of the maternal semiotic, as illustrated by the contradictions inherent in the double reading, the narrators are split subjects, wrought with conflict and contradictions.

Chapter Five focuses on how the professional South African woman constructs her ‘self’ within the socio-political context of both apartheid and post-apartheid South Africa. Because of its imaginative and textual richness and expressive power, literature is used as an effective tool to give a unique perspective on the construct, the ‘empowered’ professional woman. I analyze and compare two novels (one pre-1994 and one post-1994) written by black female South African journalists in order to reveal how the main protagonists or narrators consciously construct themselves according to the normative model of positivism. These constructions are then deconstructed according to the Kristevan model as described in Chapter Four and confirms that the protagonists are not unitary subjects but contradictory, paradoxical subjects-in-process.

Chapter Six provides a detailed analysis of the transcribed semi-structured interviews with nine professional, black South African women in order to empirically verify the Oedipal model as extracted from the Kristevan theory of subjectivity. As with the two
novels, the Oedipal model is applied to all nine interviews in order to get a clear picture of how these subjects consciously construct themselves as ‘empowered’ professional women, according to the norm of positivism. And, like the narrators in the novels (Chapter Five), these women, whose ‘selves’ are wrought with conflict and who are engaged in a struggle to be seen as independent and agentic in the new South African society, are illustrated to possess contradictory ‘selves’, which serves to confirm the Kristevan model of subjectivity.

Chapter Seven focuses on the Kristevan ‘herethics’ which can be integrated with the South African concept of ‘ubuntu’ as a possible solution to the paradox of empowerment. ‘Herethics’ is a relational, dialogical practice that acknowledges both the otherness of the Other and the otherness of the ‘self’ to itself. ‘Herethics’, just like pregnancy, breaks down the borders between identity and difference; which questions the notion of identity, and calls for a move towards a practice that is aware of the inescapable ‘nonidentity’ of the subject. Recognizing the Other within (the multiplicity of positionings and ‘selves’) as well as the other, who differ from ourselves, can be interpreted in the South African concept via the African concept of ‘ubuntu’. This new ethics with its focus on interdependence, serves to highlight a possible way forward in order to achieve true transformation within a rapidly changing society, which allows for the empowerment of women in their specificity and in relation to others.

Chapter Eight concludes with an overview of the study as well as practical recommendations for the empowerment of black professional women in the new South African democracy. Specific interventions such as coaching programmes, which focus on semiotic aspects such as for example, self-awareness and challenging self-limiting thoughts, are recommended as a practical route to facilitate change and empower women as women.
CHAPTER 2: Constructions of subjectivities: challenging perspectives

2.1 Introduction: a positivist perspective on subjectivity and empowerment

In this chapter, human subjectivity and the subjective sense of agency (empowerment) are initially discussed from the vantage point of a modernist psychological paradigm. This approach is followed since the nine female subjects who were interviewed, consciously construct themselves as ‘empowered’ professionals, according to the model of Cartesian subjectivity. This positivist subject is characterized by autonomy, separateness, rationality, disembodiment and agency. Empowerment, or agency, is defined as “…a process: the mechanism by which people, organizations and communities gain mastery over their lives” (Rappaport, cited in Weissberg, 1999:17). According to Zimmerman and Rappaport (1988:726) empowerment “is a construct that links individual strengths and competencies, natural helping systems, and proactive behaviours to matters of social policy and social change. It is thought to be a process by which individuals gain mastery or control over their own lives …”. These definitions clearly reflect how traditionally, subjectivity and its possibilities of empowerment are situated in the rational, autonomous individual of positivism.

However, in the second section of this chapter, this taken-for-granted Cartesian model of subjectivity will be shown to be a historical product which has been constructed in “the seventeenth century and is a consequence of clearly identifiable historical, political and philosophical influences” (Hekman, 1995:110). The influences of postmodernism and feminism will be discussed to show how the taken-for-granted ‘unitary’ subject is actually mythical and illusory by nature.

2.2 The birth of the modern subject of a positivist psychology: a history

In this chapter, a simplified account is given of what has been widely regarded as some of the shifts that have brought about the different conceptualizations of the human subject in Modern thought. The aim is to briefly trace the stages through which the ‘centered human subject’ with certain fixed capacities and a stable sense of its own identity and place in the order of things, emerged in the Modern age, and was shaped in discourses and practices. These discourses and practices in turn, shaped modern societies. Modernist societies show a “commitment to the search for the underlying order in society; an implicit acceptance of the desirability of identifying a ‘master narrative’, a totalizing discourse which will embrace a universalistic understanding of society” (Doherty et al, 1992:10).

For purposes of exposition I shall distinguish between the ‘Enlightenment subject’ and the ‘Postmodern subject’, the latter, which will be discussed in the second section of this chapter. Mapping the (notion of the) history of the modern subject in Psychology from within the understanding that identities are fully unified and coherent with an essential core that remains identical throughout the person’s entire life, is adopted in this section of the chapter as a device for the purpose of explaining how the black professional woman consciously constructs her ‘self’ as an ‘empowered’ subject.
The modern subject is regarded as having changed during strategic stages of the Modern Age and these stages underline the basic presupposition that concepts about subjects change and have a history. The birth of the sovereign individual between the period of the Renaissance of the 16th century and the Enlightenment of the 18th century represented a significant break with the notions of the human subject of the past. A significant shift in metaphysics at the time of the Renaissance led to a shift in the understanding of the individual and its consciousness. The Modern age gave rise to a new and decisive form of individualism, with the individual human subject taking center-stage: individuality was thus lived and conceptualized in a certain manner during this period.

With this modern thought came the innate freedom of the ‘self’ as well as the concepts of free will and determinism. The self-defining individual replaced God at the center of philosophy and the ‘thinking self’ became an imitation of divine power. Meaning was no longer found in the existence of the world or in God, but resided in the individual. Man is placed at the center of the universe and the Renaissance idea of the dignity of humans is to be found in their knowledge and power. And, the Enlightenment, generally associated with the so-called ‘Age of Reason’, was characterized by the advancement of scientific knowledge and reason. The essential philosophy, which underlies this period, is the belief in rationality, which is the belief in the basic order of things. It is viewed as a basic truth, which can be employed for advancing human good. In the modern period, to have scientific knowledge was to have power over the things in the world, which by nature are assumed to be in a state of disorder and chaos. Knowledge, associated with power and modern science, sought to exert control over the world. “The analogy of human power to divine power is decisive for the development of the modern self” (Faulconer & Williams, 1990:26).

René Descartes, the father of modern philosophy, postulated two distinct substances, namely matter and mind and by doing so, placed the individual subject at the center of the mind. The concept of the rational, unitary subject at the center of knowledge became known as the Cartesian subject. Since Descartes, the search for certainty has been firmly grounded in the rationality of the knowing subject and Descartes’ *ego cogito ergo sum* (I think, therefore I am) placed the certainty within man himself. For Descartes and for modernity, the subject was the guarantor of knowledge. The modern ‘self’ ultimately replaced reality as the standard for truth and as the origin for order in the chaotic world. It is perceived as rational and centered with the ability to reason, acquire knowledge and act independently.

### 2.3 The subject of a positivist psychology: a unitary, homogenous essence

The dualism of Cartesian thought as described above, institutionalized a split in the social sciences; and, with the decline of philosophy, psychology aligned itself with the more prestigious natural sciences and aspired to a methodological association with the natural sciences which...conceives itself as a search for knowledge free of moral, political, and social values” (Riger, cited in Nicolson, 1996:16). Psychology, as a science, committed itself to the conventional perspective “...[which] is called empiricist [and which] presumes the existence of a knowable external reality and the availability of investigative
procedures that ensure against contamination of that knowledge by human interests or prejudices” (Morawski, 1994:11).

Psychology positioned itself historically as the “procurer of objective truths about the nature of human social activity” (Gough and McFadden, 2001:104). This specific knowledge professed the desire to contribute to the enhancement of society and in order to produce such knowledge, “concrete definitions of the nature of the individual, society and behaviour are essential, as from such foundations universal codes relating to human activity may be formulated and actions taken to make improvements” (ibid.:104). Along with the identification of psychology with the natural sciences came an interest in the individual, and the “notion of the human dignity began to center on the self-worth of the individual human and on the individual’s ability to create” (Faulconer & Williams, 1990:25).

Subjectivity, or the notion of the self-defining individual, comes into existence and human reflection on the world determines meaning, purpose and truth. The notion of subjectivity also gives rise to its opposite, objectivity, so that the individual can inquire about the relation between their subjective thoughts, meanings and emotions and the purpose of the objective world. The modern “self” is thus world-defining and creates a world of objects, which are manipulated and controlled by one true method through which knowledge is acquired. The assumption of the autonomous subject, disengaged and disembodied, is closely related to the idea that knowledge is a representation of reality. The modernist worldview thus accepts a rational and autonomous subject as the basic component which underlies society, and who pursues its own self-interest. Its notions of agency are taken for granted and as universal.

Psychology’s dominant mission became the generation of knowledge about the nature of human beings and the emergence of the modern “self” is at the heart of a traditional, positivist psychology. Some of the defining characteristics of the subject of Modernity according to Hepburn (2003:224) are:

“1. The self is an individual knowable entity.
2. A rational and unbiased self gives us ‘scientific’ ways of knowing.
3. In order to be objective and unbiased our language must reflect the realities that the rational self observes.
4. By rationally reflecting on reality we are provided with timeless truths that will advance human progress.
5. All human practices and features can be scientifically (neutrally and objectively) analyzed”.

The individual is the focus as well as the object of study in psychology as well as the “seat and origin of psychological function” (Faulconer & Williams, 1990:9). The shared knowledge about the characteristics of subjectivity persists beyond the idiosyncratic differences and nuances of particular psychological theories; it is the metaphysics of subjectivity that reflects the predominant features of the Western worldview. Explanations and theories are at the level of the individual human being and the Western
conception of personhood and agency, which permeates positivist psychology’s understanding of the subject, emphasizes this individual as integrated and whole. Furthermore, the celebration of the individual is based on the positivist call of equality-based-on-sameness. “Each individual was said to be equal to any other individual by virtue of having the same capability to use reason in order to see in the same way as everyone else could see” (Sampson, 1993:80).

Social differences and diversity, which could provide conflicting views of the world, are suppressed in positing the underlying unity of a singular perspective, a universal, transcendent standard. And, this standard of difference (mind and body) is used to justify a denial of difference (male versus female). This ideal of Sameness thus relies on a belief in a universal human nature as a homogenous essence. The attitudes, values and rights of the dominant group is a universal standard which is applicable to all, and individuality is based on the suppression of alternative ideologies of selfhood.

2.4 The inner-outer split

The objective investigation of human behaviour by the positivist approach to human subjectivity, leads to certain predictions, which in turn allows for the identification and construal of laws, and a universal Truth regarding the nature of human beings. The knower and the object are seen as two distinctly separate entities and the assumption is that the knower is in control and all extraneous variables can be managed or controlled. Humans are subjective beings situated in an objective environment, the ‘inner’ and ‘outer’ are split, and the outside of the subject is the environment, whilst the interior of the individual is of the foremost importance, thus locating identity inside the subject. The individual, who is also the transcendental subject of Western philosophy, is the unit for analysis “whose essence precedes and is independent of the experience or the social realm” (Hollway, 1989:28).

The socio-historical and political context is always regarded as somewhat artificial and as inevitably distorting scientific thought. Instead, the modern subject is a-historical and a-social, abstracted from its specific culture and socio-historical context and its psychological processes are universal and essential. The separation of the individual and the social combines “with a belief in the power of the individual self to stand up to the ravages of modernity and to produce…something of value…” (Frosh, 1991:19). The possibility of creativity and self-assertion define the human subject, they have the genuine capacity to produce and elaborate a personal self, which develops in response to the socio-economic and political contexts that surround them. Individuals, in this sense “are not fully constituted by the social processes that surround them. They share in the social…but they are not identical with it” (ibid.:19).

2.5 The ‘death’ of the modern subject: a decentering process

During the period of late Modernity, the late 20th century, identities were being fragmented and de-centered by distinctive structural changes, which transformed these modern societies. These changes caused a shift in personal identities and undermined the
sense of modern ‘selves’ as integrated subjects. The loss of a stable sense of ‘self’, also known as the ‘decentering of the subject’, constituted a crisis of identity for the individual, as it was displaced from both its place in the world and from itself. Not only did the understanding of the human consciousness change, but with it the understanding of reality as a whole.

This decentering process is one of transformation and involves an increasing fragmentation of the modern political landscape. Competing and contradictory identities eroded the “universality” of identity and is brought about, according to Hall (1992: 285-290) by five great advances in social theory, namely Marxism, Freudian psychoanalysis, Saussurean structuralism, Michel Foucault’s ‘genealogy of the subject’ and finally, the impact of feminism. These influences all contribute in varying ways to the dissolution of the modern subject.

While mainstream psychology has maintained its positivist focus on the scientific study of human behaviour and remains the dominant discourse in Western society, the discipline has undergone seemingly dramatic changes as it has been influenced by diverse theories such as Marxism, post-structuralism/modernism, deconstruction, feminism and the discursive turn. These influences have allowed a critique to develop that challenges psychology’s foundational assumptions of the human subject. The late Modern period is marked by a shift in psychology towards a constructionist perspective, which recognizes that knowledge about human behaviour is constructed and affected by its historical, political and socio-economic context. This new paradigm confines the theorizing of a positivist psychology to application within certain specified socio-historical frames and instead aims at an Other-inclusive psychology.

The following section of this chapter focuses on such a critical psychology as an alternative to the positivist construction of the human subject. It is an interdisciplinary and mobile paradigm, which stands at the margins of psychology and various other human studies and stretches across the boundary marking the interior and the exterior of the discipline.

I specifically focus on the contribution of two theoretical approaches as an alternative to a positivist construction of the ‘empowered’ individual, namely postmodernism and feminism, which rigorously challenge the foundational tenets of subjectivity and agency in positivist psychology. Postmodernism and feminism replace the cognitive, individualistic approach with its emphasis on objectivity, rationality and disembodiment from the social world and instead embrace the role of the socio-political context in the construction of the individual.

2.6 A paradigm shift: postmodernist perspectives

Psychology’s subject matter, its role, and its methodologies are constructed by the socio-historical context in which it is created. And, as society changes, psychology changes in response. The ahistorical, apolitical and asocial nature of traditional psychology has brought critical researchers to a consideration of postmodernism as a paradigm.
Postmodernism, (sometimes portrayed as an extension of modernism or, in the stronger versions, as a rejection of modernism) is used here as an appellation to include poststructuralism. This paradigm challenges the search for a universal ‘Truth’, and recognizes change and fragmentation. The rejection of the sovereign Enlightenment subject and of universal, representational knowledge brings the ontological fundamentals of individualism (modernism) into question, and offers psychology new ways of conceptualizing the human subject and its opportunities for agency and empowerment.

The postmodern shift further problematizes Enlightenment beliefs and challenges its totalizing discourses and epistemological foundations. It views the Enlightenment account of the knowledge as fundamentally incorrect and flawed. Postmodernism is committed to the reinterpretation of ‘knowledge’ and challenges “the notion that there is only one, true method by which knowledge is acquired…they define knowledge as plural and heterogenous, there are “truths”, not “Truth” ”(Hekman, 1990:63). Rather, knowledge is constructed within a particular socio-historical and economic context and is open, perspectival and ambiguous. It is not acquired “through the abstraction of an autonomous subject from a separate object, but rather …knowledge, along with subjects and objects, is constituted collectively through forms of discourse…” (ibid.:63).

2.6.1 The turn to context

Postmodern discourse emphasizes the ‘rootedness’ of the subject in a specific historical and cultural situation, the interrelations of a local context, a linguistic and social construction of reality and the ‘self’ as a network of relations. The ‘self’ is not independent or detached from society; it is neither the center of knowledge (‘one who knows ’), nor the possessor of rationality or the author of its own words. Instead, culture is seen as a vehicle for re-theorizing subjectivity and the modernist disregard for context and its focus on the individual, is critiqued. The postmodernist approach accentuates “connections between the psychic and the social as well as the personal and the political, and in forging investigations of the nuances of subjectivity and identity” (Morawski, 1994:65). The socio-cultural context is emphasized, since every culture “complicates research into the social relations that comprize it, and complicates the subjectivity of all who live in it…” (Parker, 2000:196). This turn from the monadic individual to inter-subjectivity and reflexivity reframes questions about the interior and the exterior of the individual. And, this “make[s] subjectivity a resource as well as a topic of inquiry …subjectivity refers simultaneously to the sense of selfhood and to the production of that sense of self at a place in relation to others in language” (ibid.:135).

Postmodern ‘selves’ are “projects, ongoing negotiations within a complex web of relationships and practices…emergent …always in the process of construction during social interaction” (Gough & McFadden, 2001:89). There is no individual prior to social processes; the individual is a product of culture, a member of many communities and networks, and an active participant in many discourses. Any changes in the subjectivity of a person are likely to only occur within the changes of the society within which it exists and the individual “is the mediated product of society and also, in acting, reproduces or potentially transforms that society” (ibid.:6). According to Parker (2000:
“...human action always escapes any grid of behavioural regularity, operates in surprising fluid ways, is embedded in networks of social relations and can only be understood contextually”.

This contextualization casts human subjectivity as dynamic, multiple and fragmented. The individual is seen as the point where a number of social identities intersect even though these constitutive identities themselves are disparate and contradictory. Every subject exists in relation to an other or others and as such “every subject is intricately within an intersubjective web: the I is plural... Our inscription in language, and the narrative character of identity, instantiate the intersubjective ground of subjectivity, and...the primacy of the social” (Venn, 2002:57).

In contrast to the modernist focus on individuality, the postmodern critique suggests that individuality is thoroughly permeated by sociality. The individual’s role is that of a participant in a social process that eclipses his personal being, and one “has an identity only because it is permitted by the social rituals of which one is part; one is allowed to be a certain kind of person because this sort of person is essential to the broader games of society” (Gergen, 1991:157). The concept of the ‘individual personality’ is a communal creation; it is derived from discourse, redefined as relational; and no longer an essence in itself. “One’s sense of individual autonomy gives way to a reality of immersed interdependence, in which it is a relationship that constructs the self” (ibid.:147). The human subject is therefore a “provisional, contingent and constructed subject...whose self-identity is constituted and reconstituted relationally” (Kvale, 1992a: 14).

### 2.6.2 The discursive turn and subjectivity

Postmodern thought is also closely linked to the ‘linguistic turn’ in philosophy, which demarcates the “growing consensus that ideas cannot be understood apart from the language systems that produced them...” (Anderson, 1995:8). It raises fundamental questions regarding the assumption that language about the world operates as a mirror of that world and it views discourse as a largely social process. The assumption that language constitutes rather than copies reality, places the focus firmly on the linguistic and social construction of reality. Discourse constitutes a particular reality and subjectivity and the turn to discourse “is such that all there is in the world is seen as a discursive matter” (Parker, 1992:85).

This ‘discursive turn’ in psychology critiques the modernist belief that subjects “necessarily transcend language, that they create meaning prior to language [and instead]...assert[s]...that subjects are produced by, rather than produce, language” (Hekman, 1990:77). The postmodernist theory of discourse assists us to understand four things: “First, it can help us understand how people’s social identities are fashioned and altered over time. Second, it can help us understand how, under conditions of inequality, social groups ...are formed and unformed. Third, (it) can illuminate how the cultural hegemony of dominant groups in society is secured and contested. Fourth...it can shed light on the prospects for emancipatory social change and political practice” (Fraser, cited in Fraser & Bartky, 1992:178).
Whereas Modernism assumes a coherent ‘self’ which is endowed with rationality and an understanding of universal laws, postmodernism assumes “…a constructed subject that partially embodies, and enacts, conflicting social injunctions stemming from competing social institutions and processes that influence the subject’s desires and agency” (Young, 1997: 170). Human language is neither universal nor individual, but is embedded within a specific culture. Our identities and subjectivities; our sense of who we are and what we can be, are constituted through many discursive practices, which position us in the world. Subjectivity is no longer a matter of ‘free will’; but is constructed through language. The self no longer uses language to express itself; rather the language speaks through the person. The individual ‘self’ “becomes a medium for the culture and its language” (Kvale, 1992b: 36).

The subject’s latitude is thus a product of multiple and competing discourses through which the subject defines its ‘self’ and makes sense of its social reality. “Subjectivity is … multiple, layered, and nonunitary…No longer viewed as merely the repository of consciousness and creativity, the self is constructed as a terrain of conflict and struggle, and subjectivity is seen as a site of both liberation and subjugation” (Giroux, 1992: 60 – 61). The subject constantly occupies different subject positions within conflicting discourses and it is provisional, contingent, strategic and constructed. Human subjectivity “is precarious, contradictory and in process, constantly being reconstituted in discourse each time we think or speak ” (Weedon, 1997:32).

The focus on language is furthermore connected to a “decentring and de-essentializing of the subject and the social” (Rattansi, 1994:29). This decentring involves a critique of a linear connection of subjects to the external reality and de-essentialization entails that subjects are no longer seen as timeless and fixed. Decentering and de-essentialization expose the many discourses and practices, which fragment the subject and challenge the possibility of a fixed, stable identity. The postmodern subject assumes different identities at different times so that it is a constantly shifting, contradictory entity. “This focus on the fundamentally relational nature of identity results in the historically constituted and shifting self versus the static and essentialised self inherent in the concept of the free and self-determining individual” (Lather, 1992:101).

Furthermore, decentering, rather than eliminating the subject, refers to “the multi-centredness of action, a reconceptualisation of agency from subject-centred agency to the plurality and agency of meaning” (ibid.:103). Agency and empowerment, which were once simply a matter of will and desire, are now seen as the products of socio-political and linguistic effects, and the discursive tools available to postmodern subjects allow them a sense of agency and empowerment.

2.6.3 Postmodernism and power

Closely linked to the concepts of agency and empowerment, is the postmodernist accentuation and diffusion of the political problematic of power. This is in contrast to the Enlightenment political thought which is characterized by a denial of the importance of power to knowledge and a concomitant denial of the centrality of systematic domination
in society at large. The modernist subject is characterized as existing outside time, space and power relations. And, the modernist view, along with the logic of the Same which is associated with it, posits a subject-object polarity “whereby the (epistemic) subject of knowledge can be conceptualized as qualitatively distinct from the object which it can unilaterally determine…” (Venn, 2002:56).

Postmodernism, on the other hand, reveals that domination, duality and inequality are established in the name of universality and progress. It also reveals how power relations are institutionalized in and through modes of thinking which deny any link between the construction of subjectivity and power. The Foucauldian concept of power is useful to postmodernism since it sees power as productive in the sense that it produces our very concepts of individuality and our knowledge of the world. Throughout history, dominant groups have asserted their authority over language. Meaning making and control over language are important resources “through which the God-given, socially fixed, unfree subject of the feudal order became the free, rational, self-determining subject of modern political, legal, social and aesthetic discourses” (Weedon, 1997:75).

The meanings put forth by unequal access across society, are partial yet are represented as if they were complete. These norms are constantly reaffirmed as part of the large body of common-sense knowledge upon which individuals draw for their understanding of society. Our identities and subjectivities “are defined by the categories made available to us in the language we use, and by the meanings and contents ascribed to those categories” (Kitzinger, 1992:437). There is thus an integral connection between discursive formations and power in general which opposes the key distinguishing feature of common-sense knowledge that relies on a specific understanding of the human in subjectivity. Issues of power are thus implicated in attempts to privilege some identities at the expense of others, and, instead of merely repressing some identities, power “…promotes, cultivates and nurtures (particular types of) identity …it is intimately involved in the construction of the individual and her sense of selfhood” (ibid.:437).

To maintain levels of power it is necessary to discredit or marginalize ways of giving meaning to experience, which can redefine hegemonic relations. Thus, the creation of the devalued Other became the necessary precondition for the existence of the transcendent, rational subject (cf. Kaye, 2000: 196). The modernist construction of the ‘Other’ is a real construction with real consequences since the power of the dominant group shapes both the dominant and the subordinate groups’ lives and creates a reality, which fits the image that they desire. Not only does the dominant ‘self’ need the Other to be a ‘self’ at all, it also constructs the Other so as to affirm a specific kind of ‘self’ for themselves.

This positivist suppression of differences and Otherness has become a politics of domination and was carried out in the name of finding a single, unifying perspective from which all human experiences could be evaluated. The self-celebratory approach of Modernism is an Other-suppressing politics, which systematically seeks to deny, repress or transform all forms of otherness into a standardized norm, of the presumably impartial categories of the self-contained individual. “However liberating Enlightenment understanding may have once been, it is used today to conceal a far greater truth; to deny
people their own identities is to render them impotent to combat their oppression, further advantaging the dominant groups in society” (Sampson, 1993:83).

Postmodernism questions the authenticity of these universals or absolute meanings and exposes the constitution of power at stake in their assertion. Increasingly, the commonly accepted grand narratives and the rules that govern society’s beliefs and practices are being challenged and deconstructed. Because of the postmodernist attentiveness to diversity and difference it is a call for **equality based on differences** rather than **equality based on sameness**. Alterity is highlighted and subjects are viewed as under construction and transformation. It is a process where differing from the Other is a powerful constitutive force. Within the postmodern paradigm, human subjects and specifically women, glimpse new ways of thinking about themselves, their possibilities for empowerment and agency as well as new possibilities of a multiple co-existence with the Other who may be very different to themselves.

### 2.7 A feminist perspective

Postmodernism is a paradigm that has much to offer a feminist critique of the traditional views of subjectivity since it is an epistemology, which is based on recognizing differences among people, issues of power and the construction of subjectivity through language. And, a feminist perspective informed by postmodernism, is a necessary corrective on the positivist subject and its sense of empowerment and agency. It is a model of a radical politics, which reconceptualizes social relations.

Long before the likes of poststructuralists like Foucault or Lacan demonstrated the political expediency of dominant conceptions of the ‘natural’, de Beauvoir (*The Second Sex*, 1952) exposed the cultural constructedness of subjectivity and commented on how women were relegated to powerless roles and how these were used to justify their inferior status. De Beauvoir, anticipating Lacan, theorized the alterity of women who live in a society where she is compelled to assume the status of the Other, as the ‘object’.

The work of many other feminists such as Julia Kristeva, whose theory of the processual subject informs this study, continues to foster the growing awareness in the West that gender is socially constructed and can therefore be reconstructed and deconstructed. It is this fundamentally feminist conception, which informs the ideas and works of major postmodernists/poststructuralists. The profound influence of feminist theory is also visible in the Derridean deconstruction of phallocentric discourse and Lacan’s rereading of Freud as well as in Foucault’s analysis of the social construction of sexuality.

### 2.7.1 The feminist project

Feminism, like postmodernism, is a radical movement, which challenges the fundamental assumptions of the modernist view of the human subject. It is a political critique of the dominant definitions of women and is defined by myself as “a politically-motivated, multifaceted social movement, which is concerned with specific emancipatory knowledge and power”.
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Feminism and the various meanings attributed to the concept, are “…distinct from mainstream and social and political thought in that (it) recognizes women’s marginalization and seeks to overcome it” (Beasley, 1999:12). It is “partly a lived experience, a political struggle for liberation, but it is also an intellectual activity…” (ibid.:12). This intellectual activity is the development of a critical understanding of the nature of society and of the sources and mechanisms in the oppression of women. It “gives women new knowledge of social life, the power to think about our circumstances, and the power to act upon them” (Ramazanoglu, 1989:45).

Feminism’s inherent suspicion of doctrines of pure origins and essences makes it corrosive of discourses that invoke notions of historically formed cultural essences. The privileging of one truth, method, or interpretation is replaced by how knowledges, methods and interpretations can be judged and used according to the appropriateness in a given context, as a specific strategy and with particular effects. “Its de-essentializing and decentring tendencies inevitably provoke conflict with political projects which rely strongly on classificatory systems [and]…conventional ideas …as elaborated in the truth-regimes of the human sciences…” (Rattansi, 1994:52).

Decentring and de-essentialising actively question the subject ‘woman’ and any possible consensus on the nature of woman is challenged by the premise that relations of power and knowledge produce all subjects. It also questions the ontological status of subjectivity as being exclusively owned by men by providing a place where women’s voices are heard and argues for forms of identity, which are inclusive and communal rather than self-centered and separated from society, and where the Otherness of marginalized identities are celebrated. Within a feminist framework, women can assert themselves as subjects of knowledge with particular points of view and perspectives in an attempt to overcome both the implicit and explicit objectification of women.

A feminist perspective is especially “relevant to the progress and development of psychological science primarily as it is concordant with the goal of conceptualizing knowledge as a discursive practice, which takes social, cultural and individual aspects of behaviour, experience, thought and emotion into account” (Nicolson, 1995:128). A postmodernist feminist psychology is involved in experimentation with new and diverse forms of writing, methods of analysis, and discourses, in order to assert different paradigms and tools with which to reconceptualize taken-for-granted knowledge systems and methods.

2.7.2 The gendered nature of knowledge

Feminism is particularly concerned with the defining characteristic of modernism, namely the “anthropocentric definition of knowledge” (Hekman, 1990:2). This broadens the scope of a postmodernist revision of what it means to be a subject as feminism points out postmodernism’s failure to reveal the gendered nature of the privileged subject, which is the basis for female exclusion in the human sciences.
At an epistemological level, there is a need for a critical postmodernist feminist theory with which to subvert and critique the male monopoly of knowledge. This radical paradigm is also necessary to question and highlight the exclusion of women from both positions of power as well as the production of knowledge. Therefore, postmodern feminists ask ontological, epistemological and political questions since many discourses do not include women, and where there is inclusion, it occurs on the basic assumption of their sameness to men. The silences of women and their repression from struggles of representation is, however, the condition of the possibility of human thought; and this exclusion in the Western logos is a particularly well-situated point from which to expose the discourses of power and the male monopoly of knowledge.

Patriarchal discourses, methods and assumptions therefore become objects of feminist scrutiny and are tactically deployed without necessarily retaining a general commitment to their frameworks and presumptions. Feminist theory is a positive project, which constructs and develops alternative models and involves challenging and deconstructing phallocentric discourses. This entails the deconstruction of binaries that mark out inferior and marginal locations for women and critiques the premise of male-dominated knowledge, making the subordination of women under patriarchy and the relative nature of knowledge explicit. This deconstructive approach exposes modernist epistemology as homocentric. Positivist knowledge is defined in terms of man and the ideal, abstract and non-gendered subject of Enlightenment is invariably male. Rationality and autonomy, although posed as impartial objective standards, are markers of the male referent standard because the male subject is the foundation upon which traditional knowledge of the human subject has been built. The behaviour and performance of this group is further taken as the normative ‘baseline’ by which others are measured.

The unmasking of the privileged male, both in social and abstract context, is a major challenge to the unitary subject of positivism. This unitary subject is neither gender neutral nor universally applicable but structured by a thoroughly phallocentric system of thought and action. The cogito resonates with attributes, which are coextensive with the masculine ego: “self-presence, unity, transcendence, disembodied rationality and autonomy” (Shildrick, 1997:148). Male rationality which privileges reason, order and unity is in stark contrast with the irrationality, chaos and fragmentation which traditionally represents femininity and which is repressed. And, the association of the woman with the natural world is at the root of the efforts to subordinate women and to justify their domination by the culture of the masculine.

“Feminists take as axiomatic that women’s experiences and positions are produced by and through the positions we have been accorded within patriarchal relations. Thus the qualities, attributes and stereotypes associated with women gain what truth they have, not through any necessary or essential ‘femininity’, but as a result of the historical positions women have been accorded and have correspondingly (if unwillingly) occupied. Femininity is thus a construct, the contours of which reflect the intersections of a variety of institutional power relations” (Burman, 1996:3).
2.8 Postmodern feminism: a ‘politics of difference’

Most importantly, postmodern feminism is a politics, which “…concerns our power to change existing social relations [and] to transform patriarchal power relations” (Weedon, 1987:38). A postmodern psychology of women can be regarded as one with vested interests, which celebrates the ‘woman’ as a political project in her own right. This coalesces into the notion that women have a distinctive voice and their experiences are fundamentally different to those of men. “The notion of diversity… embraces heterogeneity, sidesteps the devices of dualistic hierarchy and allows differences and sameness to co-exist and mingle” (Shildrick, 1997:127).

In the following section I aim to explicate the rationale behind a ‘politics of difference’, as an alternative to the ‘economy of the Same’ according to which the professional black women consciously constructed their ‘selves’. This is followed by the contribution of the notion of embodiment, which highlights differences, as well as a specific reference to racial differences within the South African context of this study.

2.8.1 Behind a feminist ‘politics of difference’: a rationale

Discursive production is central to a postmodern feminist psychology. It is an important site in the struggle to expand our understanding of differences among individuals, the construction of their subjectivity, and their relationship to power and resistance. Discourses that define gender hierarchies as stable, fail to articulate the differences between men and women and so limit the potential for change. Difference presupposes a standard, so that that which is different from the standard is necessary the devalued, inferior term.

Feminism is engaged in elaborating the extent to which phallocratic meanings and cultural truths “have necessarily repressed multiplicity and the possibility of actual difference by appropriating difference, naming it opposition and subsuming it under the “Identity of Man”” (Smart, 1995:266-267). Difference masks a fundamental and often unacknowledged privileging of one term of a binary opposition above the other, making the latter term inferior or subordinate. Once a hierarchical difference is identified it becomes difficult to assert a standard of sameness or identity. Effectively, the rights and values of the dominant group are taken to be a universally applicable standard. That which differs from the norm is a counter-identity, and not an alternative identity with power being the property of the primary group. The norm against which all else is judged, remains firmly fixed on the primary term, and “although that structuration is linguistic…it is fully imbricated with the social relations of power” (Shildrick, 1997:109).

The incorporation of women into patriarchal discourses, meant that women per se were regarded as variations of humanity and their equal inclusion meant that only their sameness to men were discussed. Women are included as objects of theoretical studies but not as subjects. To be a modern subject, a moral agent, is a matter of taking on the ontological status of a man. This however, means that to be different from a man is to fall
short. Men on the other hand, are neither seen as different nor as the same; they remain the standard, which is both ideal and normative. Sameness and difference both “effectively silence women in their sexual specificity and render a female subjectivity impossible” (ibid.:147). It is therefore necessary to reject the operation of a single referent standard and displace any binary models.

Multiplicity within as well as between people, where no one form is unitary, integrated or whole in itself, now replaces the positivist norm. We are all constituted through a diversity of voices and “rather than beginning with the assumption of a unified core identity…we begin with the assumption of an ever-shifting multiplicity and consider unity and continuity to be a particular social accomplishment…because we function in a society in which that formulation has become a dominant belief that is usually reaffirmed by everyday social institutions and cultural practices” (Sampson, 1993:112-113). The fixity of difference and its support for hierarchical oppositions, which persistently marginalize women and position them as the objects of discourses, are radically opened up by Derridean deconstruction. The trope of deconstruction “operates through undermining the privilege given to any term in the hierarchically organized systems of concepts which govern texts and practices through unravelling the ways dominant terms attempt to master the world” (Parker, 2000:23-24). Every signifier carries with it the trace of the Other, the not-A, which is suppressed in order for the particular signifier to carry a delimited meaning. Although the suppressed term is marginalized, it is never erased and closure is impossible.

Concealment of differences between men and women hides the differences in access to power and resources between men and women; “(m)oreover, it is in the rejection of that difference which is necessarily encaptured within the economy of the same that the postmodernist feminist epistemological and ethical project situates itself”(Shildrick, 1997:111). The focus on differences is an escape from the modernist desire to establish impermeable absolutes and universals which has relied on the suppression and exclusion of others, with the feminine and the corporeal only being acknowledged as the “marked term” of the masculine and the mind; of the unitary subject in other words.

Deconstruction is a useful tool for postmodernist feminism “in so far as it offers a method of decentring the hierarchical oppositions which underpin gender, race and class oppression and of instigating, new, more progressive theories” (Weedon, 1997:160). A deconstructive approach provides a way of rethinking our common conceptions of struggle and politics of power and resistance by insisting that no system, method or discourse can be as all-encompassing singular or monolithic as it attempts to represent itself. Différance exposes “the denial of subject positions to women as a conceit masking the fundamental instability of all subject positions” (Shildrick, 1997:117) and highlights the mobility of language, meaning and identity. Différance also draws attention to “the everpresent potential of a play of signification by reference to other related concepts; reinscription in a different context…a stretching of meaning, and forms of transformation of identity” (Rattansi, 1994:30).
Deconstruction counteracts the tendency to objectify and deny recognition to those who are less independent or different, and does not obliterate difference. This approach therefore offers a profound challenge to the construction of the ‘empowered’ woman’s ‘self’ according to the ‘economy of the Same’, since, the greater the attempt to fix her identity as powerful and unitary, the greater the potential for ‘slippage’ since the contradictions in her identity reveal how meaning can only ever be fixed temporarily and her identity is always open to challenge and redefinition. Claims about female ‘empowerment’/ ‘equality’ which are constructed according to the ‘economy of the Same’ are inherently reactive and not creative. Empowerment then merely becomes the search for one Truth built on the opposition of polarities. It is not simply a question of “identifying hierarchies and overturning them. Instead we recognize the importance of focusing on the function of language, and the violence of operating with preordained ‘facts’…making the subversion of claims to truth and realism into an ethical and political move” (Hepburn, 2003:210).

When binary difference finally makes no difference, but is regarded as simply another form of identity, “différance makes all the difference. The singular voice of authority, guaranteed by the rationality of the unified and self-present one, is destabilized, at least revealed as contingent…” (Shildrick, 1997:213).

### 2.8.2 Embodiment as a marker of difference: thinking the body

The emergence of the category of difference permits theories of difference “to investigate the materiality of the discursively interpellated female subject, and thereby to open the significance of difference in embodiment for the politics of difference” (Yeatman, 1994:15). The difference between male and female is highlighted by embodiment as the category to think through how men and women occupy certain positions in a discourse. Through discourse the human body is territorialized as male or female and as such the meaning of the body in discourse ‘shapes’ the “materiality of the real body and its complementary desires” (Dallery, 1994: 293).

The status of the body within the dominant Western discourses has been largely marked by its absence or dismissal, as though the body is of no account. Cartesian epistemology views the body as the site of epistemological limitation, “as that which fixes the knower in time and space and therefore situates and relativizes perception and thought” (Bordo, 1994: 466-467). Because the mind held the superior route to knowledge, philosophical methods were devised to transcend the body’s limiting conditions. The knower in a modernist epistemological scheme had to be disencumbered of the body, as the disembodied subject “that knows no culture, history, class, race or gender” (Hekman, 1995:35). Furthermore, the female body is positioned as Other to the transcendent subject and denied expression in ethical paradigms.

Postmodernist feminism, however, opposes the idea that women and men have essential natures and instead insist, on the social construction of gender in discourse, “which encompasses desire, the unconscious and conscious emotional life” (Weedon, 1997:162). The body is reconceived, and there are multiple and limitless embodiments. The rational,
disembodied individual is countered with an embedded, situated subject. This is a strategy, which involves the figuration of bodies as steeped in culture and localized knowledges and is an acknowledgement of the lived body as the site of subjectivity.

Embodiment, as a site of potential, expresses the female subject’s ontological desire and is a key aspect in the feminist struggle for the redefinition of subjectivity. “(T)he body is a multifaceted sort of notion (and) the subject is defined by many different variables: class, race, sex, age, nationality and culture…” (Braidotti, 1992:185). The work of feminist and postmodernist theorists such as Julia Kristeva, explicitly reinstates “a textual corporeality that is fluid in its investments and meanings” and questions the “givenness and security of the so-called natural body” (Shildrick & Price, 1999:1). Rather, the body is a sign, a function of discourse, which evokes “a body as social and discursive object, a body bound up in the order of desire, signification and power” (Grosz, 1994:19).

Rethinking the body carries implications for epistemology and a reworking of subjectivities. “Changing our epistemological frameworks is …as much about an oppositional politics to dominating and exclusionary knowledge practices as it is about constructive transformations in the way we live out our lives” (Bayer, 1998:10). Bodily relations and embodiment are themselves never completed through socio-symbolic systems for there is always something ‘more’ to the body. As both a site of cultural inscriptions and an agent of cultural transactions, “the body … pushes us to rethink relations between the inside and outside, between surface and depth, between power and desire” (ibid.:15). It is deeply intertwined with cultural and historical significations, power and desires and has as such never been an entirely passive surface of inscription or reflection as evidenced by women and the Other who have used their bodies to subvert cultural scripts and interpretations.

And, for those marginalized by a dominant culture, “a sense of identity as constructed through impersonal and social relations of power (rather than a sense of identity as the reflection of an inner ‘essence’ has been a major aspect of the self-concept…” (Waugh, 1989:3). The body is central to the interplay of power and knowledge whereby woman is traditionally constituted and silenced as object through a variety of discourses. Their bodies are often the criterion for either negative or positive evaluations and their oppression becomes centered on their bodies in many instances. They “are characterized as biologically non-responsible and suited to be treated only as objects, while men, by virtue of their superior rationality, may be self-determining subjects” (Shildrick, 1997:99). By virtue of her biology, the woman (and by association, the feminine) is rooted in immanence, and disqualified from moral agency through a denial of a full rationality. Lionnet (1995: 92-93) states the effects of a certain embodiment: “This body, an emblematic space …a canvas upon which historical problems of domination and physical or verbal violence, either latent or manifest, are sketched out, the body now reflects the strategic choices forced upon the alienated and colonized subject who…wanders in search of selfhood, looking towards other lands and other times”.
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A postmodern feminist theory of embodiment builds on a Foucauldian understanding of the body as critical to modern operations of power. Women are subjected through the body as the site against which all forms of repression are ultimately registered. The body is thus an important political terrain for women’s identity and politics. “Bodies are not separate from politics but rather their very embodiment: their corporeal, fleshy, material existence determines our relations” (Harcourt, 2002:293). Since it is inseparable from power practices and “from the selfhood which grounds the knowing and known subject” (Shildrick, 1997:44), subjectivity is not transcendent but is marked by the continual process of the body.

2.9. The ‘politics of racial difference’

The postmodern emphasis on discourses has led feminist theorists to focus on both differences amongst women as well as the constitutive power of discursive formations. The embodied, engendered subject is the site of multiple differences and an embodied subjectivity takes into account many different variables such as race, class, sexuality and other forms of difference as these intersect and form a multitude of subject positions within any discourse.

This study supports a recognition of differences, which challenges any notions of universality and over-determined, static identities (as exemplified by the normative positivist subject). It aims to open up new possibilities for the construction of ‘self’ and agency and for the affirmation of multiple black feminine identities and experiences. It is an approach, which is situated within a reclamation of the body in its corporeality and its desires and reflects critically on how race is at once the product “of historically specific agents and …[is] also productive of agency and identity” (Morawski, 1994:156). It is further a project which is based on “the struggle against the forms of …subordination that exist in many social relations, and not only in those linked to gender, an approach that permits us to discuss how the subject is constructed through different discourse and subject positions…” (Mouffe, 1993:88).

It is with the South African context and the black, female subjects in mind, that I now briefly turn to the issue of racial difference amongst women. “Not to speak of race and ethnicity…is to risk elision of apartheid’s legacies; it is to commit that very error…namely the premature announcement of the end of a system of domination and the erasure of its contemporary traces” (Cooppan, 2000:30). Women are not an always-already constituted group, and as such there can be no unitary voice, which speaks for all women. It is important to develop multiple identificatory sites where difference is reconceived as diverse and multiple rather than a focus on one, singular identity. This is in contrast to a modernist appeal to homogeneity as is illustrated by the professional black woman’s conscious construction of her ‘self’ according to the ‘economy of the Same’. Instead, the category ‘woman’ is deconstructed “so that the multiple and different oppressions of women throughout the world can be seen for what they are - the consequence of gender, race, and class oppression” (Sohng, 1998:194). Each individual woman is marked in several different ways and her sense of identity is fluid and shifting.
The black subject and her experience, is thus constructed historically, socio-culturally and politically. Therefore, the conception of being black in Western society, according to Gilroy (1987:38) “has to be socially and politically constructed” in order to facilitate a working definition for projects engaged in the struggle against racism. Ramazanoglu (1989:121) argues that women “are not divided by biological racial categories, but by the consequences of racism as historically specific systems of domination, discrimination, and exploitation”. Race is a discursive rather than a biological category as it “is the organizing category of those ways of speaking, systems of representation, and social practices (discourses) which utilize a loose often unspecified set of differences in physical characteristics …as symbolic markers in order to differentiate one group socially from another” (Hall, 1992:298).

Race as category, functions as “one of the most powerful and yet most fragile markers of human identity, hard to explain and identify and even harder to maintain” (Loomba, 1998:121). While skin colour is taken to be the prime signifier of racial identity, the concept of ‘race’ receives its meaning contextually and in relation to other groups and hierarchies such as gender and class. It is a relational concept and it is therefore important to link “the various sites in which oppression is felt…by a concept of racism, understood not as a separate or external feature of society but as an integral element in the system or process…” (Gilroy, 1987:116).

Anderson (cited in Bryson, 1999:51) defines race as “…a social structure, constructed through social interaction and manifested in the institutions of society, interpersonal interactions, and the minds and identities of those living in racially based social orders”. It is in this sense that the concept of race is adhered to in this study rather than in the biological sense of the word. Bhabha (1994:78) comments: “…the epidermal schema is not… a secret. Skin, as the key signifier of racial and cultural difference in the stereotype, is the most visible of fetishes, recognized as ‘common knowledge’ in a range of cultural, political and historical discourses, and plays a public part in the racial drama that is enacted every day in colonial societies”. At its most basic level, race is a concept, which “signifies and symbolizes sociopolitical conflicts and interests in reference to different types of human bodies” (Winant, 1994:270).

Not surprisingly, black women are shown to be multiply oppressed by dominant ideologies and discourses. Triple jeopardy (race plus class plus sexual difference) is widely accepted and used in the conceptualization of the black woman’s status. And, whilst this idea advances our understanding of the erasure of black women, King (1997: 222) argues that it does not “yet fully convey the dynamics of multiple forms of discrimination”. King further asserts that most ideas regarding double and triple jeopardy merely assume an additive nature of discrimination, akin to a mathematical addition: racism plus sexism plus classism equals triple jeopardy. An additive model ignores the fact that all three modes of discrimination constitute three interdependent control systems. King (ibid.:223) defines the oppression of black women as “multiple jeopardy” which better captures their multiple instances of oppression. The equivalent formulation is racism multiplied by sexism multiplied by classism. For black women, the personal is
clearly bound up in the problems peculiar to the multiple jeopardy of race and class, not just sexual inequality.

In South Africa, “given our specific history of apartheid, there is not only a challenge to universalism, there is also a need to uncover hidden power relations … simultaneously with efforts to establish a community of purpose within the recognition of ‘difference’” (Daymond, 1996:xix). Rather than being a matter of personal identity or characteristics, racism is “a source of social identity and power which involves relations of domination and oppression” (Bryson, 1999:52). It identifies specific groups as racial groups within a hierarchy of inferiority or superiority and within this hierarchy, the dominant racial group exercises power in order to discriminate against subordinate groups. “Racism can be considered as a set of ideas and discursive and material practices aimed at (re)producing and justifying systematic inequalities between ‘races’ or racialised groups” (Duncan et al, 2001:2).

Following the election of the first democratically elected government in 1994 in South Africa, there has been a considerable focus on the empowerment of black women in an attempt to redress historical inequalities. And, especially in the professional sphere, black women are highly visible and vocal. However, what is at stake here is whether these new voices are representative of the feminine as well or whether their constructions of their ‘selves’ as ‘empowered’ professionals is merely a continued patriarchal colonialism. The latter implies an adherence to the positivist model of subjectivity where identification with the (male) norm is an attempt to achieve equality and where difference (as exemplified by the feminine) is the absence of identity, which represses the Other in an act of violence.

What is required in post-apartheid/postcolonial South Africa, is a “…contestatory/oppositional consciousness, emerging from either preexisting imperial, colonial, or ongoing subaltern conditions, which fosters processes aimed at revising the norms and practices of antecedent or still vital forms of domination” (Klor de Alva, 1995:245).

2.10 A critical psychology

A postmodernist, feminist theory invokes precisely such an oppositional consciousness to fixed and restrictive, Other-oppressing norms. It is therefore a political strategy, which provides much of the impetus for the emergence of a critical psychology, which has “utilized the resources within psychology that aided in making connections between the psychic and the social as well as the personal and the political” (Morawski, 1994:65). Kaye (2000:198) advocates the practice of a psychology which “… seeks to incorporate examination of how socially constructed ideologies, discursive formations and practices affect human behavior, thought, experience and well-being; [and] attempts to develop practices that act in the interests of the people it serves…”.

The elements that make up such a critical psychology are “a process focus, a commitment to empowerment, collaboration and cultural pluralism” (Drew et al, 2000:173). It also addresses “the relationship between subjectivity, embodiment, the cultural and political forces that shape our lives, and power, at both a discursive and a material level” (Ussher,
A critical psychology, which is informed by a postmodernist feminism, aims at subverting the existing status quo, whilst recognizing the specific, general structures of power investments. This psychology is inherently political, since being critical means “challenging not only the accepted knowledge, but also those who have an investment in this knowledge” (Nightingale and Neilands, 1997:71).

It is a paradigm which is particularly relevant to the current South African situation since a core assumption is that the individual and society are always interacting with dynamic tension and any such critical interpretation “attempts to understand the personal world within the context of wider social structures and their power dynamics (for example, gender, class and race and the wider economy where power and dynamics are played out” (O’Sullivan, 2000:138). Furthermore, its focus on the concepts of oppression and empowerment is also applicable to the changing dynamics of the new South African socio-political situation. Oppression entails subjugation, exclusion and exploitation of the other. Prilleltensky and Gonick (1996:129) define oppression as “a state of asymmetric power relations characterized by domination, subordination, and resistance ...”. It involves a structural inequality, which is reproduced by everyday practices, and is embedded in the taken-for-granted norms and rules of society and the consequences of following those rules. Empowerment on the other hand, entails freedom from internal and external sources of oppression and liberation from class exploitation, gender domination, and racial discrimination. This is the aim of the legislative and socio-economic changes in the new, democratic South Africa.

However, instead of being a mere reversal of binaries, the promotion of freedom and the eradication of oppression requires, according to Kaye (cf. 2000:206) a deconstruction of societal “givens”, the development of socially, just, inclusive practices, which enable people to question and challenge their positioning, as well as give a voice to the marginalized. Therefore, I will argue, that the ‘empowered’ professional black woman who constructs her ‘self’ according to the normative, positivist model in an attempt to achieve equal status to the male, is a form of psychic oppression. Conceptualizing the ‘self’ as a seamless whole has invidious social consequences, for it then becomes necessary to repress inner diversity. This ‘given’ construct (the ‘empowered’ professional black woman) must be deconstructed, for it is only through the double reading of deconstruction that the repressed feminine voice will truly be heard and the inner diversity of the ‘empowered’ woman is recognized.

Opportunities for resistance and transformation lie in an awareness of the potential for expression and empowerment, which are contained in the spaces in-between conflicting discourses, rather than being lodged in the illusory unitary identity. It suggests new modes of being and of configuration, which no longer function on the basis of exclusion. The aim is not to erase difference, but to inscribe it in non-oppositional terms, “to displace the polarity of difference by revealing the multiple difference” (Hekman, 1990:175). There are moments within discourse in which to convert acts of resistance into previously unheard, yet inter-textualized forms of ‘new expression’. It is from a complex interweaving of these contradictory discourses that meaning and change originate in which “no ‘pure’ or unitary origin can ever be posited...The aim, in the end, is to
reconstruct new imaginative spaces where power configurations...may be reorganized to allow for fewer dissymmetries in the production and articulation of knowledge” (Lionnet, 1995:16).

It is from within this critical reframing of subjectivity and agency that I turn to a discussion of Julia Kristeva’s work which forms the theoretical basis of this study. Her theory aptly illustrates that the ‘empowered’ professional woman is a subject-in-process, always in flux, contrary to the latter’s conscious construction of herself as a ‘unitary’ subject. This processual subjectivity is the site of critical praxis, which articulates the role that misrepresentations and silences, as well as gaps, play in suppressing the Other and it aims at affirming alternative perspectives.
CHAPTER 3: The discursive subject-on-trial

3.1 Introduction

Kristeva’s theory of the sujet-en-procès forms the focus of this theoretical chapter in order to explicate how professional black women consciously construct their sense of ‘self’ as individuals equal to the male in knowledge and power at the expense of their feminine characteristics.

Kristeva designates identity as a constructed process in contrast to the positivist norm of unity and rationality and so radically undermines and subverts the notion of a unified subject, by claiming that alterity is within the subject. This “dialogic strategy for constructing a processual subjectivity is relational and refuses transcendence. This …is in contrast to a dialectic strategy which is marked by unequal power struggles and aims to achieve ontological and epistemological transcendence over the other” (Hawthorne, 2004:46). This approach problematicizes signifying practices and established meanings and demonstrates that in every entity (in this instance, the ‘empowered’ professional woman) there is a surplus of meaning, excess, and a difference-within that prevents that entity from being a reliable ground for knowledge. In contrast to a ‘phallic’ conception of the subject, Kristeva proposes one which is always already in process. She explores the contradictions “inherent in dialectical materialism and those implicit in the notion of the unconscious to undermine further the dominant view of “the subject in signifying practice: and to develop a theory of difference” (Stanton, 1980:74).

3.2 The ‘empowered’ professional woman as ‘unitary’ subjectivity: tales of the ‘thetic’

Empowerment is defined as a process which “involves individuals gaining control of their lives and fulfilling their needs, in part, as a result of developing the competencies, skills, and abilities necessary to effectively participate in their social and political worlds” (Kreisberg, 1992:19). From this perspective, empowerment is concerned with both personal control and political action. It is seen as an appropriate goal for any individual or group who has been subjected to discrimination, such as black South African women, and is regarded as a crucial project in the movement to liberate individuals from oppressive structures and beliefs. Inherent in the many definitions is the belief that the individual has the ability to effect change and improve their social lives. The concept of empowerment (political agency) is thus the essential expression of individualism and self-determination.

This individually oriented definition presupposes the importance of constructing one’s ‘self’ as ‘unitary’ and as powerful and independent. When the ‘empowered’ woman consciously constructs her ‘self’ as ‘unitary’, her attempt at rightful political equality entails a support of the imaginary discourse of wholeness. The positing of this foundational structure does not provide a model for pluralist expression or an acknowledgement of the asymmetry of human relationships. Rather, the desire to possess one’s own origin is in actual fact, the desire to exclude otherness and difference. The
focus of this section will be on the construction of the ‘empowered’ professional woman as a ‘unitary’ identity that belongs to the realm of the Symbolic order.

For Kristeva the Symbolic order is the realm of culture and language is definitive of being a human being. In order to become a fully social being, the individual must become a competent user of language, for it is language, which constitutes subjects and the social relations between them. It is the order where the object is posited, the proposition is affirmed and the statement is located so that either truth or falsehood can be assigned to it. It is also the “order of naming…reference, meaning, enunciation and denotation” (Grosz, 1989:49). The Symbolic is articulated by Kristeva (1984:43) as “always that of a proposition or judgment, in other words, a realm of positions. This positionality…is structured as a break in the signifying process, establishing the identification of the subject and its object as preconditions of propositionality. We shall call this break, which produces the positing of signification, a thetic phase”. The break or ‘thetic’ is a term, which means ‘thesis’, ‘postulate’ or ‘proposition’ that Kristeva appropriates from Husserl’s phenomenology. The thetic phase is the starting point of signification, and the threshold of language. The ‘thetic’ phase “operates as a break, a threshold. It is the point at which the subject takes up a position, an identification” (Oliver, 1993b: 40). All enunciation, whether a word or a sentence, is ‘thetic’.

The ‘thetic’ further refers to “the assumption in rational discourse of a unified, transcendent, self-present subject which is fixed in a subject-object relationship of which it is the guarantee and which itself guarantees meaning” (Weedon, 1987:88). Unitary, thetic subjectivity is identified with two crucial phases in the formation of stable identity, namely the mirror stage and the Oedipus complex (the threat of castration). For Lacan, as for Kristeva, the compensatory identification with whole forms, which arise in the mirror-stage, establishes a feeling of unity. It is the “necessary boundary originating in the mirror stage and is the basis of all structural relations” (Lechte, 1990a:135). The mirror stage thus marks the moment when the merging subject experiences itself as a unified whole for the first time. It is through identification with images that the infant misrecognises itself and so constructs the alien ‘self’ that Lacan calls the ego or moi.

“The fact is that the total form of the body …the maturation of his power is given to him only as Gestalt…in an exteriority…this Gestalt … symbolizes the mental permanence of the I, at the same time as it prefigures its alienating destination” (Lacan, 1977:2).

The mirror stage comes to a close with the entry of the Oedipal scene and this gradually gives rise to the coherent use of language. “The acquisition of language…is in fact parallel to the mirror stage” (Kristeva, 1998:145). The passage of the subject from the state of dependence on the mother, to the ‘symbolic’ stage; is thus concomitant with language acquisition. Language is the search for something absolute, it is an attempt to reconstruct a state of unity and integrity. Language, which severs the mother-child dyadic, also bars the return to the mother, and makes the infant’s loss of maternal presence irrecoverable. “The effects of loss on an infant and the consequent lack of any permanent wholeness are the principles that drive humans to use language” (Ragland-Sullivan, 1990:252).
Kristeva argues that subjects must submit to the Symbolic order as the price of their sociality in the current economic logos. The Symbolic order is an ahistorical system of language that must be entered for a person to have a coherent identity. “To enter the Symbolic order is to take up a position, which is possible only through the symbolic function” (Oliver, 1993b: 39). The thetic phase is the precondition of the subject of énonciation and Kristeva views the thetic phase (the positing of the imago, castration and the positing of semiotic motility) as the “place of the Other, as the precondition for signification, that is, the precondition for the positing of language” (Kristeva, 2002a: 43).

The Symbolic order, within which the Phallus has a structural function as the inauguration of a series of differences, is the structure in which the subject is forced to find its place. Following Lacan, Kristeva accepts the phallus as the crucial signifier in the subject’s acquisition of a speaking position. The Law of the Father, of the phallus requires that the child submit to the law of the Symbolic father and separate from the mother. Since the mother is the Phallus for males and females, separation from her is castration. “Castration is a lack and the symbolic function is always the result of lack…” (Oliver, 1993b: 24). The discovery of castration detaches the subject from the dependence on his mother and it is the perception of this lack/manqué that makes the phallic function a symbolic function. “This is a decisive moment fraught with consequences: the subject, finding his identity in the symbolic, separates from his fusion with the mother, confines his jouissance to the genital, and transfers semiotic motility onto the symbolic order” (Kristeva, 2002a: 42). Kristeva (1984:48) further argues: “For there to be enunciation, the ego must be posited in the signified, but it must do so as a function of the subject lacking in the signifier; a system of finite positions (signification) can only function when it is supported by a subject and on condition that this subject is a want-to-be [manque à être]”.

3.3 Split subjects

The structure of the Symbolic order posits a transcendent subject, which is fixed in a “subject-object relation which underpins the syntactical structure of language in which…[the] thetic subjectivity is constituted” (Weedon, 1987:69). The ‘thetic’ is therefore positionality deriving from the distinction between subject and object. This positionality of language, in which meanings exist for a subject who functions as the place of the intention of those meanings, starts with the separation of subject and object.

The thetic break occurs when the subject, who was immersed in the semiotic chora begins to realize that language can be used to point out events and objects and that it is separate from its surroundings. The subject becomes aware of the difference between the ‘self’ (as subject) and the other (the object) and separates from its objects, as a result of the realization that the primary identification with the mother is an illusion. When the mother is perceived as the Other and as separate by the child, and when the thetic break “clears the way for the threshold of language, then the mother becomes a signifier, a place for the condensation or displacement of semiotic fragments” (Smith, 1998:23). With the hierarchical unification of the body posed in ‘thetic’ moments (the mirror stage
and the Oedipus complex), the ego becomes identified with the subject’s psychical interior, and its objects become associated with the opposed externality.

The subject undergoes a splitting in order to find a signifying place from which to represent itself, from which to take up a position with regards to meaning. The child, at the same time as it is transformed into a subject of language and history through the obedience to the law of the Father, becomes a split subject with an unconscious. “[I]t is … through the operations of language that the child becomes internally split, as at one and the same moment language induces a search for integration and precipitates a complete and constant fragmentation” (Frosh, 1989:152). The human subject is caught in an intersection or crossroads, an impossible unity caught between symbolic unity and negativity. All human subjects are split subjects who exist “at such crossroads between pain and pleasure, lack and plenitude, sameness and difference” (Edelstein, 1992:33). Splitting is a complex matter, since this ‘unitary’ subject separates firstly, “from its sense of continuum with the mother’s body; then with the illusory identity and totality of the ideal ego of the mirror stage; and finally a separation by which the subject finds itself a place in symbolisation. It is this construction which creates the subject and the unconscious, and involves imaginary and symbolic relations” (Coward & Ellis, 1997:100).

After the mirror-stage, the speaking subject attempts to reassure itself of its fixed and stable identity and so attempts to impose a singular meaning and order upon its inherent disorder/chaos. This libidinal chaos, which is characteristic of the subject’s early dependency on the maternal, is regarded as fully constrained by the unitary subject whose language is structured by the Father’s law. The child now transfers the “energetic force of its pre-oedipal drives to the symbolic, signifying order through the processes of repression and sublimation…” (Grosz, 1989:46). Thetic identity is thus both rooted in a defense against dissolution as well as a narcissistic desire for masterful agency over language.

3.4 Identification and investment

The ‘thetic’ subject can be interpreted as ‘defensive construction’ formed by separation from the pre-Oedipal immersion in the semiotic continuum and marked by an investment in the myth of being a ‘unitary’ subject. Normative practices “which fix us produce for us a model of a whole mature ‘individual’ with an ‘identity’” (Henriques et al, 1984:225) and the intensity of the subject’s investment in the ‘unitary’ position results in the splitting of the ‘I’ from what is other to itself. Hollway (1989:238) chooses the term ‘investment’ to illustrate that “there will be some satisfaction or pay-off or reward…for that person” in taking up certain positions and not others.

The ‘unitary’ subject (the temporary fixing of meanings in the thetic) is never a neutral act; it involves both interests and questions of power. Power relations interpenetrate human subjectivity since assuming unitary positions “confer power and are supportive of our sense of our continuity” (Henriques et al, 1984:205). The realm of the Symbolic, the Law of the Father, is associated with the privileged position of power and the phallus,
which represents difference. The phallus’s meaning as a symbol of revolt and separation
derives from the nature of the child’s struggle to separate from the original maternal
power. Therefore, it follows that there is a great deal invested in assuming a subject
position as ‘unitary’, rational and non-contradictory. The newly forged subject positions
her ‘self’ as ‘unitary’ since this position is traditionally associated with rationality; power
and status (the domain of the Law of the Father), which motivates her to recurrently take
up that position. “The precariousness of any attempt to fix meaning which involves a
fixing of subjectivity must rely on the denial of the principles of difference and deferral.
The assertion of ‘truth’ involved is constantly vulnerable to resistance and the
redefinition of meaning…As individuals we are not the mere objects of language but the
sites of discursive struggle, a struggle which takes place in the consciousness of the
individual” (Weedon, 1987:105-106). In the phallic ‘economy of the Same’, masculine
power and the male monopoly of desire are accepted as the only route to individuality.

Identification with the phallic Law is not a politically neutral concept, rather it is a
‘violence’ done to the Other in which the latter is assimilated into the domain of the
Same. Kristeva agrees that the speaking female subject exists uneasily in the Symbolic
order (and is in an unstable speaking position) since the girl, because of her identification
with the mother, encounters difficulty in taking up her speaking position. Her foothold in
the Symbolic order is difficult and precarious since she must constantly recreate forms of
identification with this order, against the background of the demands and desires “of her
own body, of maternal attention, of her desire for a child and relation to the child’s body,
of her identification with and desire for her own sex, the allure of sameness” (Smith,

Thus, when the ‘empowered’ professional woman consciously constructs her ‘self’
according to the economy of the Same, it is related to the fact that difference in
patriarchal societies always already involve oppressive power relations. She gains
“recognition through symbolic identification with the Law of the Father because what she
needs “ is recognition of one’s desire; …recognition that one is a subject, an agent who
can will things and make them happen” (Benjamin, 1988:102). There are certain powers
invested in introjective identification with the powerful subject position in the Symbolic,
since the Law of the Father carries connotations of rationality, knowledge and status. It
also entails that “admiration, love, and esteem for the object are transferred into one’s
own self” (Sandler & Perlow, 1987:10). The professional women also identifies with the
Law of the Father since “she gains [access] to the symbolic mastery which is necessary to
censor the pre-Oedipal stage and wipe out all trace of dependence on the mother’s body”
(Moi, 1986:149).

Further, the identification with the Law of the Father (individualization and civilization
and the privileged position of power) is accompanied by the devaluation of the feminine
((m)Other, nature and dependency). The ability to take up a symbolic position as a social
and speaking individual therefore entails the disavowal of its modes of corporeality. The
subject must negate parts of itself in order to gain a stable sense of ‘self”, and this form of
negation marks whatever identity it acquires as provisional, and thus open to
fragmentation and instability and dissolution. Subjectivity is claimed by the dominant
(masculine) subject by repudiating the feminine and enforces the split between male subject and female object and with it the dual unity of domination and submission. By splitting, “the two sides are represented as opposite and distinct tendencies, so that they are available to the subject only as alternatives” (Benjamin, 1988:63). Splitting leads to an unequal complementarity in which one side is the dominant and one the ‘marked’ term. The dominant position of the ‘unitary’ subject is associated with the realm of the masculine, whilst the repressed, ‘marked’ feminine is positioned as the object.

The splitting of the ‘empowered’ subject is a repudiation of her inner multiplicity and heterogeneity, through which she tries to defend the integrity of the disintegrated ‘self’. Furthermore, the idealization of the unitary subjectivity (the Law of the Father) is accompanied by the devaluation of the feminine. The subordination of the feminine characteristics of the ‘unitary’ subject entails that she simultaneously denies the (m)Other’s subjectivity and makes her into the object that is the embodiment of the split-off parts of the ‘self’. This “split means that identification and closeness with the mother must be traded for independence; it means that being a subject of desire requires repudiation of the maternal role, of feminine identity itself” (ibid.:133-134). Since the mother is deprived of subjectivity, identification with her involves a loss of ‘self’ and the identification with the Law of the Father “functions as a denial of dependency” (ibid.: 171). The professional woman thus represses her identification with her feminine Other in order to phantasise herself as a more powerful and acknowledged member of the (patriarchal) social contract.

The subject’s wish to assert her independence, and her efforts to differentiate, bring about a struggle for control. Each reiteration of power, such as the construction of ‘professional woman’ as unitary subject, distorts its own mythical unity and betrays its anxiety about its own integrity. The (m)Other is repudiated by “defensively rejecting recognition of the mother’s power and independent subjectivity and also rejecting maternal identifications, because the dependency on the mother, and the desire for her, are too anxiety-provoking” (Hollway, 1997:67). Because of a continuing fear that dependency on the (m)Other is a threat to the subject’s own independence, she does not recognize the (m)Other but represses her. The existence of a boundary between the ‘unified self’ and the repressed maternal (Other) is maintained by the interplay between the psychic processes of projection and introjection.

She introjects the ‘good’, or masculine parts as it is identified with the Symbolic order and projects the ‘bad’ or feminine parts, which threaten to disrupt her sense of unity. The projection of negative, repressed or inaccessible aspects of the individual and social ‘self’ fulfill active, albeit unconscious emotional needs for the subject. She expels, gets rid of “something unwanted or uncomfortable out of the self, where they cause mental conflict and pain…” (Rustin, 2000:191). The feminine aspects of the subject’s personality are therefore abjected, and to the “extent that hostile and destructive instincts are projected on to the object, the object becomes a bad, threatening object” (Meissner, 1987:30). However, even though the realm of the Father represents autonomy, identification with the realm of the Father comes at a high price. For the woman, identification of the ‘self’ with the rational mind is to masculinize that ‘self’, a ‘self’ that mimics and approximates the masculine ideal. It also entails acknowledging control over the (m)Other, which
means that the daughter must relinquish her own pre-Oedipal ties with the (m)Other, and take on the father’s devaluation of and contemptuous attitude for the mother and by extension for women as a group. This inner conflict results in a great deal of psychic pain for the feminine subject who adopts the ideal of masculine subjectivity, a ‘false differentiation’ at the expense of true recognition of her feminine ‘self’. The psychic split is formulated between the progressive, liberating Oedipal father and the regressive, archaic (m)Other, which also bars the way to the representation of women’s sexual subjectivity and denies the (m)Other’s Oedipal sexuality. “Thus patriarchy reproduces itself, reinforced by the “fruits of civilization” – the knowledge and the political and economic systems which reflect and reinforce the splits between nurturance and autonomy, public and private, male and female. As long as patriarchy exists, differences will inevitably be translated into relations of dominance and submission, superiority and inferiority” (Flax, 1980:37).

Kristeva maintains that our society places the female subject in a double bind. The oppressive condition of the (m)Other in the Lacanian Symbolic leaves the undesirable option of either mother-identification or father-identification. A woman’s situation is complex, for if she identifies with the mother, she ensures her exclusion from and marginality in relation to the patriarchal order. She carries the mother within her as a ‘living corpse’, the mother’s body that no longer nourishes. However, if she identifies with the father and makes herself in his image, then she ends up becoming him and being supportive of the same patriarchal order, which excludes and marginalizes herself as woman, who also forms a defense against her mother. The feminist tendency to promote female autonomy thus merely echoes hegemonic constructs “where being an autonomous subject is a masculine cultural prerogative from which women have already been excluded” (Baxter, 2003: 35).

According to Kristeva women must refuse this dilemma: she must neither refuse to enter the Symbolic order nor must she adopt the masculine model of femininity. “Let us refuse both these extremes…By listening; by recognizing the unspoken in all discourse, however Revolutionary, by emphasizing at each point whatever remains unsatisfied, repressed, new, eccentric, incomprehensible, that which disturbs the mutual understanding of the established powers…” (Kristeva, 1986:156). Instead, the way forward for women entails both recognition of the law of castration and sexual difference as organizing principles of Western patriarchy.

In the current Symbolic order, the ‘empowered’ woman cannot easily be part of the dominant order except by identifying with the Law of the Father: “We cannot gain access to the temporal scene, that is, to the political and historical affairs of our society, except by identifying with the values considered to be masculine (mastery, superego…)” (ibid.:155). However, whereas Lacan defines the Symbolic (and therefore signification) in terms of the symbolic function only, Kristeva’s theory of the Symbolic is more complex as she identifies both semiotic and symbolic elements within the Symbolic order. The symbolic function (the ability to take up a position) is only one aspect of signification. Entering the realm of language is not merely limited to entering the symbolic element; it is to enter the Symbolic order that consists of heterogeneous
elements, since there is a constant dialogic oscillation between the semiotic and symbolic elements. The outcome is not a fixed meaning but rather a ‘signifying process’.

In the current economy, there is no other space from where the woman can speak, if she is able to speak at all, it will have to be within the framework of symbolic language. Rather than doing away with the Symbolic order, women must place themselves within this order. Both women and men can access the semiotic and the Symbolic, the Symbolic “is a matter for speaking beings, … we women are first of all speaking beings” (Kristeva, 1988:145). The Symbolic needs to be retained as it is the domain of language and of love, which is “openness to the other, and it is what gives me my human dimension” (1980b: 144). It is only through language, which is by nature symbolic, that women can hope to challenge the law of patriarchy and create new discourses.

Woman must therefore look beyond the rules of patriarchy and summon their own truth. “Since this truth cannot be fitted into the established order of language and social symbol, it cannot…be designated as true or false by the prevailing law, and so remains silent, invisible, situated ‘outside time’” (Sellers, 1991:14-15). And, in order not to be trapped by an oppressive double bind of identity, women must express their jouissance within the Symbolic without relinquishing any of their difference. Women must take up their rightful places in the Symbolic. They must take up their identity as an identity in process in order not to be linked with that identity in an oppressive way. Simply finding a female counterpart to the phallic symbol is ineffective; it is necessary to find an alternative psychic register. The revolutionary subject “whether masculine or feminine, is a subject that is able to allow the jouissance of semiotic motility to disrupt the strict symbolic order” (Moi, 1985:170).

Her semiological investigation into human subjectivity thus shifts from the functional, homogenic and homological account of the Symbolic order (the realm of the ‘unitary’, independent subject) to the unstable yet indissoluble relationship between the heterogenous domains of the Symbolic and the semiotic. The Kristevan Symbolic is both the realm of the Law and the realm of resistance to the Law since the Symbolic (as the realm of the social) consists of both semiotic and symbolic elements. A discussion of this realm of resistance to the Law follows.

3.5 Deconstruction and genealogy

As illustrated in the previous section, the ‘empowered’ professional black woman constructs her ‘self’ according to the positivist norm of ‘unitary’ identity, which is a denial of the feminine parts of her ‘self’. This denial occurs in and through brutal and violent moments of repression. Derrida (1976:37) refers to this process as “a violence of forgetting”.

The hallmark of the Kristevan deconstructive analysis is to question the modernist assumption that the human subject is organized in terms of oppositions, where the feminine and the masculine exist in a hierarchy, a relationship of power, with one term at any moment dominant over the other. The ‘unitary’ subject, by virtue of repudiating the
feminine, claims subjectivity. It is the illusory ‘unitary’ subject’s attempt to maintain absolute difference and control, which reveals the vulnerability of a fixed identity that is forged in the crucible of femininity. This denial of the maternal function refuses and forgets the centrality of the Other in the construction of the ‘self’. It is a radical exclusionism, which defines the ‘Other’ as a complete negation of the ‘self’, based on the basic premise that A cannot also be not-A. Identity’s constitution is thus always based on exclusion and repression of that which threatens it as a ‘truth’.

Kristeva argues through her formulation of human subjectivity in the pre-Oedipal, that one term in any pair of oppositions, for example the (unitary) masculine is defined only by contrast with the negatively valued term, the (repressed feminine) always inhabits and interpenetrates the other term, producing a supplementarity of both /and, thus a double movement between the two. Her model resists any closure of terms, and actively explores the interconnection or supplementary of the one with the Other. She does not merely reverse the binary by centring the marginal; she goes beyond the hierarchies of oppositions, to sustain the perpetual double movement within the opposition. The maternal (the devalued object-position) will be shown to be the condition of possibility as well as the impossibility of the mythical ‘unitary’ subject. The semiotic is posited as a counter-discursive force, which is “always interlocked with and parasitic on the dominant they contest – working as opposition without effacing the antagonist, inhabiting and struggling with the dominant…” (Parry, 1996:88). This deconstructive practice of overturning challenges the place of the suppressed term, in this instance, of the maternal. As Caputo (1997:155) argues: “Deconstruction loves the mère/mehr”.

This section explicitly focuses on the feminine principle, the semiotic, which is the cornerstone of Kristeva’s subversive theory of subjectivity. The semiotic is relevant to the deconstruction of the ‘empowered’ professional black woman’s ‘unitary’ sense of ‘self’ since the feminine principle “works by turning established categories and syntactical structures inside out and upside down [and] can reflect the world of the pre-Oedipal mother and challenge the often false certainties of the law of the father” (Minsky, 1998:101). It logically and chronologically precedes the Symbolic order and its subject, and its influx remodels the Symbolic with its illusions of stability. As an agent in the process of thrusting or expelling the speaking being into language and subjectivity, it is the constant transgression of the Symbolic.

Although all subjects are constituted through the interaction between the semiotic and symbolic modalities, only the semiotic realm is repressed by the Logos because it is experienced as threatening, yet the eruption of the semiotic into the Symbolic gives rise to heterogenous meaning, to difference and to a subversion of the existing systems of signification. The semiotic seeks to overcome the repressive structure of the subject’s unity, to disrupt the status of the subject and of the individual. Kristeva’s conception of subjectivity is thus “a subjectivity in revolt against constraint and against the signifier which announces fixed identity” (Smith, 1998:24). Her deconstruction of the ‘unitary’ subject further reveals that the Lacanian mirror-stage as (the discourse of) the origin of subjectivity, evades the truth of the Other; bars access to it, and, not to recognize this is yet another example of the Foucauldian “will to knowledge” (Prado, 2000:92). Due to
woman’s place in the Lacanian Imaginary, the feminine is the missing element in
discourse, woman, is “the other space of symbolic representation…that space of the other
is always occupied by an idée fixe: despot, heathen, barbarian, chaos, violence” (Bhabha,
body as the site of primary identification. For Kristeva, following Foucault, the human
body is the site at which repression is ultimately registered. The corporeal body is
inseparable from the power practiced upon it and from selfhood, which grounds the
knowing and known subject. Thus, subjectivity is not transcendent but is marked by the
continuous process of the body. Furthermore, the feminine realm calls into question the
boundaries between culture and nature and between subject and Other. And, as I will
illustrate with reference to the semiotic order, the maternal is the necessary precondition
for the possibility of the paternal Law.

The focus on the repressed maternal realm can be viewed as an appropriation of
Foucault’s subjugated knowledges, which is concerned with “exhuming the hidden, the
obscure, the marginal, the accidental, the forgotten, the overlooked, the displaced” (Prado,
2000:25). Genealogy always exposes how subjects come under the illusion that they are individual, autonomous unities. It disrupts the formerly secure,
accepted foundations of our knowledge and produces an awareness of complex,
contingent, fragile forms which were once described as stable and therefore entails a
change in force relationships. It is in these genealogical works that “we find truth,
knowledge, and rationality reconceived as products of power” (ibid.:29).

Genealogy is the method, which enables an analytic of power relations since it always
problematicizes established, dominant discourses and the struggle against these
discourses. “Genealogy, the analysis of descent and emergence respectively, is radically
different from traditional history…and its aim is to…reveal beneath the constructed
unity of things not a point of origin but dispersion, disparity, and difference, and the play
of dominations” (Smart, 1983:57,59). A feminine genealogy, as exemplified by the
semiotic, provides a counterweight to, and has an effect on, the dominant economies (the
construction of ‘selves’ as ‘unitary’ and fixed) since it could “disable a masculine
subjectivity that denies the subjectivity of the feminine other. And…it could open up new
alternatives for subjectivity in which corporeality on the part of both self and other could
be fully acknowledged” (Lorraine, 1999:42).

It is politically necessary, since it prevents established disciplines from gaining total
hegemony over subjectivity, which leads to the eradication of differences among
subjects. The Kristevan semiotic as genealogy, which attempts to “deconstruct tradition is
oriented toward a moment of insight, a prise de conscience, that leads to renewal and
affirmation” (Lionnet, 1995:173). It also alerts individuals to the falsity of every
discourse that claims to be absolute and universal. The explication of the repressed
maternal realm, the semiotic, will be followed by an explanation of the necessary psychic
processes for the structuring of heterogenous subjectivity, namely primary negation and
primary identification, the two processes required according to Kristeva, to propel the
individual towards language and subjectivity in the Symbolic.
3.6 The feminine realm: the necessary condition for the possibility of the ‘unitary’ identity

Kristeva focuses her theory of subjectivity on the foundations of the Oedipal triangle, a stage that is logically and chronologically prior to the patriarchal Oedipal stage. Her semiotic “goes beyond the mere representatives of affect to its source in drives...her semiotic operates between Lacan’s Real and his Imaginary” (Oliver, 1993b: 38-39) and is positioned behind the mirror-stage. It is an articulation of unconscious processes “which fracture the common idealisation of those images and signs which secure the status quo...” (Smith, 1998:16). She redescribes and reinterprets what is ‘outside’ the Symbolic as the semiotic, a poetic mode of signifying that “although dependent on the symbolic, can neither be reduced to it nor figured as its unthematizable Other” (Butler, 2004:154).

Subjectivity according to Kristeva, is a ‘process’ that begins with the material body prior to the Lacanian mirror stage. The ‘unitary’ subject is the result of a process that is prior to meaning. Human subjectivity has its origin in the maternal law, which prefigures and sets up the paternal Law and the onset of the Symbolic as it already contains the two processes of negation and identification. The dynamics of the Symbolic are already at work within the body, and these dynamics are material as well as symbolic. Subjectivity is therefore an ongoing process, which neither begins nor ends with the mirror-stage, but already functions within the material body before the mirror-stage.

Kristeva (1984:25) defines the semiotic as follows: “We understand the term “semiotic” in its Greek sense: ...distinctive mark, trace, index, precursory sign, proof, engraved or written sign, imprint, trace, figuration”. The semiotic order is regarded as the traces of the subject’s difficult passage into the order of language. It is “articulated by flow and marks: facilitation, energy transfers, the cutting up of the corporeal and social continuum as well as that of signifying material...” (ibid.:40). The semiotic is the libidinal-signifying organization, it is “instinctual, maternal, and feminine. It is ...instinctual because the organization is dictated by primary processes such as displacement and condensation, absorption and repulsion, rejection and stasis...It is ...maternal because of the child’s direct dependence on the mother...it is ...feminine because this semiotic realm of rhythmic, corporeal rapport with the mother has been gendered by our culture” (Leland, 1992:125).

Kristeva contests the equation of the Symbolic with all linguistic meaning, by asserting that the semiotic has its own modality of meaning, it is a dimension of language occasioned by the maternal body which serves to subvert the Symbolic. The semiotic “… invest[s] the maternal site with affirmative positive force” (Braidotti, 1989:96). The semiotic further alters traditional psychoanalytical concepts of subjectivity by reinscribing language within the material body. The feminine realm thus radically reconnects theoretical discourse with its libidinal, unconscious foundations. The maternal is a function, which breaks through the symbolic mode of language and culture since language emerges from the materiality of bodily life, as the “reiteration and extension of a material set of relations...” (Butler, 2004:154).
The fact that the semiotic disrupts the order of signs “does not mean that it is not linguistic. On the contrary, …the semiotic is perhaps the most important linguistic force” (Ziarek, 1991:98). The semiotic is “transverbal” as it “is not independent of language; it interferes with language and, under its domination, articulates other arrangements of meaning…” (Kristeva, 2002c: 446). It *contributes* meaning and not merely emphasis to the linguistic realm, even though the semiotic has to work through the very order of language, which it defies. The inscription of the feminine realm in the masculine realm “is the key to the vital heterogeneity of a fluid free subjectivity in language… The feminine is what inscribes heterogeneity (in language). It has to be inscribed in the order of language to have an existence. To make the feminine a challenge to or denial of the laws of the symbolic is to relegate the feminine to the ineffable” (Smith, 2003:137).

The Kristevan designation for the other of signification: the semiotic, is defined as the *chora* following Plato’s *Timaeus*. It is a space “which exists always and cannot be destroyed. It provides a fixed site for all things that come to be. It is itself apprehended by a kind of bastard reasoning that does not involve sense perception, and it is hardly even an object of conviction. We look at it as in a dream when we say that everything that exists must of necessity be somewhere, in some place and occupying some space” (*Timaeus*: 52: b-c). Kristeva often uses the term *chora* in conjunction with the term *semiotic*; and her phrase ‘*semiotic chora*’ reminds us that the *chora* is the space in which the meaning that is produced is semiotic. The *chora* “is a *disposition* that already depends on representation…Although our theoretical description of the *chora* is itself part of the discourse of representation that offers it as evidence, the *chora*, as rupture and articulations (rhythm), precedes evidence, verisimilitude, spatiality, and temporality” Kristeva (1984:25-26).

The concept of the *chora*, “specifically defines the bodily site of the first signifying processes of the fetus” (Payne, 1993:167). It is not a sign nor a position, but “a modality of significance in which the linguistic sign is not yet articulated as the absence of an object and as the distinction between real and symbolic” (Kristeva, 1984:26). The *chora* accounts for the moments of undecideability and transformation which are always already at work within the subject and society, and it is a theoretical construction rather than a natural stage. “[O]nly theory can isolate [the semiotic] as “preliminary” in order to specify its functioning” (ibid.:68).

The *chora* as feminine and material realm is based on primary processes and is maternally oriented. This repressed space is in opposition to the Symbolic which is an Oedipal system, and which is regulated by the secondary processes and the Law of the Father. The mother’s body is the ordering principle of the semiotic *chora* since “speaking subjects emerge into language from a background of conflict between attraction and repulsion with an image of the archaic mother” (Fisher, 1992:98). The maternal body therefore plays a structuring role: “The mother’s body …mediates the symbolic law organizing social relations and becomes the ordering principle of the semiotic *chora*… The semiotic *chora* is no more than the place where the subject is both generated and negated, the place where his unity succumbs before the process of charges and stases that produce him” (Kristeva, 1984:95).
The *chora* is neither an alternative more authentic origin nor an alternative independent position within the symbolic. Rather, the semiotic *chora* can be viewed as a Derridean trace, which is a mark of difference *within* every identity, and which is, “in fact contradictory and not acceptable within the logic of identity. The trace is …the disappearance of origin” (Derrida, 1976:61). It is a material, yet non-phenomenological trace, which should be read as “traces of alterity and heterogeneity operating *within* the linguistic and psychic economy” (Ziarek, 1991:98). It functions as a questioning of the metaphysical ideas of presence, origin, and identity. The *choric* remains as one of the permanent traces in the economy of subjectivity, therefore the subject is “constituted and re-marked by the maternal otherness, which enables our ethical orientation in the world” (ibid.:99). It is further an already signifying economy, and therefore the logic of *signification* is already present in the maternal body; since for Kristeva, signification is not merely the result of a lack, which begins in the mirror stage and is completed through castration.

### 3.7 A challenge to the mastery of the ‘unified’ subject

The transverbal realm of the semiotic is correlated with the anarchic, pre-Oedipal component drives and polymorphous erotogenic zones. “Discrete quantities of energy move through the body of the subject who is not yet constituted as such and, in the course of his development, they are arranged according to the various constraints imposed on this body - always already involved in a semiotic process - by family and social structures. In this way the drives, which are “energy” charges as well as “psychical” marks, articulate what we call a *chora*: a nonexpressive totality formed by the drives and their stases in a motility that is as full of movement as it is regulated” (Kristeva, 1984: 25).

“Drives make their way into language through the semiotic element of signification, which does not *represent* bodily drives but *discharges* them” (Oliver, 2002: xvi). These primary drives, which are repressed, are maternal drives; belonging both to the maternal body and the infant’s bodily dependency on the maternal. In early infancy “biological impulses are organized through a liminal attunement between the infant’s bodily needs and the mother’s preverbal, gestural responses” (Huntington, 1998:4). As such all signification has material motivation: it is the drives above anything else that are the precondition of the processual subject.

Drives, according to Kristeva (1984:167) “are the repeated scission of matter that generates significance, the place where an always absent subject is produced”. They are primitive energy flows that move across the body, connecting it with sites of pleasure and desire. Although the drives are impossible to fully register, they are able to renew language (the Symbolic mode) as they are infinite processes. They also operate on a material level, prior to the onset of the Symbolic, and are social since there is already an experience of Otherness in the semiotic body, which “prefigures the other in the mirror even as it sets it up” (Oliver, 1993b: 32). The material signifying or drive process is both social and biological; it is “a bridge between the biological foundation of signifying
functioning and its determination by the foundation of the family and society” (Kristeva, 1984:167).

Kristeva insists that we re-activate the repression of the drives “by rupturing it with the semiotic motility [which] stems directly from the body…”(Boulous Walker, 1998:111). According to Lacanian theory, the ‘self’ can only assume an identity of wholeness if it represses the drives and separates from them. However, this is an illusory sense of unity or cohesion, for it is one that is undercut by the fragmenting and aggressive drives (libidinal forces) that cross the body, and which lead to a disintegrating sense of ‘self’-experienced together with a desired wholeness. Lacan’s account of desire is interpreted by Kristeva as a repression of the subject’s relationship with the semiotic body (of a repressing of the “Real”), and as a discounting of the semiotic drives force, which is the necessary condition for the possibility of its existence. The Lacanian subject is founded on lack alone and the drives are “dismissed and forgotten” (Kristeva, 1984:130). This lack produces a “certain subject…the subject, precisely, of desire who lives at the expense of his drives, ever in search of a lacking object” (ibid.:132). Whilst for her, bodily drives involve violence, a negation or force; this process does not merely signify sacrifice or loss. For, the drives are neither sacrificed nor lost to signification but are an essential element of signification.

The Kristevan semiotic as the multiplicity of drives manifests in language, disrupts the signifying function of language with their insistent energy and heterogeneity. The explosion of the semiotic shatters the unity of the ‘thetic’ and the subject position. “This explosion of the semiotic in the symbolic is far from a negation of negation, an Aufhebung that would suppress the contradiction generated by the thetic and establish in its place an ideal positivity… It is instead, a transgression of position, a reversed reactivation of the contradiction that instituted this very position” (Kristeva, 1984:69). The reactivation occurs when it focuses on the contradiction, the heterogeneity between the semiotic and the symbolic, which is negated by the Symbolic in order to appear as a unity. The reactivation shatters the ‘thetic’ and uses it against itself (as a reversal). The semiotic chora should thus not be read as a failure of the thetic but rather as its very precondition.

The semiotic chora is, according to Kristeva, the effect of the entry of the individual as subject into the Symbolic order and the repression, which this entry into the Symbolic involves. The Kristevan semiotic and the chora thus “position the maternal as the locus of a heterogenous and disruptive negativity” (Boulous Walker, 1998:106). This site of negativity is a process of semiotic generation, which constantly challenges and seeks to transform the unitary subject of the Symbolic order. And, since the semiotic chora is the site of negativity from which constant challenges to the subject of the symbolic order and symbolic meanings arise; it is “heterogenous to meaning and signification…it erupts within the symbolic…” (ibid.:105).

Kristeva’s negativity is a replacement of the Sartrean negative and she distinguishes ‘rejection’ (or negativity) from the thetic act of negation (the saying ‘No’) and views it as the movement of the drives, of the heterogeneous matter. This negativity is not the usual
Hegelian negativity of consciousness but is non-symbolized and materialist. It is defined as a “movement of the material contradictions that generates the semiotic function” (Kristeva, 1984:119). The semiotic as negativity “is the process of rejecting thetic formulations, without being reducible to a formulation constituted as a rejection of another formulation” (Rajan, 1993:228).

The logic of material rejection or negativity (the Kristevan bodily structures of separation) is already operating within the body prior to the onset of signification. This logic of negativity or rejection is the necessary condition for the onset of subjectivity. Material rejection is thus inherent to the maternal function and the transition through the mirror-stage (presymbolic) into the Symbolic is made possible by material rejection. Negation/rejection operates through maternal rejection, which is not only the driving force within the Symbolic, but also serves to set up the Symbolic. The entrance into the Symbolic is thus not based on just lack, but also on pleasure and excess, which motivate the move into language. The material element, which allows for the transition is heterogenous to the Symbolic; it operates as the law before the Law. Rejection is not limited to the Symbolic order alone, where the move through the symbolic stage is made possible by the threat of castration.

Negativity makes visible the processes underlying signification, and by making the processes visible, calls into question all and any stable identities. Negativity is the catalyst for a narcissistic crisis in identity since it subverts the stability and coherence of the Symbolic. The subject’s mythical identity ultimately dissolves in the face of this powerful and heterogeneous negativity. Kristeva (1998:137) states that negativity is “the logical impulse behind the stases of negation and negation of the negation, but it is not identical with them, being the representation, in logic, of the movement which produces them”.

The semiotic as site of negativity “can be seen to tear at and transgress the syntactic stability and constructions of identity proper to the symbolic” (Smith, 1998:23). From the thetic side, the repression of the chora is never complete, since the semiotic erupts in speech and in signifying practice as a heterogenous force that, (held in dialectical tension with symbolization), ‘pulverizes’ meaning. From the side of the semiotic chora, as a material-based drive force, it defies a full assimilation into symbolic representation. The permanent negativity of the drives as well as the fact that the chora links the drives to signifying processes, which guarantees subjectivity, is never a completed state but is always ‘en-procès’. The unitary subject is mythical, instead it is “the corporeal subject in process, constituted...in and through displaced and condensed drive activity: the locus in effect, of the semiotic and the symbolic” (Lechte, 1990a: 145).

The emergence “of rupture into language from within its own interior instinctuality is not merely the outburst of libidinal heterogeneity into language; it also signifies the somatic state of dependence on the maternal body prior to the individuation of the ego” (Butler, 1993:168). The language of the semiotic always indicates a return to the maternal, which signifies both libidinal dependence and the heterogeneity of drives. The semiotic therefore challenges the mastery of the phallic signifier and shatters the autonomy of the
subject. By the displacement of the release of the repressed multiplicity, which is interior to language itself, the hegemony of the paternal Law (with its associations of unity, rationality and autonomy) is subverted.

The multiplicity associated with the maternal libidinal economy which disperses the univocality of the paternal signifier (the ‘unitary’ subject) is able to “create the possibility of other cultural expressions no longer tightly constrained by the law of noncontradiction” (ibid.:174). Because the feminine is situated in the unconscious, it is also a position, which “allows a way of thinking and speaking to women and men beyond the reach of phallic control, in a domain which potentially offers meanings based on openness, plurality, diversity and genuine difference” (Minsky, 1996:180). The eruption of the feminine in the (masculine) Symbolic is a ‘new logic’ which rejects all closure and “entail(s) a different relation to unity, to identity with self, to truth, to the same and thus to alterity, to repetition and thus to temporality” (Derrida, 1977:153).

3.8 A struggle for independence: the logic of abjection

The ‘unitary’ identity of the ‘empowered’ professional woman is based on the abjection of the maternal, a primary repression which occurs before the subject-object split. This economy of violence and sacrifice upon which the construction of her identity is based, will be discussed in the following section with the specific implications for the feminine subject.

Whilst Kristeva agrees with Lacan that the mirror-stage may bring about a sense of unity, she asserts that, even before the mirror-stage, the infant begins to separate from others in order to develop borders between the “I” and Other. To Kristeva, the Lacanian mirror-stage where the ‘self’/other (subject/object) distinction arises, is a secondary repression, one in which the infant becomes “homologous to another in order to become himself” (Kristeva, 1982:13). This mimesis is secondary to an earlier, primary repression of undifferentiated being, to the chora, where the infant, the ‘not-yet-I’ abjects itself, (separates from the archaic mother) and through ab-jecting itself, gives birth to itself as an “I”, as an independent subject.

The notion of abjection is developed by Kristeva, as an operation of the psyche through which identity is constituted by excluding anything that threatens the fledgling subject in its dependence on the maternal body. Abjection describes the strange place and time, which marks the “threshold of language and a stable enunciative position” (Grosz, 1989:71). Understanding abjection entails an examination of the ways “in which the inside and outside of the child’s body are constituted, the spaces between the self and the other, and the means by which the child’s body becomes a bounded, unified whole - the conditions under which the child is able to claim the body as its own, and through its ‘clean and proper’ body, gain access to symbolisation” (ibid.:71).

The Kristevan abject is “radically excluded” and draws the subject to the place where meaning collapses. Kristeva (1982:1) defines abjection as “one of those violent, dark revolts of being, directed against a threat that seems to emanate from an exorbitant
outside or inside, ejected beyond the scope of the possible, the tolerable, the thinkable”. It is neither subject nor object but is situated at a place before we enter into the Symbolic order. “It is a recognition of the impossible, untenable identity the subject projects onto and derives from the other … the abject is … the fading, instability or even the disappearance of the subject…The abject is that part of the subject it attempts to expel, but which is refused the status of the object. It is the symptom of the object’s failure to fill and define the subject” (Grosz, 1989:72).

According to Kristeva, our first experience is a realm of plenitude, of oneness with our environment and immersion in the semiotic chora. The infant comes into being without any borders, which must be developed. The infant develops these borders between the “I” and the “other” (its identity), through the logic of abjection. The mother’s body, the child’s own origin, is the first “thing” to be abjected, before the mother can become an object for the infant.

The abject thus marks the primal repression, which precedes the establishment of the subject’s relation to its objects of desire and of representation, even before the establishment of the opposition of conscious and unconscious. The logic of negation/rejection, which is a prerequisite for human subjectivity, operates through maternal rejection, which is not only the driving force within the Symbolic, but also serves to set up the Symbolic. The subject-object dichotomy (difference) cannot occur until the infant represses the maternal chora, as state of oneness. It is a condition of the constitution of the speaking subject, and attests to the always tenuous nature of the Symbolic order in the face of a series of dispersing semiotic drives. The abject is both a condition of symbolic subjectivity, and it is also “its unpredictable, sporadic accompaniment” (ibid.:72).

By pushing the infant out of the chora (a state of undifferentiated being) into the Symbolic realm, the infant enters the realm of language and begins to experience difference. Through abjection the “I” is formed and renewed, it lays the ground for being a subject. The abject is therefore “a precondition of narcissism” (Kristeva, 1982:13), of the mirror-stage. The child makes the mother into the abject in order to separate from her; abjection is the struggle to separate from the maternal body: “Abjection is … a kind of narcissistic crisis” (ibid.:14). This body “having been the mother, will turn into an abject. Repelling, rejecting; repelling itself, rejecting itself. Ab-jecting” (ibid.:13).

Abjection shows up as the struggle to set up borders between the maternal body, the maternal ‘container’ and itself. It exists on the border between the unconscious and the conscious, and is a reminder of the child’s pre-Oedipal life before passing through the mirror-stage, before it enters into the Symbolic where it is able to assert its own individuality by differentiating its ‘self’ from the unity with the mother. Abjection is linked to the image of the splitting mother; thus to one's desire for separation, for becoming autonomous – accompanied by the contradictory feeling of the impossibility of performing this particular act.

The ‘unitary’ subject’s wish to assert its own independence, and its efforts to differentiate itself from the maternal, bring about a struggle for control. It is an attempt to release the
hold of the symbolic umbilical cord by means of the violent breaking away from the womb, as if guided by the logic of rejection, embedded in bodily structure. But because this body is the only and immediate life-world known by the “I”, the very act of the fall or separation leads to the child becoming a jettisoned object in this process. The child is violently expelled from the maternal body during birth, which leads Kristeva (1982:3-4) to say, “it is no longer I who expel, [but] “I” is expelled”. During the weaning process, when the child first becomes aware of itself, it engages in a struggle to separate from the maternal body, even whilst still identifying with this body. The abject thus marks the moment when we separate ourselves from the mother.

The threat of abjection comes from the maternal entity that is neither ‘us’ nor ‘not us’ but somewhere in between and which recalls an archaic state of the subject’s development before the desire, which is precipitated by the mirror-stage. In order to repress the chora, the child has to expel itself from itself, in order to create itself: “I expel myself, I spit myself out, I abject myself within the same motion through which “I” claim to establish myself” (ibid.:3). The repression of the chora through the process of abjection makes differentiation possible as the child now begins to form personal boundaries. The chora is again repressed in the mirror-stage and the subject ab-jects itself, and then discovers itself in its abjection.

Abjection for Kristeva induces violence to the subject, blurs the borders of the ‘self’; and sends the subject reeling into the territory of emptiness, of nothingness, where borders dissolve. “If it be true that the abject simultaneously beseeches and pulverizes the subject, one can understand that it is experienced at the peak of its strength when that subject, weary of fruitless attempts to identify with something on the outside, finds the impossible within; when it finds that the impossible constitutes its very being, that it is none other than abject” (ibid.:5). It is the underside of a ‘unitary’ and stable subjectivity, an abyss at the borders of the subject’s existence; the abject has to do with “what disturbs identity, system, order. What does not respect borders, positions, rules” (ibid.:4). However, abjection is not a simple repudiation, for, even after abjecting the mother’s body, the infant can never entirely forget the chora, or undifferentiated state. What is abjected is radically excluded, but it is never banished entirely, or wholly obliterated. The fantasy figure on whom the child is absolutely dependent in its need is the Phallic Mother, and even once the dyad is shattered, the Phallic mother remains in the Imaginary as ‘all-powerful’ and threatening. The abject comes back in fleeting encounters so that the subject is always haunted by the possible return of the abject that was a part of a pre-subjective experience.

It continues to hover at the borders of our existence, and threatens the illusory unity of the subject with disruption and a possible dissolution. “Abjection preserves what existed in the archaism of pre-objectal relationship, in the immemorial violence with which a body becomes separated from another body in order to be...” (ibid.:10). Kristeva’s notion of abjection differs from the Freudian ‘return of the repressed’, which entails that many of the desires of the subject have to be denied and repressed, and as long as it did not return, it was well out of sight. The abject, in contrast, always remains on the periphery of human consciousness and continually challenges the subject with its presence and
threatens it with annihilation. Abjection reveals how all identities operate through exclusion,” through the discursive construction of a constitutive outside and the production of abjected and marginalized subjects, apparently outside the field of the symbolic, the representable …which then returns to trouble and unsettle the foreclosures which we prematurely call ‘identities’ ” (Hall, 2000:28).

When the ‘unitary’ subject is threatened by the return to the maternal realm, the pre-symbolic, she experiences a great deal of uncontrollable anxiety. And, the seemingly absolute truths upon which her ‘unitary’ subjectivity rests become uncertain or relative, therefore the ego tries to oppose that disintegration which surrounds it and opposes it. The anxiety the ‘unitary’ subject experiences is controlled by attempts to maintain the existence of a boundary between the ‘self’ and the mother through the psychic processes of projection and introjection. For the ‘unitary’ subject to survive extreme feelings of anxiety, it must “split the good and the bad. The good becomes the ideal and helps the [subject] to deal with the bad…” (Weininger, 1992:26).

The ‘unitary’ subject is freed of her repressed parts, of the abject maternal, which cannot be acknowledged to be a part of her ‘self’. This process of repudiation involves “defensively rejecting recognition of the mother’s power and independent subjectivity and also rejecting maternal identifications, because the dependency on the mother, and the desire for her, are too anxiety-provoking” (Hollway, 1997:67). The unwanted parts of the personality are regarded as inferior and repellent and disowned with a degree of symbolic violence. Identification and closeness with the mother are now negated in favour of independence. Primary repression or abjection is a denial of the bodily reminders of maternal dependency, a denial of “the primal narcissistic identification with the mother, almost” (Oliver, 1993b: 60).

The difference between the ‘unitary’ ‘self’ and the abject (the maternal, the feminine) is therefore ‘amplified’ by means of projection in order to put a greater distance between the ‘self’ and the abject in an attempt to achieve a measure of temporary mastery and possession. Identification with the domain of the Law “is an attempt to gain control over anxiety and hostility” (Weininger, 1992:30) and is used to achieve liberation from the maternal on which every subject is dependant. Abjection, as the turn against the female body, constitutes for Kristeva a process of psychic violence: “The abject confronts us…within our personal archeology, with our earliest attempts to release the hold of maternal entity even before ex-isting outside of her…It is a violent, clumsy breaking away, with the constant risk of falling back under the sway of a power as securing as it is stifling” (Kristeva, 1982:13).

The primary separation from the maternal realm is thus the necessary condition for society and identity. It is a ‘necessary matricide’, which amounts to a negation of the loss of the Other, to a forgetting of the loss of the mother. Abjection preserves what existed in the “archaism of preobjectal relationship, in the immemorial violence with which a body becomes separated from another body in order to be…” (Kristeva, 2002b: 236). Since the abject mother presents the threat of total loss of ‘self’ rather than that of castration, Kristeva (1987:27-28) asserts: “Matricide is our vital necessity, the sine qua non
condition of our individuation” and abjection is a revolt against that which gave us our existence, our state of being. In contrast to Freud, who argues that society is set up against the murder of the father, Kristeva asserts that society is set up against matricide. Society is founded upon the initial violent “murder of some, the transformation of the body, the captation of drives” (Kristeva, 1984:75). By correlating the loss of the mother with the symbolic compensation of language acquisition, Kristeva demonstrates that linguistic mastery and subjectivity is dependent on the effacement of (maternal) alterity, which precedes and displaces the subject. The sacrifice of the maternal body, which marks the inception of the Symbolic, further suggests however, that no site “in its fantasied autonomy and in-difference, could develop without taking into account its significant and/or abjected others” (Hall, 1996:252).

3.9 Misplaced abjection and oppression: the effacement of the feminine

The relation of woman to language is intricately tied to the maternal. The space of abjection that crosses the boundaries of language and pre-language, paternal and maternal, offers us a commentary on the complexity of a woman’s relationship with that space. Women are “neither within abjection, nor outside of it; neither its object, nor fully removed from its borders either” (Smith, 1996:160).

Since men and women have a different relation to the maternal it follows that they have a different relation to language. Kristeva (1987:373) maintains that separation is more difficult for women than for men: “the dramas of individuation demand of her such a violent rejection of the mother, and by the mother, that in the hatred of the loved object a woman immediately finds herself in a known and intolerable country”. Because of woman’s bodily identification with the mother it is more difficult for her to commit the necessary ‘matricide’. She must deny her identification with her mother in order to enter the Symbolic, yet matricide is a form of suicide since to kill the mother means that she loses herself. “For the woman there is more at stake than bodily integrity or gratification of desire. For her it is a question of losing herself. It is a question of losing desire itself. It is a question of

becoming Lack” (Oliver, 1993b: 63).

As the daughter begins to separate from her mother, she both longs for the primal oneness and yet also fears the annihilation of her ‘self’ since she belongs to the same sex as the mother. She is more deeply attached to the mother than the boy child and longs for a penis as a crucial sign of difference “to serve as a defense against the undertow of merger with the mother and, as a symbol of power, to establish herself against the woman she has known as all-powerful” (Kahn, 1985:77). She desires differentiation from her mother in order to be an autonomous agent yet, because of the girl’s lengthy identification with the mother, her ego’s boundaries are less defensively, and also less firmly established than the boy’s, therefore she experiences her ‘self’ as less differentiated from the mother.

Insofar as the woman identifies with the maternal body, she cannot abject it without abjecting herself. When the woman makes the mother abject in order to reject her, she also makes herself abject and rejects herself. By identifying with the maternal, the woman takes up her place as the repressed since as a woman, she becomes the sacrifice
upon which the unity of the Symbolic order is maintained. Whereas the male subject can assume his place in the Symbolic order without difficulty, the female subject cannot do so in the current Symbolic order, other than as the repressed. The woman is “constituted by the tradition as the Other, who is mute, powerless, outlawed, ahistorical, and absent” (Lowe, 1993:152).

Furthermore, misplaced abjection and the reduction of women to reproduction is particularly relevant to the explanation of the construction of the ‘empowered’ professional woman’s subjectivity since it is offered as an explanation by Kristeva for the oppression and effacement of the feminine in the realm of the Symbolic. She argues that the crisis in the religious representation of maternity, the Virgin Mary, leads to a misplaced abjection, which results in the abjection and denigration of women. “The image of the Virgin – the woman whose entire body is an emptiness through which the paternal word is conveyed – had remarkably subsumed the maternal “abject”…Lacking that safety lock, feminine abjection imposed itself upon social representation, causing an actual denigration of women” (Kristeva, 1987:374).

In Western culture, woman, the feminine and the mother have all been reduced to the reproductive function of the maternal body, which means that when we abject the maternal body, we also abject the feminine, the woman and the mother, who have all become undesirable. Kristeva argues that the child must abject the “maternal container” in order to become an independent subject. It must not abject the mother as a person, or the mother’s body as the body of a woman but only the “maternal container” upon which it was dependent. Everyone must abject the mother (the maternal function) in order to separate from her. Society requires a feminine counter-imagery to offset culturally entrenched patriarchal images of womanhood.

It is important that the maternal operates as a function and that women and the feminine are not reduced to maternity. She unties the “Freudian knot by freeing the feminine from the maternal and by characterizing the mother not as object of the child’s desire but as a function, her body the field on which the generic code of the species and of the biological individual is written” (Wiseman, 1993:97). The female subject must confront the paradoxical requirement to simultaneously separate from and identify with the mother. If women want to “accede to a position of singular subjectivity, we need…to open a discourse of motherhood which is not based upon the enforcement of woman’s repudiation of the …mother. We need to open the possibility of relation to the other woman - to our mothers, as singular subjects, located in their specificity …” (Weir, 1993:84). Women need to get away from the fixation on the phallic mother in order to subvert the phallogocentric order, and must posit themselves as women, as singular subjects, as different from the “universal absolute woman, the archaic phallic mother of our cultural phantasy” (ibid.:87).

Only if the necessary dependence on the maternal body can be separated from the dependence on the mother, then the daughter can commit the necessary and ‘vital matricide’, lose the maternal body as ‘container’ and still love her mother. Women need to be provided with new fantasies so that they can come to terms with their primary loss,
the loss of their mothers. The articulation of the mother as a desiring and social subject is important for women who, within patriarchal culture, are forced to identify with the remains of the dead maternal body after the body has been sacrificed to the social: “in order to separate from their mother’s bodies females must separate from themselves as women; and in order to maintain some identification with their mothers as the bodies of women females carry around the ‘corpse’ of their mother’s bodies locked in the crypt of their psyches” (Kristeva, 1987:28-29).

Discourses on maternity must therefore separate the maternal function from women, so that neither femininity nor motherhood are associated with maternity. The maternal function must be considered as apart from women and individual mothers. Only then will the child be able to abject the maternal function without abjecting the woman as mother and as the feminine. Since maternity is available to both men and women according to Kristeva, she conceives of a notion of difference, which does not operate according to “dualist logic of opposition” (Oliver, 1993b: 7).

3.10 The bridge of love: primary identification

Kristeva locates the origins of subjectivity in abjection and its obverse, narcissism. Narcissism, for Kristeva, relies on a “non-oedipal triangular relationship which lacks the stability or organisation of the symbolic or oedipal structure” (Grosz, 1989:86). The ‘empowered’ woman abjacts the maternal in order to enter the realm of the Symbolic order. However, her independence and autonomy are made possible by the mother’s love, via primary identification in the semiotic realm.

Kristeva develops Freud’s later notion of primary narcissism, which is not merely a ‘stage’ of development but is already a structure. Primary narcissism as structure exists prior to the pre-Oedipal ego and sets up the identification in the mirror-stage; it sets up the possibility of symbolization. Kristeva argues that primary identification involves a transference to/from the Imaginary Father and that this is correlative with the mother being abjected. The mother’s love, her desire, is posited as a counterbalance to the abject mother and is the structure, which assists the child to negotiate between the maternal semiotic body and the Symbolic.

Similar to the process of primary negation, which precedes and sets up symbolic negation, is primary identification, which sets up and precedes symbolic identification. The space between the mirror and the child is guaranteed by this structure of narcissism through the separation in reduplication prior to the mirror-stage and the identification before and through the mirror-stage. The identification in the mirror-stage is a reduplication of the identification prior to the mirror-stage and is therefore not a primary identification. Oliver (1993b: 73) asserts that what the logic of reduplication provides, “which the logic of rejection did not, is a theory of identification”. The narcissistic structure “provides a way for the child to start incorporating and thus mimicking what is other to itself, even before it has a concept of self-other distinction. This narcissistic structure, which is already evident in its imaginary realm of the semiotic chora, paves the way for the infant to become a subject in a signifying order” (MacAfee, 2004:36). The
Imaginary is therefore not a ‘lost territory’ since it continues to be discernible in the semiotic mode of signification.

In Lacanian terms, the Symbolic law stands between the newly emerging subject and its desire to return to the maternal body. “This separation (signified through the threat of castration) subjects the child to what Lacan terms the Name-of-the Father …” (Boulous Walker, 1998:52). The child realizes that the mother will not automatically meet its needs, and that it must substitute demands in order to indicate what it needs for the imaginary unity with the gratifying maternal body. The unfulfillable gap between needs and demand is called ‘desire’, and the infant moves from need to desire, from the maternal container to the Law of the Father, the paternal realm. Lacan argues that the paternal function allows for the child’s entry into the Symbolic order or paternal law. He uses the ‘paternal metaphor’ in order to set up the social function, or the ‘metonymy of desire’, which is a move from the maternal to the paternal, from metaphor to metonymy.

The model for Lacanian desire is metonymy, and the model for repression is metaphor and the Name of the Father is substituted for the desire of and for the repressed and absent maternal. It is only through this substitution that the infant becomes a subject and enters the linguistic realm; thus it follows that the logic of the metonymy of desire is set up on the basis of the paternal metaphor. The paternal metaphor is necessary to ensure that the infant separates from the mother (the anti-social dyad) and allows for the introduction into the social realm. The Oedipal scene is portrayed as a Hegelian struggle to death between the mother’s body and the father’s name, between nature and culture.

Kristeva, however, by including the psychic structure of the ‘Imaginary Father’, insists that there is more than just one paternal function, not just the one of the Phallic Law. The pre-Oedipal dynamics, the ‘metaphor of Love’, which is associated with the maternal function, radically departs from the Lacanian and Freudian view that the third regulating term is the Phallus or the Symbolic father. Identification with the father (the symbolic dimension of the signifying process) has a far different import for Kristeva. Instead, her revised conception of the Oedipal conflict provides us with an image of a loving father in an attempt to limit the erosion caused by the loss of meaning and lack of love.

The ‘Imaginary Father’ supports the narcissistic structure as the place where the birth of the human subject is located and this conglomerate is the crux of primary identification within the narcissistic structure. The fantasy of the loving Imaginary Father supports the child’s transition from dependence to independence from the maternal body during the phase of abjection, which operates between material and symbolic rejection. The Imaginary Father facilitates the flow of the semiotic into the symbolic and as such he is the “pivot around which the beginnings of self and other are constituted” (du Nooy, 1998:56). It is further a primary identification with a loving agency that counterbalances the primary negation and whose “habitation… offers space and intimacy to the journeying subject. For the Imaginary Father is one who loves rather than judges” (Smith, 1996:166).
Love constitutes a pre-existent ‘outside’ close to the mother and it forms the basis of a dynamic potential in the process of identification. Love is understood “psychoanalytically, it is a transference, based on infantile narcissism and primary (imaginary) identifications” (Kristeva cited in Grosz, 1989:85). The crisis in the paternal function, according to Kristeva, is the lack of love rather than the lack of Law. The object of identification as envisaged by Kristeva, is a process that prevents idealization under the phallus from becoming oppressive. As Lechte (1990b: 30) explains: “The father in individual prehistory emerges prior to the formation of an object which will accompany the emergence of the subject in language; it is thus prior to any ideal, but it is nonetheless the basis of all idealization – especially in love. The father of individual prehistory which Kristeva also calls the Imaginary Father is the basis for the formation of a successful narcissistic structure – one that enables the symbolization of loss, and the formation of desire”.

The “mother-father conglomerate” (Oliver, 2003:46), which precedes the Law of the Phallus, highlights the importance of the maternal function, which, according to Kristeva, operates through the Real, the Imaginary and the Symbolic and is a complex of the body, of love and desire. The ‘Imaginary Father’ contains the attributes of both parents, who “as a Third Party, [is] a factor that draws the mother’s gaze away from the child, and prevents her from claiming the baby as her own Ideal, and thus part of her ego”(Smith, 1996: 165). It is therefore an amalgamation of the mother and her desire (cf. Oliver: 1993b: 79), it is the maternal desire for the Phallus; the One already within the mother. Therefore it is the mother’s love, which supports the child’s move from the semiotic to the Symbolic. The Imaginary Father will sustain the subject without overwhelming it and it leads the subject beyond an autoerotic relationship with the mother into narcissism, which always precedes object love. Although Kristeva retains the Lacanian “Spaltung”, she redefines the object as one of love and transference and not one of desire and fantasy. Primary identification based on love, is Kristeva’s answer to the Lacanian Symbolic, which cuts off the drives and negates the importance of the maternal function.

Although it is a ‘father-mother conglomerate’ the masculine gender is used by Kristeva to intensify the point that the mother’s libido is oriented towards the other entity. It is the identification, which sets up all subsequent identifications. Identification takes place with a “not-yet-object”, thus, not with a corporally present object or an actual father but with that to which the desire of the mother refers. The ‘Imaginary Father’ is the one to whom the mother’s desire may be turned. The mother’s desire for something other than the child enables/facilitates separation, absence and the desire to both give and receive love. Kristeva (1987:387) wants to avoid the logic which forces humans into “the field of desire” and the “reign of the signifier” by her description of the pre-Oedipal metaphorical identification which both precedes and sets up desire. The Kristevan return to the imaginary space of the ‘Imaginary Father’ (who is literally the mother’s desire for the other), replaces the Lacanian imaginary struggle for recognition. Kristeva decentres the Lacanian struggle as follows: “Metonymic object of desire. Metaphorical object of love. The former controls the phantasmatic narrative. The latter outlines the crystallization of fantasy and rules the poeticalness of the discourse of love”(ibid.:30).
The Lacanian view holds that metonymic desire founds subjectivity in a set orientation towards a phallic control over meaning. He reifies desire around an antagonistic struggle against others in a struggle for control over meaning and the Law of the Father is erected on the desire of the mother. The Phallus functions as both the desire of the mother and the Law of the Father since without her desire, there would be no need for the Law of the Father. Behind the Lacanian metonymy of desire, Kristeva finds a metaphor of Love, which sets up the primary identification. Lacan’s model is rejected on the grounds that it emphasizes metonymy over metaphor since Lacanian desire, which operates according to the logic of metonymy, overlooks the metaphoric operations of Love. The identification with the ‘Imaginary Father’ is linked with metaphor, “not simply the metaphor of linguistic similarity and substitution (in Lacan’s case, the substitution of one word for another) but metaphor as a Baudalairian “metamorphosis”” (Lechte, 1998:41). Metaphor is to Kristeva (cited in Lechte, 1998:41) a “fuzzy set”. It is not just “a rendering permeable of all boundaries or an openness of identities to instability” (ibid.:41), it is the movement leading to metamorphosis.

Movement and transformation figure prominently over stases and comparison. Metaphor is a continuous dynamic transference, “an indefinite jamming of semantic features one into the other, …the drifting of heterogeneity within a heterogenous psychic apparatus, going from drives and sensations to signifier and conversely” (Kristeva, 1987:37). It is metaphor, which, according to Kristeva, transports bodily needs or drives into demands and so fills the gap. “The metaphoric transference supports needs as they break into demand through a fantasy of completion, wholeness, jouissance, rather than lack” (Oliver, 1995:173). Metaphoric transference, (as a non-object oriented identification) allows the drives to enter subjectivity, desire and language. Because the relation between the mother and infant emerges through the identification with the Third term (the ‘Imaginary Father’ or metaphorical other), primary identification channels desire towards the ‘Imaginary Father’, which in itself makes possible a social desire in which self-other relations are neither possessive nor repressive (cf. Kristeva, 1987:29). The ‘Imaginary Father’ is “where my primitive desire to devour has been redirected through a metaphorical register on to a psychic level” (Smith, 1996:173).

Lacanian theory, in contrast, makes the body as well as identification, intrinsically Symbolic by making them dependent on a metonymical structure. Furthermore, in Lacanian psychoanalytic theory, the mother is regarded as the child’s first object or partial object; she is the ‘container’ that meets the infant’s needs. Lacan identifies the objects of desire with partial objects associated with bodily functions because they represent that which is forever cut off from signification. Lacan’s objets a are partial objects of want, which represent the gap inherent in signification between the body (the object) and language. This primary identification with the maternal is a threat to the normal psychic development of the child and its autonomy. The mother’s body, which is here associated with needs and with nature and not with desire, is seen as threatening and phallic. Kristeva, in contrast, brings the maternal body back into signification by arguing that the infant’s bodily exchanges with the mother cannot be reduced to the Lacanian objet a.
Kristeva (along with feminist philosopher Luce Irigaray) follows the Kleinian argument that the relation to the mother is not primarily a relation to an object or partial-object. “Rather than fixing upon an object (s)he identifies with the process of subjectivity, a mode of being, characterized by desire for otherness, ordered according to a logic of negativity: constant movement, change” (Weir, 1993:89). She asserts that there is neither a fixed object nor a fixed subject in the Oedipal situation as both subjects and objects remain in process. Through metaphorical identification, the drives, now divested of libido and requiring an attachment to a transforming ideal; are cath ected onto a form or a metaphor. The child cathects “a preoedipal object rather than the paternal Phallus” (Kristeva, cited in Oliver, 1993b: 74), a cathexis which precedes the Oedipal identification with the paternal Phallus. The semiotic need is not replaced by desire; rather the semiotic need is a pattern, which sets up the possibility of desire; it “is an intrasymbolic structure that precedes the metonymy of desire” (ibid.:74).

The image of the Imaginary Father recuperates the mother’s body filled with drives and desires and pre-objects, which lie behind the mother-object. The Imaginary Father is a “screen for the mother’s love…[and] who provides the support necessary to allow the child to make the move into the Symbolic order…a move from the mother’s body to the mother’s desire through the mother’s love” (Oliver, 1993b: 70). According to Kristeva, the mother must not be reduced to the primary object, but must be recognized as social, and desiring. Identification with the mother is only threatening if the mother is not recognized as a speaking and desiring subject herself: “The loving mother, different from the caring and clinging mother, is someone who has an object of desire; beyond that, she has an Other with relation to whom the child will serve as go-between…without the maternal “diversion” toward a Third Party, the bodily exchange is abjection or devouring” (Kristeva, 1987:34).

The desiring mother, whilst maintaining heterogeneity, participates in the Symbolic order, she is not the phallic castrated mother within the Law of the Father. And, “only when the mother’s body is associated with needs and not with desire, …can she be a threatening, phallic, all-powerful mother” (Oliver, 1995:168). However, if the mother’s body is seen as desiring, she must therefore be social and cannot be a phallic mother who undergoes castration. It thus follows that she cannot be the representative of Lack as portrayed in Freudian and Lacanian theory.

To Kristeva, the logic of the Symbolic is already present in the maternal body as the child’s first affections are directed towards the mother. The father is not yet the Name of the Father, the father of the Symbolic; “he is a presymbolic imaginary father who stands in as a support for the place of the mother’s desire” (Oliver, 1993b: 78). Love gives way to desire as the Imaginary Father allows identification with the mother’s desire for the Phallus. The child’s identification with the Imaginary Father allows identification with the paternal function, which already exists in the mother.

The Imaginary Father is the imaginary reunion with the child’s dependency on the maternal body, which takes place in the place of the real union so that the child is able to enter the realm of language. The identification with the Imaginary Father is thus the
child’s identification with its conception. “It is a transference to the site of the jouissance of the primal scene” (ibid.:79). The child’s origin is founded on excess, on imagined pleasure rather than lack since it is the imaginary identification with the mother’s body, with the maternal jouissance that enables the child to lose the real identification with the mother. This “archaic transferential imaginary identification” (ibid.: 85) encourages separation from the pre-Oedipal maternal. And, the fantasy of the father-mother conglomerate “allows the child to feel loved even while it is separating from its mother’s body” (Oliver, 2003:45).

Kristeva triangulates the infant/mother dyad and formulates a model beyond the binary couple of Lacan, for whom the father is physically absent from the mother-child scene because he is part of culture. She indicates the necessity of a third mediating term between the semiotic and the Symbolic, between the body of the mother and the paternal Law. The traditional father of psychoanalysis is the stern father of the Law, who does not, according to Kristeva, provide any support for giving up the identification with the maternal body. The Imaginary Father, as distinct from the paternal role construed by the Symbolic order, is a mediating term in the process that operates between the semiotic and the Symbolic and constitutes a bridge to the Symbolic.

If only the stern father of the Law existed, and without the support of the Imaginary Father (the love of the mother) the child will merely be devoured by the abject mother, it will not become an autonomous subject. The ‘Imaginary Father’ thus creates the space in the mother-child dyad, which allows for individuation and development. It is marked or motivated by a need to “signify the reorientation of the eros of the mother to another and to prevent a suffocating or devouring passion for the child” (McNelly Kearns, 1992: 119). As the primary psychic structure, it sets up the experiences of abjection and the mirror-stage. It assists the child to negotiate between the maternal semiotic body and the Symbolic, and is posited as a counterbalance to the abject mother. “This is because the imaginary father is a third party, an Other, who guides the child away from maternal fusion and towards participation in symbolic (paternal) structures. The third term provides the way out of the dyad” (du Nooy, 2003:123).

With this loving figure, Kristeva is able to effect a sense of distance away from the body and its abject contents as well as from the subject and object’s mutual aggressivity. The Imaginary Father makes possible “the identification with another who is like oneself. Consequently, the other (object) of love is impossible unless the Other (Ideal) is also involved” (Lechte, 1990a: 170). The child’s fantasy regarding its conception sets up the possibility of symbolic identification and enables access to speech: “When the object that I incorporate is the speech of the other – precisely a nonobject, a pattern, a model – I bind myself to him in a primary fusion, communion, unification. An identification… In being able to receive the other’s words, to assimilate, repeat, and reproduce them, I become like him: one. A subject of enunciation. Through psychic osmosis/identification. Through love” (Kristeva, 1987:26).

Love is the victory of the “excessive pleasures found in language over and against a theologization of the original murder of somatic autoeroticism requisite to found the
social order” (Huntington, 1998:100-101). Pleasure, rather than lack is named as the original motivation for identification and developing a sense of subjectivity. Instead of reifying the founding violent sacrifice, we open the pathway to love and harmonious relations. In love, the subject’s longing for an original autoerotic immersion in the maternal body is resolved in favour of being a subject-in-process.

3.11 Processual subjectivity: a sujèt-en-proces

The ‘empowered’ professional woman is, contrary to her own conscious construction as a ‘unitary’ and ‘empowered’ subject, a true Kristevan subject-in-process, always in flux. Her identity is not a fundamental essence of character but rather a continuous process that is accomplished through actions and words. Human subjectivity, as explicated by Kristeva, is a dynamic process, which liquefies and dissolves the rational attempt of the subject to define and stabilize thought and language. The sujèt-en-proces suggests that individuals must be thought of as “(u)nfixed, unsatisfied…not a unity, not autonomous, but a process, perpetually in construction, perpetually contradictory, perpetually open to change” (Belsey, 1980:132). It is a movement that constantly transgresses the limits of a fixed identity such as the ‘empowered’ professional woman.

Furthermore, the human subject is a composite, a combination or interpenetration of body and soul, the result of the dialectic between the semiotic, material rejection and symbolic stases/stability. All signification is driven by this dialectic oscillation between the semiotic drive and the stases of the symbolic, between the semiotic and the symbolic elements, between rejection and identification. In the dialectical oscillation between the semiotic and the Symbolic, rejection both precedes and follows the Symbolic order. Kristeva insists that both rejection and stases are necessary, and through “the jolts and starts of material rejection, the expulsions of the semiotic body become the negativity that allow the would-be speaking being to metonymically replace its privation and excess with a signifier ”(Olliver, 1993b: 46). The semiotic and symbolic remain interdependent; the ‘thetic’ is required for the functioning of any symbolic or semiotic functioning since these two realms constitute signifying practice in dialectical oscillation. The Symbolic, as empty and abstract, is always open; “it becomes an open system in which difference and otherness are structurally integral to the very existence of the system. The symbolic is the body speaking, but it is not the body; the semiotic is the material presence of words, but it is not language” (Lechte, 2003:194).

The introduction of the semiotic chora and the drives, stress the inseparability of body and meaning, by bringing the body back into language, and by suggesting that the bodily desire or crisis can rupture the Symbolic. The subject is an embodied subject, constituted by the unstable somatic processes since the semiotic disruptively erupts in the Symbolic order. It transgresses and disrupts the monologic of the dominant ‘self’. The identity and space of the unitary subject are therefore “simultaneously destroyed and recreated by the pressures exerted on language from an affect-driven body” (Smith, 1996:5). The reconstituted subject is not a stable “je” or “ego” which states meanings and constructs itself (the self, the identity) within the structure of language; rather, it is a dialectical
process in which the structured realm of language collides with the bodily realm of psychic instincts.

Although the Symbolic attempts to repress the traces of the semiotic, in so doing it gives rise to the unconscious semiotic chora (the carrier of logical and chronological primacy), which continuously challenges the Symbolic. The semiotic rupture is a way of “dynamising the symbolic, of putting it in time, of setting it in motion, of giving it fluidity as well as a content” (Lechte, 2003:194). Although the semiotic is the ‘precondition’ of the Symbolic, it “functions within the signifying practices as the result of a transgression of the symbolic” (Kristeva, 1984:68). The subject is constructed via the dialectic between the semiotic and symbolic modalities and signifying practice (significance: the meaning produced by the semiotic in conjunction with the symbolic) is constituted by and within this play between the semiotic and the symbolic. Significance emphasizes play and process rather than fixed meaning, which is a kind of negativity, a division which questions unity. “It is a process that dissolves and deconstitutes the subject’s cohesion. It is a force heterogenous to rational logic” (Boulous Walker, 1998:105). The subject that emerges from this ‘play’ and ‘process’ is a product of the interaction of these two necessary, primordial elements.

3.12 The subject as site of radical contradiction

The subject is “a contradiction that brings about practice because practice is always both signifying and semiotic, a crest where meaning emerges only to disappear” (Kristeva, 1984:215). The ‘thetic’ subject is an effort to reconcile these two different orders of thought, which can never be reduced to each other’s terms but can also not be assumed to exist in self-sufficient isolation. The subject-on-trial is caught between the primary processes of the body and the secondary processes of the Symbolic, it moves between identity and its splitting apart. It is the outcome of the “heterogenous contradiction between two irreconcilable elements – separate but inseparable from the process in which they assume asymmetrical functions” (ibid.:82). Instead of a subject, positioned at and as the center of meaning, the owner of intentional and rational thought and subjectivity; subjectivity is suffused with a contradictory and chaotic negativity, which erupts within the social, Symbolic order. The semiotic body shatters the logical unity of Symbolic thought and language and reaffirms the subject as the site of radical contradiction and as the site of the radical subversion of meaning, “a practice dissolving the coherence of subject-identity” (Boulous Walker, 1998:112).

The subject-on-trial embodies a kind of lived contradiction; and is “literally an unliveable state of crisis” (ibid.:107). The ‘empowered’ professional woman adopts multiple subject positions, and is therefore a contradictory subject, simultaneously powerful (masculine, unitary) within certain subject positions and powerless (feminine, absent) in other instances. The multiple subject positionings that constitute her subjectivity “casts the self as neither unified nor fixed, but as a layered site of conflict and contradiction, where submission as well as resistance to socio-historical representations are negotiated” (Leitch, 1996:137). These contradictions expose the power-suffused, struggle-produced quality of any fixed identity. The ‘empowered’ professional woman is a ‘self’ torn in
different directions by competing discourses “and of a fragmented discursive space which sabotages the hope of internal coherence …” (Burman et al, 1997:4). The inherent contradictions in the construct ‘empowered’ woman reveal the irreducible flawedness of closure of that construct by the traces of an alterity, which it can neither reduce, nor expel. And, the ‘empowered’ professional woman as subject is always-already shot through with otherness.

3.13 New configurations

The contradictory state of the thetic subject (the oscillation between renewal and repetition, between rejection and stases) continually propels it forward to new configuration within the Symbolic, to a new level, that of thetic heterogeneity. Although the emergence of the semiotic is always accompanied by violence, its end result is the radical transformation and renewal of thought. It is within these contradictory spaces where the old and the new discourses meet, that new subjectivities (subjects-in-process) are forged. Rejection creates something new, rather than merely operating according to the logic of repetition. It is “the passage from one sign system to another [which]…involves an altering of the thetic position – the destruction of an old position and the formation of a new one” (Kristeva, 1984:59). “For it is not the fragmented, or intermittent, identity of a subject constructed in division by language alone, an ‘I’ continually prefigured and preempted in an unchangeable symbolic order. It is neither…the imaginary identity of the individualist, bourgeois subject, which is male and white …What is emerging… is, instead the concept of a multiple, shifting, and often self-contradictory identity…an identity made up of heterogenous and heteronomous representations of gender, race and class, and often …across languages and cultures” (de Lauretis, cited in Moore, 1994: 57).

The contradictory nature of the sujet-en-procès reveals the continuous process of change as it permits a new range of signifying practices, which effectively reject the fixed, totalizing account of a unitary subject. This dialectic makes revolution within the Symbolic possible and is productive in the sense that it opens up the possibility of new types of discourse. The subject-on-trial opens up “new alternatives for subjectivity in which corporeality on the part of both self and other could be fully acknowledged” (Lorraine, 1999:42). It is thus from the complex interweaving of these contradictory discourses that meaning and change originate in which “reciprocal relations prevent the ossification of culture and encourage systematic change and exchange. By responding to such mutations, language reinforces a phenomenon of creative instability in which no ‘pure’ or unitary origin can ever be posited….variety and homogeneity lead to richer and more fulfilling lives for all those who share a given environment; multiplicity flourishes when the shackles of homogeneity and rigidity are broken” (Lionnet, 1989:17-18).

The liminal subject-on-trial becomes the paradigm for a ‘politics of difference’; for it theorizes a subject-position based on the transgression of boundaries as well as the possibility of negotiating a cross-section of identities that avoids homogenous ‘universalism’. The subject-on-trial can be interpreted as a Foucauldian genealogical struggle which “is necessary to prevent established disciplines from gaining total
hegemony over subjectivity and eventually obliterating differences among subjects” (Prado, 2000: 109). It is a celebration of differences which allows for a dispersed multiplicity which is not limited to the logic of the Same. These differences must be recognized and encompassed without falling into oppositional ways of thinking, it is “the regulation and negotiation of those spaces that are continually, *contingently*, ‘opening out’, remaking the boundaries, exposing the limits of any claim to a singular or autonomous sign of difference…where differences are neither One nor the Other but *something else besides, in-between*—It is an interstitial future, that emerges *in-between* the claims of the past and the needs of the present” (Bhabha, 1994:219).

A new identity is formed which is characterized by “divergent thinking… by moving away from set patterns and goals toward a …perspective…that includes rather than excludes” (Anzaldúa, 1987:378-389). This new subjectivity requires a paradoxical balance between sameness and difference rather than a binary opposition, which values one and denigrates the Other by splitting them off into polarities. And, the processual subject personifies “the possibility of transforming the sameness of the duality between same and other by the radical heterogeneity negatively inscribed in a subject-effect straddling a plurality of discursive positions” (Carusi, 1991:105).

For, it is in the awareness of the potential for expression and empowerment, which are contained in the spaces in-between conflicting discourses, rather than being lodged in the illusory ‘unitary’ identity, that there lie the opportunities for resistance and change and transformation. These moments within discourse must be used to convert acts of resistance into previously unheard, yet intertextualised forms of ‘new expression’. Sawicki (1991:44) states: “Freedom lies in …discovering new ways of understanding ourselves and one another, refusing to accept the dominant culture’s characterisations of our practices and desires, and redefining them from within resistant cultures”.

Woman, as speaking subject, is faced with the challenge of refusing to be the Other of male discourse and with the refusal to be integrated as the Same. This task entails “entering culture and society in ways that defy identification and subjection, of entering into dialogue with the symbolic and social order without being integrated into it, without becoming fixed and forced or lulled into speaking from a singular point” (Butler, 1995: 272). Only when woman accepts the fragmented and contradictory nature of her ‘self’, will there be a correspondence of the subjects, the ‘new generation’ to a free and fluid form of subjectivity, which is truly able to integrate both separation and difference. Simply centring the marginal and marginalizing the central remains an oppositional strategy, which merely creates another hierarchy that will require overturning. Instead of merely supplanting one dominant discourse with another, there must be a concern with releasing new, emergent voices. As an alternative to a discourse of Sameness, the self-creating subject, who is capable of resistance, must “[refuse] to be scripted by the dominant discourse and [turn] instead to subjugated knowledges to fashion alternative discourses of subjectivity” (Hekman, 1995:84).

In the chapters that follow, the construction of the ‘empowered’ professional black woman will be analyzed according to a binary model (the Oedipal model), which is
informed by the Kristevan theory of processual subjectivity. This construct will then be deconstructed in order to reveal the marginal and the marked Other of the dominant discourses.
CHAPTER 4: Methodology

4.1 Introduction

As described in the previous two chapters, the human subject typically secures its position through “syllogistic logic; it excludes contradiction, and thus never fundamentally doubts or questions itself” (Stanton, 1980:74). Kristeva’s theory of processual subjectivity strives to deconstruct the Western notion of the subject as an organic and consistent unity and aims at unveiling the heterogenous forces, which belie the apparent homogeneity of the positivist unity. Her postmodern feminist theory and Derridean deconstruction raise serious questions about the possibilities of transformation and ‘empowerment’ since knowledge is deeply gendered and power continues to play an enormous part in social and political life. This entails an acknowledgement of the fact “that legitimation of knowledge claims is intimately tied to networks of domination and exclusion” (Lennon & Whitford, 1994:1).

Kristeva’s ‘theory of the Other’ is an attempt of thinking otherness “which resists incorporation into the unifying orders of discourse but on which both thought and discourse depend for their possibility” (Ziarek, 1991:102). It is a radically different approach to Otherness, since alterity is perceived as always already inhabiting every identity and interrupting every principle of thought. For Kristeva, the very activity of constructing the self along the norm of the ‘male logic’ is the reduction of plurality to unity and alterity to sameness; or the reduction of Otherness. In the sections that follow I set out the Oedipal model, which has been extracted from the Kristevan theory of subjectivity.

4.2 The Oedipal model: a discourse of Sameness and Difference

This model is based on the distinction between sameness and difference (between the conscious and unconscious or symbolic and semiotic realms) upon which human subjectivity is traditionally constructed. Therefore the initial focus will be on the dominant discourses that the ‘empowered’ woman as ‘unitary’ subject employs to construct herself consciously. The first reading is then the dominant interpretation of the text, its intended meaning.

The ‘empowered’ woman constructs herself according to the binary dualism of Sameness (I am Similar to the Law of the Father) and Difference (I am Different from the (m)Other). Underlying the construct ‘empowered’ woman along the line of difference is the assumption of dualistic values that is “a characteristic feature of the Western tradition …” (Shildrich, 1997:105). Furthermore, these dominant constructs privilege one pole of opposites over the other, where ‘similarity’ is the valued term, and ‘difference’ is the marked, devalued term.

In this Oedipal model, ‘sameness’ equals identity and equality to the norm and ‘difference’ equals the absence of identity and inequality to the norm. The model thus reveals how the ‘self’ is constructed by placing equality and difference in an antithetical
relationship. This binary denies the way that difference figures in political notions of equality and suggests that sameness is the only way in which equality can be claimed. Sameness as a requirement for equality negates the fact that power is constructed upon difference and must be challenged from a ground of difference.

I then apply the double reading of deconstruction to the Oedipal model, which interlaces two layers of reading, by means of the ‘dominant interpretation’ of the text and second, by opening the text up to the blind spots or ellipses within the first, dominant interpretation. This traversing of the text enables the reading to obtain a point of alterity/exteriority from which the text is deconstructed. This second moment also brings the text into contradiction with itself, opening as it were, against its ‘intended’ meaning onto an alterity which goes against what the text wants to say or mean. Furthermore, the second reading is something wholly Other, which cannot be reduced to what the text wants to say. This double reading reveals that the ‘empowered’ woman is not the ‘unified’ subject she believes herself to be, but a fragmented one who occupies multiple subject positions. Deconstructing the subject in the above manner, does not imply that the concept is negated; rather, deconstruction implies only that we consider how the term is used to conceal the mechanisms of power and authority. To deconstruct is to question the taken-for-granted usage of the term and to reuse it in a novel manner.

The next sections will focus on the binary, Oedipal model with specific reference to the discourses used by the ‘empowered’ woman to construct her ‘unitary’ sense of ‘self’. Throughout the following section I will explicate how the Kristevan theory of processual subjectivity informs this model and show how the ‘texts’ oscillate between dual drives, namely similarity (sameness) and difference, and between continuity and disruption.

4.3. Constructing the ‘empowered’ professional black woman: a thetic subjectivity

The analytic technique used to obtain the structure of the discourses is explicated by Andersen (2003: 58), namely that in any “…hierarchical relationship between the two elements in a difference – one tries to subjugate the other. By deconstructing differences, the relationship is usually reversed in such a way that what appears to be the norm is recognized as a game of dominance”. Thus, the first dominant discourse “I am similar to the Law of the Father” (which includes the two sub discourses “I silence others”, and “I am a powerful decision-maker”) and the second dominant discourse “I am different from the (m)Other”, (with its four sub-discourses, namely “I am a rebel”, “I am independent”, “I am outspoken” and “I am educated/knowledgeable”) try to dominate that which is different from it, its other. However, through the process of deconstruction, this hierarchical relationship is reversed and by so doing, reveals not only the subjugation but also how the supposedly dominant discourses are always inhabited by the devalued, suppressed discourses,

The dominant reading of the construct, the ‘empowered’ professional black woman, shows her attempt to establish herself as an absolute, an independent entity. This monadic, self-interested ego is essentially one that is posited in classical psychoanalytical theory. The empowered woman, (Says) constructs herself via two distinct dominant
discourses, which assert her omnipotence by employing the structure of the economy of Sameness.

The first dominant discourse is identified as “I am similar to the Law of the Father” which has two sub-discourses, namely:

i. I silence others, and
ii. I am a powerful decision-maker.

This dominant discourse privileges rationality and independence and has specific implications for the subject’s positioning as a powerful subject in the Symbolic order, the order of language and culture.

The second dominant discourse is identified as “I am different from the (m)Other”, which employs the logic of difference. The above powerful subject effectively distances herself via this discourse from the devalued, negative and feminine object position, which belongs to the semiotic realm. This second dominant discourse has four sub-discourses, namely:

i. I am a rebel,
ii. I am independent,
iii. I am outspoken, and
iv. I am educated / knowledgeable.

The above two dominant discourses with their sub-discourses are based on the Kristevan ‘thetic’ phase, which is situated in the realm of positions or of positionality, that of the Symbolic. Kristeva argues that subjects must submit to the Symbolic order as the price of their sociality in the current economic logos. This order must be entered for an individual to assume a coherent identity, since to enter the Symbolic order is to take up a position, which is only possible through the symbolic function (cf. Oliver, 1993b: 39).

Positionality is the co-operation with material, cultural and historical conditions, thus the patriarchal and social ordering of modern society. Kristeva accepts the phallus as the crucial signifier in the subject’s acquisition of a speaking position. The Symbolic realm entails the identification of the ‘unitary’, thetic subject with the Law of the Father. Autonomy, the aspect of free will, and agency characterize the ideal of masculine individuality of the realm of the Symbolic order. The Symbolic realm’s monopoly over power and over desire is justified on the grounds that it is the only viable route to individuality. The positing of a ‘unitary’ subjectivity, or the desire to possess one’s own origin, is further a desire to exclude otherness and difference. This dominant discourse of Sameness (to the Law of the Father) is therefore centered in a single, Western, patriarchal authority.

Through constructing herself as similar to the Law of the Father and different from the mother, the black, professional woman can be seen as seeking equality and sameness within the Logos, and as wanting an equal share of the existing symbolic system. Her
equality to the Logos is achieved by identifying with the position of the ‘unitary’ subject (the realm of rationality, mastery and control) in the Symbolic order.

4.3.1 The split subject: subject/object

The entry into the Symbolic and the assumption of the unitary subject position is marked by the acquisition of language. “The Name-of-the-Father: the patronym, patriarchal law, patrilineal identity, language as our inscription into patriarchy” (Gallop, 1982: 47). Language produces the individual as a human subject whilst at the same time making this subject alienated and split. Language is therefore both the means of a search for oneness as well as a division within the essence of the individual. Identification with the symbolic realm also requires that the subject must separate from and through her objects since positionality of language starts with the separation of subject and object. The subject undergoes a splitting in order to find a signifying place from which to represent itself, from which to take up a position with regards to meaning.

Splitting as defence mechanism is employed and is defined by Mitchell (1986: 20) as follows: “…the ego can stop the bad part of the object contaminating the good part, by dividing it, or it can be split off and disown a part of itself…each kind of splitting always entails the other. In projection the ego fills the object with some of its own split feelings and experiences; in introjection it takes into itself what it perceives or experiences of the object. In [projective identification] the ego projects its feelings into the object which it then identifies with, becoming like the object which it has already imaginatively filled with itself”. The ‘unitary’ subject, via her identification with the realm of the Symbolic, actively introjects the positive values of the Same as part of her conscious identity. By constructing herself through the dominant discourses, namely “I am different from the (m)Other” and “I am similar to the Law of the Father”, she positions herself consciously as the dominant powerful subject and projects her devalued side to the object-position. These two sides are regarded as opposing and distinct tendencies, so that they are available to her only as alternatives, as subject and as object positions.

This polarity, or the conflict of opposites, further sets the stage for defining the ‘self’ in terms of a movement away from dependency on the mother. To maintain a separate identity, it is necessary to define oneself against the other and as such the feminine and the corporeal are the marked terms of the masculine and the mind. It enforces the split between (male) subject and (female) object and with it the dual unity of domination and submission, between the semiotic realm (of attachment) and the Symbolic realm (of separation). Psychic splitting from what is other to itself occurs because of the intensity of the subject’s investment in the unitary position of the ‘I’. It is a projection of the devalued maternal/feminine parts of the ‘self’ on to the (m)Other and identification with the (dominant, unitary) Law of the Father. The Law or truth of patriarchal society “is the law of the phallus, which is the logic of identity, the logic of the same, of the singular, inviolable One that suppresses its other. It is this patriarchal regime of decidable representations that produces the male as the privileged, empowered term and subjugates woman as the excluded other” (Ebert, 1996:167).
The professional black woman identifies with the realm of the Name of the Father in an effort to establish the separateness that is threatened by identification with the (m)Other. The Symbolic realm therefore fulfills a dual role: it is a defense against the all-powerful archaic maternal and it is an expression of the subject’s innate striving to individuate. Through identification with the realm of subjectivity, of language and culture, the daughter denies dependency and dissociates herself from the ties with the semiotic, maternal realm.

This identification with the Symbolic, the realm of culture and language, embodies the repudiation of femininity. The subordination of the feminine characteristics of the unitary subject entails that she simultaneously denies the (m)Other’s subjectivity and makes her into the object that is the embodiment of the split-off (feminine) parts of the ‘self’. The feminine is constituted as the symbol of the passivity of society and therefore feminine forms of signification are relegated to the margins of discourse. Furthermore, the polarization of subject and object leads to an assignment of subject status to the dominant, masculine term and the object status to the feminine, devalued term. The ‘unitary’ subject, by virtue of repudiating her feminine aspects, now claims subjectivity.

4.3.2 A struggle for independence: abjecting the (m)Other, the precondition of a ‘unitary’ subjectivity

As indicated above, the division of the subject is the precondition of rational language. The preconditions of the production of the unitary subject with its standards of objectivity, rationality and universality require the exclusion of the feminine, the body and the unconscious. The social subject is thus defined because of the repression of the feminine, the maternal. It is a movement away from dependency, away from the (m)Other. The woman’s struggle for independence is thus a denial of the dependency on the maternal, of “the primal narcissistic identification with the mother…” (Oliver, 1993b: 60). It is a denial that forgets the centrality of the other, the semiotic realm in the construction of the ‘self’.

The chora as feminine and material realm is based on primary processes and is maternally oriented. This repressed space is in opposition to the Symbolic that is regulated by the secondary processes and the Law of the Father. The maternal body is the ordering principle of the semiotic chora since “speaking subjects emerge into language from a background of conflict between attraction and repulsion with an image of the archaic mother” (Fisher, 1992: 98). The logic of negation/rejection, which is a prerequisite for human subjectivity, operates through maternal rejection, which is not only the driving force within the Symbolic, but also serves to set up the Symbolic.

The subject-object dichotomy (difference) cannot occur until the infant represses the maternal chora, as state of oneness. It is a condition of the constitution of the speaking subject, and attests to the always tenuous nature of the Symbolic order in the face of a series of dispersing semiotic drives. The negativity of the semiotic suggests that it is the necessary precondition of the Symbolic realm, the realm of meaning, representation and
judgment. It is the semiotic, as the feminine space, which provides the foundations of law and language.

The origin for the ‘unitary’ subject’s desire of mastery lies in the experience of abjection, which is an attempt to break away from the all-sufficient mother, the semiotic realm. Abjection is the precondition of narcissism and the (m)Other is abjected via the ‘unitary’ subject’s assertion of difference and superiority. The repudiated maternal body persists as the object to be separated from, to have power over, to denigrate. The integrity and the legitimacy of the ‘empowered’ professional woman’s fixed identity is called into question and threatened by the experience of the abject as ‘the stranger within’ and as the contingency of the center on margin and of the self on the Other. The maternal realm threatens to re-engulf the independent subject with its reminder of helplessness and dependency. “Abjection preserves what existed in the archaism of preobjectal relationship, in the immemorial violence with which a body becomes separated from another body in order to be…” (Kristeva, 2002b: 236).

Subjectivity follows from the struggle of the ‘unitary self’ struggle to violently escape her feelings of dependency associated with the (m)Other and her efforts to maintain absolute difference and control. When the ‘unitary’ subject is threatened by the return to the maternal realm, the pre-symbolic, she experiences a great deal of uncontrollable anxiety. And, the seemingly absolute truths upon which her ‘unitary’ subjectivity rests become uncertain or relative, therefore the ego tries to oppose that disintegration which surrounds it and oppose it. Her contradictory positioning as both a professional (the Symbolic realm) and a woman (the semiotic realm) threaten to destabilize her sense of being a unitary subject. It is this anxiety, which she constantly tries to manage, which reproduces the subject-object split.

In order to assume the speaking position in the Symbolic realm, the ‘unitary’ subject represses her negative, feminine parts, the counterpart of the rational realm and projects them onto her (m)Other. The anxiety the ‘unitary’ subject experiences is controlled by attempts to maintain the existence of a boundary between the ‘self’ and the (m)Other through the psychic processes of projection and introjection. She projects her inferior/bad parts onto the (m)Other who is silenced. She cannot accept them in herself and so she cannot accept them in others. She thus denies her (m)Other and her own feminine subjectivity and instead makes the (m)Other into the object that embodies the split-off parts of her ‘self’ by projecting the ‘unwanted’ parts of herself onto the Other.

The ‘empowered’ professional black woman’s need to sever her identification with the realm of the maternal in order to be confirmed as a ‘unitary’ and autonomous subject prevents her from consciously recognizing her feminine capacities. She thus asserts her subjectivity and difference from the maternal realm, via the discourse “I am different from the (m)Other” since the structure of individuation permeates our culture, and privileges separation over dependence.
4.3.3 A deconstructive reading: semiotic eruptions and contradictions

Once the subject enters the Symbolic order, the chora will more or less successfully be repressed and can be “perceived only as pulsional pressure on or within symbolic language: as contradictions, meaningfulness, disruption, silences and absences” (Moi, 1986:13). However, abjection is not a simple repudiation, for the abject is that which “lies outside, beyond the set, and from its place of banishment, does not cease challenging its master” (Kristeva, 1987:2). The feminine aspects of the subject cannot be contained by the rational thetic structure of the symbolic order and threatens the sovereignty of this symbolic.

For, even after abjecting the mother’s body, the subject can never entirely forget the chora, or undifferentiated state. What is abjected is radically excluded, but it is never banished entirely, or wholly obliterated. The dominant ‘empowered’ woman is unable to systematically and consistently exclude that which is other to her, the silent (m)Other. The “semiotic processes are never left behind and operate synchronically across language and other manifestations of subjectivity” (Smith, 1998:20). For, the very condition of the possibility of the ‘empowered’ woman includes precisely what this construct attempts to exclude and repress, and so the condition of her possibility as ‘empowered’ woman is also the condition of her impossibility.

Deconstruction counteracts the tendency to objectify and deny recognition to those who are less independent or different, and does not obliterate difference. The Derridean concept of différance has implications for the construction of any fixed, dominant form of identity, which is always built on self-appropriation. The very notion of the ‘unitary self’ as an autonomous site is discursively constructed in and through the Other, for no site in an imagined indifferrence or autonomy can ever exist without taking account of its abjected, forgotten others. Whilst the professional black woman actively constructs herself as ‘empowered’ and therefore educated and professional within the framework of Sameness, the oppositional (devalued) discourse of femininity and Otherness, is always present. And, in a deconstructive reading when the ‘unitary’ subject constructs (Says) herself as ‘empowered’ she is also implicitly referring to what those things are Not, to what is absent from them (the Unsaid).

The double reading of deconstruction opens up the text to its blind spots/ellipsis and is a radical thinking of otherness, which is “perceived as always already inhabiting every identity and interrupting every principle of thought” (Ziarek, 1991:102). The second reading brings the text into contradiction with itself, opening against its intended meaning onto an alterity.

The first dominant discourse, when deconstructed reads as follows: “I am not similar to the Law of the Father”.

The two deconstructed sub-discourses are:

i. I do not silence others, and
ii. I am not a powerful decision-maker.

The professional woman is thus not similar to the dominant, valued position of the Law of the Father (thus the rational, ‘unitary’ subject of the Symbolic order) with a concomitant investment of power.

The second dominant discourse, when deconstructed, reads as follows: “I am not different from the (m)Other”, and the four deconstructed sub-discourses are as follows:

i. I am not a rebel,
ii. I am not independent,
iii. I am not outspoken, and
iv. I am not educated/ knowledgeable.

When the dominant discourses are deconstructed, the repressed parts of the ‘empowered’ woman’s ‘unitary’ identity are brought to the fore. The ‘empowered’ woman is found to be similar to the devalued, negative and feminine position of the semiotic order.

The semiotic realm constantly exerts pressure on the Symbolic, threatening disruption and reminding the subject of the impossibility of transcending the corporeal origins of subjectivity. These not-Said discourses are eruptions of the unconscious, the maternal semiotic in the Symbolic unity and are the condition of the possibility of existence of the Said discourses, of the woman’s construction of herself as a ‘unitary’ subject. The not-Said (the implied) opens up two irreconcilable lines of thought within the text. And, in the second reading of deconstruction, the second, undivulged text is articulated within lapses of the first text. These interruptions and insights which are to be found in the contradictions are moments when the necessary Other announces its presence in the reading, an event in which it overrides the ontological Said. The semiotic, the place of the (m)Other, is a realm of “marginality, subversion and dissidence” (Moi, 1985:164) and is an articulation of unconscious processes “which fracture the common idealisation of those images and signs which secure the status quo…” (Smith, 1998:16). The maternal realm declares the opposition between the Other and the same, the notions of identity (“I am similar to the Law of the Father”) and difference (“I am different from the (m)Other”) as insufficient. The notion of origin is not a pure, unified source of meaning or history but it is always already heterogenous.

Deconstructing the dominant discourses reveals that the primary term (that of the ‘empowered’ woman as a ‘unitary’ identity) derives its identity from the suppression and curtailment of the opposite, the devalued, ‘marked’ term (the feminine qualities of the ‘empowered’ woman). However, a clotural reading articulates the ethical interruption of ontological closure as stated by “I am different from the (m)Other” and “I am similar to the Law of the Father”. It disrupts the ‘empowered’ woman’s claims of comprehensive unity and self-understanding and her attempts to define herself in terms of closure, are denied. Deconstruction reveals the irreducibly flawedness of closure of that construct. It is flawed by the traces of an alterity which it can neither reduce nor expel; and is unable to demarcate its inside from its outside, divided within itself between belonging and not-
belonging to a logocentric tradition. Instead, the construct, the ‘empowered’ professional black woman is shown to be the failure of the closure, that which is the opening or breakthrough which occurs within the closure, which violates its vows of unity and breaches its barriers, an undecideability is the moment of excess over the closure.

4.3.4 A subject in process: paradoxes and aporias: a surplus value

The complexities and ambiguities of the professional woman’s position acknowledges the aporias, the irresolvable contradictory tensions in her claim of being a ‘unitary’ subject, it also acknowledges the impossibility of assigning a singular and definitive meaning, of any “Truth” or value. The semiotic and symbolic are not simply binary oppositions, these domains are heterogenous and therefore disruptive of one another, which illustrates the logic of excess. “These two modalities are inseparable within the signifying process which constitutes language, and the dialectic between them determines the type of discourse … involved…because the system is always both semiotic and symbolic, no signifying system he produces can be either “exclusively” semiotic or “exclusively” symbolic, and is instead marked by an indebtedness to both” (Kristeva, 1984:24). Kristeva’s speaking subject is the split subject of psychoanalytic theory; it is a composite, a combination of body and soul, of semiotic and symbolic elements. This proposes a dynamic interrelationship between the two domains and the human subject conceived as subjectivity ‘in process’, undoes, rather than insists on any essentialist notion that the ‘self’ is a mind separated from the body. All signification is driven by this dialectic oscillation between the semiotic drive and the stases of the symbolic, between the semiotic and the symbolic elements, between rejection and identification.

The empowered woman is thus both the one and the other, and an ‘I’ that carries the excess value of what is neither the one nor the ‘self’. She is a contradictory, heterogenous subject who is both “I am similar to the Law of the Father” and “I am not different from the (m)Other”. The ‘empowered’ woman is a Kristevan ‘sujet-en-procès’; she is a product of the ‘impossible dialectic’ between the semiotic (‘maternal’ jouissance) and the Symbolic (the ‘paternal’ power or Law). Kristeva thus argues for simultaneity and equality, rather than exclusion and privileging of either the Symbolic or the semiotic realms or capacities.

Identity is thus not a fundamental essence of character but rather a continuous process that is accomplished through actions and words. Process undermines and subverts the notion of a unified subject; alterity is within the subject. Meaning itself is self-divided and undecideable: “the access of the signifier to the signified is delayed and deferred, divided by a difference-within or differance” (Ebert, 1996:184). In every entity there is a surplus of meaning, and a difference-within that prevents that entity from being a reliable ground for knowledge. The subject-in-process signiﬁes the inherent instability of the ‘unitary’ subject of rational discourse and the Symbolic order and is a wholly deconstructive practice that reveals that fixed ideas such as foundation and origin are always already inscribed in a differential structure of meaning, and questions this privileging of identity.
The ‘empowered’ professional black woman as subject is always-already shot through with otherness. Deconstruction’s movements “do not destroy structures from the outside. They are not possible of effective, nor can they take accurate aim, except by inhabiting those structures…Operating necessarily from the inside, borrowing all the strategic resources and economic resources of subversion from the old structure…” (Derrida, 1976:24). All presence is infused with absence, with the trace; without the latter, the present cannot be assumed to exist in isolation. All identities are based on difference; presence is built on absence, and identity on difference. The aim, in the end, is to “…reconstruct new imaginative spaces where power configurations, inevitable as they are, may be reorganized to allow for fewer dissymmetries in the production and circulation of knowledge” (Lionnet, 1995:6).

4.3.5 A dual perspective on the construction of the ‘empowered’ professional black woman

In Chapters Five and Six, the aim is to empirically confirm the Oedipal model as explicated in this chapter. Chapter Five is concerned with the analyses of two autobiographical novels, one written during the apartheid era, You can’t get lost in Cape Town (Zoe Wicomb), 1987 and one written in the post-apartheid era, Our generation (Zubeida Jaffer), 2003.

Autobiographical writing has specifically been selected for the analyses, as it is has become critical commonplace to regard autobiographies written by South African black authors as a social document, which emerge from a particular socio-political milieu. An autobiography can thus be read as a record of social and historical events and as such should be regarded as expressions of a collective social awareness rather than just the expression of the unique experience of a single individual. Ngwenya (1996:28) asserts that autobiographies yield “illuminating sociological insights about interpretation and of (responses) to social reality held in common by members of a particular class or groups located within that class”. It thus follows that the analyses of the construction of the ‘empowered’ narrators reflect the changes and transformation of their broader society.

In Chapter Six, the Oedipal model is applied to the semi-structured interviews of the nine professional black women who form the sample group of the study. As with the analyses in Chapter Five, these analyses are conducted to empirically confirm the validity of the Oedipal model, which has been extracted from the Kristeuan theory of subjectivity.
CHAPTER 5. Literary perspectives: two tales of constructing the ‘empowered self’

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter, two South African autobiographies, written by black female journalists, are analyzed in order to provide a perspective on the construction of the female narrators’ subjectivity as subjects-on-trial, within a South African context, during both the apartheid and the post-apartheid eras. These analyses are specifically conducted in order to empirically verify the validity of the Oedipal model, which was explicated in Chapter Four.

Literary texts are useful for analyzing how the textually constructed woman’s voice is positioned and interpellated, and how history (however fragmented and submerged) has shaped those voices. The content of these stories are local, it is “socially and historically formed, politically and economically conditioned and culturally specific” (Rosaldo, 1996: 245).

The social structures in which the characters live, frame their thoughts and experiences and the characters become embedded in these. From a socio-critical perspective, literary texts of whatever form are the products of complex, related social forces: “They are created by authors who have a history of socialization in a particular class, gender and place and who are subject to a range of social pulls and pressures. They are created at a particular historical stage of history…” (Laurenson, cited in Ngwenya, 1996:21) and “…works of art preserve certain homologies with the social and economic structures of their time, and are important sources of information about human history: every work of art is … an important social document…” (Thurley, ibid.:21).

As the legacy of the past is defined and contained and new sociopolitical obligations are formulated, these novels facilitate a sense of the female subjects’ being in and of history. Their narratives structure our sense of their world since subjectivity is constructed, rather than merely discovered. The subject is therefore not prior to discourse since the subject is an act of self-creation as well as the product of certain discourses. Discourse produces the subject rather than being the manifestation of the subject.

The specific literary texts that are analyzed are both autobiographical, with the first novel classified as a semi-autobiography. This novel, which is situated in the apartheid era is titled You can’t get lost in Cape Town by Zoe Wicomb (1987) and the post-apartheid novel is titled Our generation by Zubeida Jaffer (2003). The analyses of the novels are grounded in the belief that “literature allows us to enter into the subjective processes of writers and their characters and thus to understand better the unique perspectives of subjects who are agents of transformation and hybridization in their own narratives – as opposed to being objects of knowledge” (Lionnet, 1995:8). Although the two writers occupy subject-positions imposed on them by the dominant discourses and social institutions, they are also able to challenge these imposed identities and roles by reconstructing their identities within their specific socio-historical context. As well as focusing on the uniqueness of the individual’s experience in autobiographical writing, I
also focus on the contexts, which “broaden critical perspectives to include the social, political and cultural dimensions of human experience…” (Ngwenya, 1996:2). The writers’ rootedness in historical reality and their commitment to sociopolitical positions signify the complexity and plurality of their experiences and situations.

The literary form is used to challenge imposed definitions of social and political roles and identities. Their texts are powerful vehicles for ‘talking back’ to the authorities that created the conditions described in these texts. In South Africa and elsewhere, autobiographies aim to “empower, to proclaim the presence and voice of those who have been denied recognition …because of their race, class and/or gender” (Coullie, 1994:58). The stories are their versions of reality, which they find the most meaningful, given their socio-political context and the norms of human values to which they ascribe. Through their writing they trace a fascinating picture of the change in South Africa, their own personal transformation and also of the factors that have produced the change.

However, as I aim to show, these subjects are not only powerful or vocal, they are examples of Kristeva’s processual subjectivities since, in spite of their construction as educated and as ‘unitary’ subjects, they are also simultaneously positioned as powerless and silenced.

5.2 A tale of two narrators

The two novels that are analyzed are You can’t get lost in Cape Town (Zoe Wicomb), 1987 and Our generation (Zubeida Jaffer), 2003. Although the Wicomb novel is described by the characters as ‘stories’, the text, when taken as a whole, shows that the narrator’s life is a thinly veiled reproduction of Wicomb’s life and it is a portrayal of the writer’s protest against political oppression. The second novel by Jaffer, who is a journalist and a political activist, is explicitly written as a true history of her life and people.

Both Wicomb and Jaffer write as individuals who are positioned within a particular social group (black South Africans) and more specifically as belonging to a smaller sub-group within that category, namely Coloured women. Within the broader socially and ideologically delineated group of black women, these two authors further represent, and construct themselves as the relatively small group of emancipated and educated professional women (also the subject group of this study) who “have consistently challenged the political and cultural constraints designed to ensure their subservience to men and, politically, to the dominant white group” (Ngwenya, 1996:183). A close inspection of these texts focuses on tracing the commonalities amongst their contexts and discursive practices. It also analyzes differences and outlines the ways in which the two female narrators construct their sense of identity within two different socio-political eras.
5.3 Apartheid South Africa

The ‘master narrative’ of apartheid deserves special mention, as it is the main characteristic of the context of South Africa and of the historical period covering both the novels.

The second half of the twentieth century witnessed momentous changes in South Africa’s history. In 1948 the Afrikaner Nationalist Government came into power and embarked on a process of institutionalized racism and the subsequent relentless denial of human rights for the majority of South Africans. The law in South Africa, prior to 1994, with the handing over of political power to the ANC, impeded social change and served the interests of a white minority. Segregation was not just restrictive legislation, it was also “a composite ideology and (a) set of practices seeking to legitimize social difference and economic inequality in every aspect of life” (Beinart & Dubow, 1995:4). Apartheid as the dominant ‘master narrative’ was a policy of racial segregation, which encompassed many social relationships, and the rights and movements of so-called “non-whites” were restricted in almost every sphere.

Apartheid had at different times and for different groups, a multitude of meanings and functions. Apartheid “modernises by using premodern cultural identities upon those it dominates; it reifies communities and it legitimates its domination by projecting its own particularism upon the dominated” (Pechey, 1996:155-156). The discursive structures of apartheid in South Africa were successful in disempowering its victims who were subjected to an “internalized oppression”. This, according to Wouters (1993: 272) “reflects the deeper emotional and attitudinal responses to what has been mediated to persons by society over a prolonged period of political oppression”. However, because of resistance on both local and international fronts, apartheid was abolished and 1994 saw the country embark on a journey of transformation when its first democratically elected government swept into power.

It is against these powerful discourses of apartheid and equality, that I analyze the two literary texts and the verbal constructions of the main narrators in order to demonstrate how discourses interact to comprise the subject as both ‘professional’ and ‘empowered’. Both the analyses are constructed according to the Kristevan theory of the subject-on-trial and follow the Oedipal model that was explicated in Chapter Four.

5.3.1 You can’t get lost in Cape Town – Zoe Wicomb (1987)

The first novel You can’t get lost in Cape Town, details the story of a Coloured woman from the 1980’s onwards and is developed as a cycle of short stories. Wicomb’s narrator Frieda Shenton is a ‘voice from the margins’; the center to which she is speaking is the white authority in South Africa before 1994. Her story is situated firmly during the apartheid-era and reflects her attempts as a journalist-intellectual to come to terms with feelings of alienation and powerlessness in the face of repressive and discriminatory legislation. Apartheid’s divisive force is imbued with fragmentation, both social and psychological, and reflects displacement, dislocation, and disconnectedness. The novel
further asserts both a fictional unity and solidarity on the one hand, and fragmentation on the other. The genre that Wicomb has chosen, the short story cycle, is itself ‘between’ genres, lacking the coherence of the novel, yet it is more unified than a collection of autonomous short stories. It structurally reflects the tension between the centre and the margins and it effectively exposes the fictionality of the discourse of apartheid as a ‘master narrative’. It is from within this framework that I analyse the construction of the narrator, Frieda Shenton as a Kristevan subject-on-trial.

5.3.1.1. Frieda Shenton: a ‘unitary’ identity

Frieda Shenton, the narrator, constructs herself as a ‘unitary’ subject who is a highly educated journalist. As an educated and hence empowered woman, Frieda (Says) constructs herself via two distinct dominant discourses, which employ the structure of the economy of Sameness. These two discourses will be discussed in detail in order to illustrate her construction of her ‘self’ as ‘empowered’.

5.3.1.1.1 The “I am similar to the Law of the Father” discourse

The first dominant discourse is identified as “I am similar to the Law of the Father” with two sub-discourses, namely:

i. The “I silence others” discourse, and
ii. The “I am a powerful decision-maker” discourse.

This dominant discourse, which signifies the presence of identity, privileges rationality and independence and has specific implications for Frieda’s positioning as a powerful subject. Each sub-discourse will be discussed in detail in order to reveal how Frieda positions herself as a powerful subject who is able to make important decisions and silence others in the Symbolic order.

i. The “I silence others” discourse

Frieda, by means of her education and professional status in life as a journalist (and activist, although this is only insinuated in the last story) is able to assert herself and silence others. She is a feminist who does things her own way; she has an abortion as a student and she also is not repentant about the abortion: “For once I do not plead and capitulate; I find it quite easy to ignore these men” (75). In spite of her lover’s protestations, and her father’s religious views, she decides to abort the foetus. Later, when she visits the doctor, she silences her father’s admonishing to dress properly: “I don’t want antibiotics and I dress entirely for my own pleasure. If I had best clothes I would certainly not reserve them for an uncouth old white man” (109).

When on a visit home from England, she decides to visit her university friends, Desmond and Moira. She effectively silences Desmond’s chattering with a practised look: “I am a guest in their house; I must not be rude. So I content myself with staring at his jaw where my eyes fortuitously alight on the tell-tale red of an incipient pimple…I shall allow my
eyes at strategic moments to explore his face then settle to revive the gnathic discomfort” (146).

ii. The “I am a powerful decision-maker” discourse

Frieda, as an educated woman, is able to make her own decisions. One of the major decisions that she makes is to have an abortion, in spite of her lover’s proposals of marriage and desire to keep the child: “‘I must go.’ I lift the heavy hand off my forearm and it falls inertly across the gearstick” (78). She plans the abortion very carefully: “I am brisk, efficient, and rattle off the plan” (81).

Another weighty decision that Frieda makes is to go abroad. She effectively goes into exile, to England: “I will not come back. I will never live in this country again” (90). When she returns on visits she is the one who decides to make contact with her university friend, Moira: “I arranged the meeting two months ago when I wrote to Moira after years of silence between us, and yesterday I telephoned to confirm the visit” (145). Furthermore, she appears to be totally in control of events: “I had thought it prudent to arrange a one-night stay which would leave me the option of another if things went well” (146).

5.3.1.1.2 The “I am different from the (m)Other” discourse

The second dominant discourse “I am different from the (m)Other”, employs the logic of difference. The above powerful subject effectively distances herself via this discourse from the devalued, negative and feminine object position that indicates the absence of identity. This second dominant discourse has four sub-discourses, namely:

i. The “I am a rebel” discourse,
ii. The “I am independent” discourse,
iii. The “I am outspoken” discourse, and
iv. The “I am educated/knowledgable” discourse.

i. The “I am a rebel” discourse

Frieda’s rebellious nature is what separates her from the other, more traditional women in her community and family. There are many incidents/examples that reveal that she is not a conformist. She has a forbidden relationship with a white student, Michael: “We do not fear the police with their torches...We have the community of love” (76). Her decision not to get married to him, and to rather have an abortion is also one of rebellion against convention. She rebels against traditional spiritual beliefs: “I have done with sentimental nonsense about water spirits. They have long since been choked to death” (103) and also against Christianity: “God is not a good listener. Like Father, he expects obedience and withdraws peevishly if his demands are not met. Explanations of my point of view infuriate him so that he quivers with silent rage” (75).
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She does not care about her mother and other women’s traditional ‘wisdom’ as to how a woman should behave in order to get married, and their ‘rules’ are commented upon with cynicism: “A lady must never be seen without her handbag. So Aunt Cissy always says. Which is why she has wedged the unwieldly object between her stomach and the edge of the dinner table”(82). Her family recognizes her rebellious streak: “ ‘Ag Gerrie, you know this child’s always been so. Everybody goes to Canada so she wants to go to England where there’s nobody, not a soul from South Africa. She’s stubborn as a mule; always pulls the other way’”(86). She is aware of her family’s perception of her: “The party on the stoep is watching, no doubt discussing me, my marriage prospects, my waywardness and my unmistakeable Shenton determination” (99).

ii. The “I am independent” discourse

Frieda’s independence is highly prized. Even when she goes for the abortion, she travels alone: “But this is my journey and I must not expect Michael to take responsibility for everything. Or rather, I cannot expect Michael to take responsibility for more than half the things…” (66). As a child, she yearned for a ‘white car’: “One day I will drive a white car” (24), a symbol of independence. Furthermore, throughout the collection of short stories, Frieda’s life is marked by her journeys which she makes on her own, whether they are at home, for example, to the donga (103) in order to escape her relatives, or to the local doctor (106). She also exiles herself to England and lives there on her own, with only a cat for company (112). She comes across as sexually independent and emancipated and during a casual sexual encounter with Henry Hendrikse she wryly remarks: “He would like to fuck me without my noticing. I will not allow him that luxury…” (123). Furthermore, she is able to support herself financially since she is a successful journalist: “ ‘My stories are going to be published next month. As a book I mean’” (171). Frieda’s independence is in shrill contrast to the other, more traditional women in this novel, who are dependent on their husbands for financial and emotional support.

iii. The “I am outspoken” discourse

Frieda is both a journalist and an activist. She is able to voice her opinion and tell her stories, as is visible in the comment to her mother: “ ‘Oh, you won’t approve of me here either. Wasted education, playing with dynamite and all that’ ”(182). Even as a child, Frieda is outspoken, and is chastised by her mother for speaking Afrikaans: “ ‘And I have warned you not to speak Afrikaans to the children’”(4). In spite of these admonishings, she is disdainful when stared at by boys at the station:

“Why you look en kyk gelyk,
Am I miskien of gold gemake?” (35)

Moira also comments that Frieda is never at a loss for words: “ Moira laughs. ‘You’re always ready with a mouthful of words’ ” (54). Frieda’s outspokenness with regard to her family is not habitual. When present at a family gathering, Frieda comments wryly: “ ‘Of course Auntie. Doing my duty is precisely why I’m here’. It is not often that I can afford the luxury of telling my family the truth” (169). Yet, Frieda speaks her mind in front of
her mother when going to the ‘Gifberge’ in the final story. Her sarcastic comments are indicative of the difficult relationship she has with her mother: “I swallow, and pressing my back against the cupboard for support I sneer, ‘Such a poor investment children are. No returns, no compound interest, not a cent’s worth of gratitude…I can’t imagine why people have children’” (171).

iv. The “I am educated / knowledgeable” discourse

Frieda is a highly educated and knowledgeable individual. She is differentiated from her peers when she gets a bursary to go to a formerly ‘whites only’ school, St Mary’s Anglican school (31). After completing Matric, she continues her studies at the new Coloured university (46), where she studies English and Psychology. Her determination to be successful is clear when she completes her degree, in spite of the abortion: “No doubt I will sail through my final examinations at the end of this year…” (73).

Furthermore, Frieda’s education is seen as a vehicle for the empowerment of the coloured community, and it is also what separates her from her own relatives: “‘So we’ve sent you to college, your very own college that the government’s given you, just so you can go away and leave us to stew in ignorance. I know,’ Uncle Gerrie continued, ‘that here in the veld amongst the Griquas is no place for an educated person…’” (85-86). Her family acknowledges that her education makes a difference: “‘…so remember you are an educated girl…’” (87). She hesitates to read one of her university setworks in the presence of less educated locals for fear that her display of literacy might be offensive: “Such a display of literacy would be indecent…” (106). Finally, when she visits the ‘Gifberge’ with her mother, she expresses knowledge about her own indigenous people: “‘You mean Khoi-Khoi-goed’” (180), which surprises her mother, who took her on the trip in order to educate her daughter in the indigenous ways.

5.3.1.2 Frieda’s tale of identification and repudiation (abjection)

By constructing herself via the dominant discourses “I am similar to the Law of the Father” and “I am different from the (m)Other”, Frieda positions herself consciously as the unitary subject and emotionally invests in the powerful Symbolic realm. It is the mother’s love, the father who encourages and enables her independence. He is the driving force behind Frieda’s education and independence from poverty and social marginalization: “‘You must, Friedatjie, you must…’” (24). And, it is to his word and his rules that Frieda is obedient: “The habit of obedience is fed daily…” (24).

However, Frieda’s identification with the traditionally masculine realm promotes a polarization of subject and object, with the assignment of subject status to the dominant, masculine term and the object status to the feminine. Identification thus entails the repudiation of femininity, for, in order to maintain a separate identity, it is necessary for Frieda to define her ‘unitary self’ against the devalued (m)Other.

Frieda’s identification with the unitary subject position is an attempt to assert her own independence. She engages in a struggle to violently escape her feelings of dependency
associated with her (m)Other. Her struggle to differentiate is visible in many instances in
the text, especially her repudiation of her indigenous roots, of her Griqua heritage.
Because of a continuing fear that dependency on the (m)Other is a threat to her own
independence, Frieda repudiates and splits off her feminine characteristics and projects
them onto her (m)Other. A denial of any dependency on the maternal occurs since any
recognition of the (m)Other is a compromise to her unitary sense of ‘self’. Frieda’s ‘self’
can thus be read as a construct, which erects itself upon the social structures of repression
and denial.

Her desire for mastery lies in the experience of abjection which is an attempt to break
away from the (m)Other. And, the mother’s refusal to see Frieda can be interpreted as
abjection of Frieda into the realm of independence: “She said she didn’t want to see
you”(169). The difficult and often ambivalent relationship with her mother is especially
evident in the final story, ‘A trip to the Gifberge’, where the mother accuses Frieda of
always having loved her father better (163). The daughter’s ‘vital matricide’ is evident in
the text when the mother blames Frieda: “You’ve tried to kill me enough times” (163).
Their relationship is a difficult one: “For years we have shunted between understanding
and failure …” (171) and this fills Frieda with guilt: “…and the sour guilt rose
dyspeptically in my throat” (171). Furthermore, the visual description of the maternal
figure reveals Frieda’s distaste and dislike for her mother, who is described as a “large
tough-skinned vegetable” (162), who speaks with a “halting hiss” (163). Frieda herself is
aware of her own mother’s dislike (and abjection) for her as a wayward daughter: “I
brace myself against the roar of distaste…No, she would rather remove herself from my
viperous presence”(163). Although their relationship is ambivalent; Frieda cannot
entirely abject the mother: “I have never thought it unreasonable that she should not want
to see me. It is my insistence which is unreasonable” (163). And, in spite of trying to ‘kill
off’ the mother, the abjected (m)Other cannot be excluded from Frieda’s identity as a
‘unitary self’. Instead, these abjected and repressed aspects never cease to challenge her
sense of mastery and unity.

The analysis will now focus on a deconstructive reading of the above two dominant
discourses in order to make visible the blind spots of the text. This second moment brings
the dominant text into contradiction with itself, opening against its ‘intended’ meaning
onto an alterity which goes against what the text wants to say or mean. Whilst Frieda
Shenton actively constructs herself as ‘empowered’ and therefore educated and
professional within the framework of Sameness, the oppositional (devalued) discourse of
femininity and Otherness, is always present. And, in a deconstructive reading of her
construction, when the ‘unitary’ subject constructs (Says) herself as ‘empowered’ she is
also implicitly referring to what those things are not, to what is absent from them (the
Unsaid).
5.3.1.3 Deconstructing the ‘unitary’ Frieda: semiotic eruptions and contradictions

In the discussion that follows, Frieda’s construction of her ‘self’ via the above two
dominant discourses will be deconstructed to reveal the ‘marked’ and repressed
discourses, the not-Said.

5.3.1.3.1 The “I am not similar to the Law of the Father” discourse

Frieda is, contrary to her conscious construction, shown to be not similar to the dominant,
valued position of the Symbolic order, with its concomitant investments of power.

The not-Said discourses are as follows:

i. The “I do not silence others” discourse, and

ii. The “I am not a powerful decision-maker” discourse.

Instead of being a powerful subject who is able to silence other people, Frieda is often at
the receiving end of acts of silencing, both in the public and private spheres of her life.
As a young girl, Frieda is criticized for speaking Afrikaans to the children (4), and her
mother often scolds her: “‘Stay there, you are not to hang over the lower door and
gawp,’ Mamma hissed unnecessarily” (5). Even as an adult woman, she is silenced by her
mother: “Not a please and certainly not a thank you to follow. The daughter must be
reminded of her duty. This is her victory: speaking first, issuing a command” (165). And,
where initially her mother encouraged her to speak English, she is scolded as an adult:
“‘My mother said it was a mistake when I brought you up to speak English. Said people
spoke English just to be disrespectful to their elders, to You and Your them about. And
that is precisely what you do…No respect!’ ” (171).

As a child she is called many unpleasant names, which silence her and makes her
withdraw: “I am once again engulfed by the loneliness of childhood…” (115). Her
mother refers to her as a “tame Griqua” (9) and other children call her “‘Fatty, fatty
vetkoek’” (30). In the apartheid context of the novel, it is mostly the black men and
women that are silenced by the dominant white system of apartheid. Frieda’s father
teaches her a stoic acceptance of this situation: “‘It’s no good being so touchy. Just shut
yourself off against things around you, against everything, and keep your self-
respect’”(93). The discourse of silencing is closely associated with the discourse of being
‘invisible’ in the apartheid context. It is the black individual that is invisible, and whose
presence is negated throughout the texts.

The non-white Frieda as student is an unknown entity (object) to the white lecturer: “Has
it occurred to James that Retief has no idea who any of us are?” (53). Blacks are not
‘visible’ to the ‘white’ gaze: “Unless he hasn’t seen her…” (59). When Frieda goes for an
abortion she is questioned about her race: “Is she blind…with such defective sight?” (78)
And, although Frieda is more educated and outspoken than the majority of the black
community, she fearfully does not claim her Coloured identity in the conversation before
the abortion. This makes her feel like a Judas: “‘ and wait for all the cockerels in Cape
Town to crow simultaneously” (78-79), since she has denied her own origins. Her local train journey also reveals that the apartheid State, symbolized by the policeman also does not ‘see’ Frieda: “But he does not as much as glance at me” (88). And, when Frieda goes to the doctor’s rooms, she once again experiences being invisible: “Has she seen me?” (106).

Furthermore, in the patriarchal society, it is the men who mostly silence the women. Thus, Moira and Frieda decide against deliberating with the male students about the funeral of Hendrik Verwoerd: “Moira is determined to go until I say, ‘They will whistle as we approach’ ” (52). The female as object of lewd male comments and the male gaze is met by the silence of the narrator: “You will never know the original admirer so it is best not to look, not to speak” (50).

It is evident from the above extracts that Frieda is not always in the position of one who can silence others. Instead, as a black and as a woman she is often the silenced object in both the public and private sphere.

ii. The “I am not a powerful decision-maker” discourse

Frieda’s mother decides that the family should speak English rather than their mother tongue, Afrikaans: “I have warned you not to speak Afrikaans to the children” (4). The Shenton mother strives for social equality through insisting on Frieda’s speaking English and being educated in English. It is also Frieda’s father who decides to apply for a bursary at St Mary’s in Cape Town and Frieda has no choice but to obey. Her father is elated with the opportunity to send her to St. Mary's, a previously all-white girls' school in Cape Town: “You'll have the best, the very best [English] education” (32).

Education is seen as the road to upliftment from the lowly status that her people and community have been assigned to. Her education is seen by some as an attempt to identify with the Boers: “keeps up with the Boers all right” (27). It is the mother’s love; in the figure of the father, who encourages Frieda to deny any identification with her community and her roots and who facilitates her entry into the sphere of the symbolic, of language and of education. When she shows hesitance to leave home, he reprimands her: “How would you like to peg out the madam’s washing?” (24). Being a servant, who is illiterate and devalued, the marginal in society, is the alternative if she does not leave home and succeed. Frieda has no choice but to become displaced just like her uncle Jan Klinkies (11); she must leave her ‘home’ in order to become educated.

Frieda’s education is the way out of impoverishment and lack of status: “Brains are for making money and when you come back with your Senior Certificate, you won’t come back to a pack of Hottentots” (30). Yet, even as a student she has to travel back daily to the Cape Flats (57) because the apartheid laws forbid her to reside on campus. And, her mother blames Frieda and other educated black people for not being able to free them with her education: “Playing with fire, that’s what they’re doing. Don’t care a damn about the expensive education their parents have sacrificed for” (170).
Frieda, like other young women is expected to adhere to the rules and regulations of their society. Virginity is highly prized amongst the conservative parents: “She slept lightly, Moira’s mother, who said a girl cannot keep the loss of her virginity a secret, that her very gait proclaims it to the world and especially to men who will expect favours from her” (149). It is clear that these patriarchal expectations are internalised by the young girls and Moira and Frieda who, as adults, scold themselves for being “(o)bsessed with virginity” (155). In spite of her emancipation as an adult, Frieda is subjected to the sexual advances of Henry Hendrickse, who was once described by her father as “almost pure kaffir” (116). She engages in casual sex with Henry even though she is afraid: “His hand has traveled the length of my leg, my thigh. I keep still. I do not understand the source of his confidence...Fear seeps into the striped cotton cover crossed by the dark imprint of my sweating body...He leans over me and I do not draw away” (123). When traveling by train, Frieda is forced to share a compartment with a drunken man: “I do not choose to put up with the man in my compartment; fear of both men leaves me lying frozen in my bunk” (88). He forces himself on her: “His trousers slung low on his hips...he explains in the babyish diminutives of Afrikaans, ‘Gotta little businessy here before I return to town. Lekker ridie my little bridie’”(90).

In spite of making difficult decisions such as going into exile and having an abortion, Frieda, the woman, is subjected to other people’s decisions, especially those of her more traditional parents and also of men. The latter clearly illustrates the power imbalance that exists between the two genders in spite of Frieda’s construal of herself along the logic of the Same and of equality.

5.3.1.3.2 The “I am not different from the (m)Other” discourse

In spite of abjecting her repressed, feminine parts, these repressed parts can never be entirely erased. Frieda is shown to be similar to the devalued, negative object position, by means of the not-Said discourses, which are as follows:

i. The “I am not a rebel” discourse

The Law of the Father (patriarchy) is especially visible within the private sphere. Women are expected to remain subservient and fulfill gender-specific (and often lowly) tasks. Frieda’s father insists that she smears the floors with cow dung: “We must smear it. By which he meant that I should, since I am a girl” (18). She is also sent to make tea for the men, “I was sent to make tea...I had mine in the kitchen...”(17). With patriarchy also comes objectification; and the female is the object of men’s desires throughout the stories. The concern with physical appearance and beauty, which is imposed on females, illustrates this vividly. Women can improve their position in life mainly through marriage - and for this physical beauty is required: “Poor child,” says her mother of Frieda. “‘What can a girl do without good looks? Who’ll marry you? We’ll have to put a peg on your nose’ ” (164).

Although Frieda portrays herself as an intellectual who ignores outer appearances, there are many instances in the text, which reveal the opposite. Frieda realizes early on that she
does not possess natural beauty, which leads to distress and heartache: “I sometimes cry about being fat…” (21). Acutely conscious of the gaze of boys, Frieda concludes, “I am not the kind of girl whom boys look at” (21). And, embarking alone on her trip to a white school, Frieda thinks of white boys as fairy-tale princes, her own position being that of the pumpkin.

And, even though as an adult Frieda finally lets her hair grow ‘in a bush’ (178), she spends most of her life trying to renounce her Griqua inheritance, by straightening her hair. She does so at her father’s insistence: “the wet hair wrapped over large rollers…dressed with Vaseline to keep the strands smooth and straight and then pulled back tightly to stem any remaining tendency to curl. Father likes it pulled back”(26). Her mother too, dislikes her naturally curly hair: “What do you do with that bush?” (178).

In spite of her emancipation, Frieda does not rebel against her family’s ignorance: “Their stories,” Frieda concludes, “whole as the watermelon that grows out of this arid earth, have come to replace the world…I would like to bring down my fist on that wholeness … I would like to reveal myself” (87-88). As with her parents, she remains respectful of their opinions, albeit different from hers.

Frieda’s conformity (or internalized oppression) is visible when she gives up her seat in the university library to a white male student out of guilt and uneasiness: “No doubt I am in the very seat he has come to think of as his very own. Perhaps I should leave…It should be more comfortable on the first floor where I usually work…” (42-43). For the young Frieda, a simple task such as the paying of the bus fare is filled with fear of recrimination: “How would he know of the fear of missing the unfamiliar stop, the fear of keeping an impatient conductor waiting, the fear of …”(65). She does not rebel against the norms of apartheid society, but is shown to be wary and law-abiding.

ii. The “I am not independent” discourse

Although Frieda consciously constructs herself as an unattached career woman, she admits that she fell deeply in love as a student: “For two years I have loved Michael, have wanted to marry him” (75). She is filled with anxiety about his love for her when she falls pregnant: “Am I a loved one?… Am I a loved one?” (76). Because the laws in South Africa forbid mixed marriages, Frieda decides to undergo an abortion. And, although Frieda mostly positions herself as a strong and independent person, whilst waiting in the room admits that she is fragile and in need of care: “I am a child who needs reassurance” (80).

Later when she visits Moira, they recall their adolescent years: “Or the tears, the stifled sobs of bruised love…” (149). And, even as an adult, she refused to share the sacred memories of her first love: “I could not, would not, share the first man to love me” (155). In ‘Behind the Bougainvillea’ she also recalls the love letters that she exchanged with the dark-skinned Henry Hendrickse: “All through that summer we composed delicious letters of love” (116).
After vociferously expressing her hatred for South Africa: “‘Ag, I don’t care about this country; I hate it’” (174), she changes her mind after the trip to the Gifberge and says to her mother: “‘I wouldn’t be surprised if I came back to live in Cape Town again’” (182). She realises that she belongs in South Africa. This thought is brought on by her admission in rainy England that she is “in the wrong bloody hemisphere” (112) and her realization that she could not escape the pull of her own country: “I would go home. I could no longer avoid a visit” (113). From these examples it becomes evident that Frieda cannot deny her emotional investment in her close interpersonal relationships and in her sense of belonging to her own country. Even though she has an ambivalent and difficult relationship with her mother, she insists on seeing her (162), and it is in the final story, ‘A trip to the Gifberge’ (163) that she makes her peace with her Griqua roots.

iii. The “I am not outspoken” discourse

Although Frieda is constructed as a very vocal person who is never lost for words, she often stoically listens to the advice on gender-related issues from her relatives. She does so, even when the older women, steeped in tradition, admonish the younger Frieda as to what her female duties are: “The party on the stoep is watching me, no doubt discussing my marriage prospects” (99) and Aunt Nettie offers advice: “‘A girl should help to keep the house tidy. And when you meet a nice man you’ll have the experience of housework’” (110). Frieda’s mother scolds her: “‘You’ll have to start again; nice girls don’t do slovenly needlework’” (109). When in her mother’s presence on a trip to the Gifberge, Frieda admits: “I am not allowed to complain about the heat” (179).

The Shenton aunts subscribe to the belief that women should be thin, or at least appear to be so. “I’ll get you a nice step-in,” says Aunt Cissy, unasked, to her niece who is approaching middle age, “gives you a nice firm hip-line. You must look after yourself man; you won’t get a husband if you let yourself go like this’” (167). She herself is “packed into corsets” (168), the constrictive garments symbolising the suppression imposed by society and adopted by women themselves, of social mores on gender and the ideal of beauty. Frieda is also subjected to platitudes about the behaviour of “nice girls” - a favoured term that embodies the Shenton family wisdom on class, gender and morality. When she visits Desmond and Moira, she abides by the social ‘rule’ of abstinence for women: “I decline but I long to violate the alcohol taboo for women” (151). Her thoughts turn to her father’s beliefs about women who drink: “‘A girl who drinks is nothing other than a prostitute,’ ” Father says. ‘And there’s no such thing as a little tot because girls get drunk instantly…A nice girl’s reputation would shatter with a single mouthful of liquor’” (151).

And, although she accepts their opinions silently, she finds herself alienated from her own people: “Why do I find it so hard to speak to those who claim me as their own?” (94).
iv. The “I am not educated / knowledgeable” discourse

Frieda’s struggle to write an essay about a European novel for her English course, indicates that she is never quite at home in the English language: “Large and slothful I sit pressed in my carrel on the top floor of the library making no progress whatsoever with the essay on *Tess of D’Urbervilles* …” (39). She is also not as calm and rational as she pretends to be when she travels by bus to the place of abortion: “I ought to know it, but I am lost, hopelessly lost…” (67). As an adult, when visiting with Moira, she laughs and admits that she was ignorant about the true nature of sexuality: “‘Suppose that’s what we thought sex was all about: breaking a membrane. I expect Michael was as stupid as you. Catholic, wasn’t he?’” (155). When on the bus en route to her abortion, she notices a woman with missing front teeth and reflects on her ignorance: “How could I have known the demands of kissing?” (68).

And, in spite of her education, she is unaware of the resistance war that is being fought: “‘In the bush there’s a war going on that you know nothing of, that no newspaper will tell you about’” (121). Finally, her education is not enough to ensure the freedom of her people and the return of her father’s land. This fills her with guilt “…and the sour guilt rose…in my throat…” (171) and her mother erupts with bitterness: “‘Do people ever do anything decent with their education?’” (172). Frieda, even though she has a university degree is ignorant about her ancestors: “‘What do you know about things, about people, this place where you were born? About your ancestors that roamed these hills? You left. Remember?’” (172). It is evident that Frieda lacks vital ‘local’ knowledge: “‘Nonsense,’ she says scornfully, ‘you don’t know everything about this place’” (174). Frieda is ignorant about the most important place, of her origin, her roots.

5.3.1.4 Frieda Shenton: a subject-on-trial

Deconstruction allows us to take apart the taken-for-granted in the construction of Frieda’s subjectivity. Frieda, as the narrator, is a split subject rather than a ‘unitary’ subject. She consciously positions herself as a journalist and an activist who writes from a position of emancipation and education, and who is able to voice her own concerns and rewrite her own history. However, the greater her attempt to fix her identity as powerful and as outspoken, the greater the potential for ‘slippage’ since the contradictions in her identity reveal how meaning can only ever be fixed temporarily and is always open to challenge and redefinition.

Frieda’s female ‘self’ who has been attributed a secondary social status, and which is the marked term, is effectively marginalized but can never be wholly excluded and so always threatens to disrupt the center. The ‘unitary’ identity is a symbolic construct that is dependent on its Other, the semiotic term under erasure. These feminine aspects, in spite of repression and splitting cannot be contained by the rational thetic structure of the symbolic order and continually threatens the sovereignty of this symbolic. Frieda, the woman, is silenced and negated. She is silenced by men because she is a ‘woman’ and by the apartheid regime because she is ‘Coloured’. Just like the women who are uneducated and not emancipated, she is relegated to the object position, powerless and silent. In spite
of her education, she is still subjected to the rules and enforced boundaries of the apartheid State.

And, although Frieda portrays herself as emancipated and vocal for women’s rights, her poor relationship with her mother who is resurrected at the end of the story and who remains mute throughout most of the texts, reveals her own ambivalence towards her feminine ‘self’, the repressed parts of her ‘self’. Although Frieda’s mother tongue is Afrikaans, she expresses herself only in English, denying a part of her identity along with her community. This example, together with the others that were discussed in the analysis, reveal that the maternal sacrifice is the necessary condition of the existence of the symbolic, of both the emancipated subject and the nation State. The (m)Other is sacrificed in order to bring about a (mythical) sense of unity and individuality. Frieda, is a subject ‘in crisis’, she is contradictorily constituted as being both “I am similar to the Law of the Father” and “I am not different from the (m)Other”.

5.4 Post-apartheid South Africa: a discourse of empowerment

During the apartheid-era, The African National Council was formed in 1912, and in 1931 the Bantu Women’s League was recognized as the first women’s branch of the ANC. In 1943 women were formally admitted to the ANC as members and the ANC Women’s League was formed in 1948.

The ANC Women’s League actively sought to dismantle the discursive and structural blocks out of which oppressive hierarchies were built. Their project was aimed at opposing subordination and rectifying the economic imbalances, which created and reinforced female dependency. They spawned campaigns for legal and financial equality, as well as equal opportunities. The impact of the women’s activities led the male leadership to recognize the potential of the women’s struggle. Based on the experiences of women in other liberation struggles, South African women were adamant that the struggle for national liberation and gender equality, was indeed, one struggle. Women activists organized around the slogan: “the nation is not free if the women are not free” which stressed the interconnectedness of the two struggles. A crucial aspect of this project was the recognition of the diversity of black women’s experiences and the specificity of oppressions faced by them.

Under the auspices of the ANCWl several protests were staged in South Africa demonstrating against pass laws. Many women fled into exile and those left behind were banned or restricted by the ruling National Party. In the late 1980’s the ANC was finally unbanned as a political party and the official launch of the ANCWl took place in August 1990 in Durban. Soon after the unbanning of the ANCWl, the then president, Gertrude Shope, convened a national meeting and lobbied to draw up a Women’s Charter based on the priorities and concerns of women from all walks of life throughout the country.

This was completed in 1994 and women’s rights were specifically incorporated in the Bill of Rights in the new constitution of South Africa. It can be regarded as the outcome of the enormous struggle on the effort of women activists. South Africa’s Bill of Rights is
regarded by many as the cornerstone of democracy. Its foundational rights embody a firm commitment to the achievement of equality, the advancement of human rights as well as non-sexism and non-racism. Apart from being a constitutional value, equality is also listed as a right in the Bill of Rights. This emphasis on equality is evidence of a shift in the law’s approach to women, specifically with regard to their legal status.

Albertyn and Goldblatt (1998: 249) distinguish between equality as a value and equality as a right. Equality as a value is aspirational, whereas equality as a right needs to be interpreted in order to give effect to its transformative nature. These authors identify transformation as follows: “We understand transformation to require a complete transformation of the state and society, including a redistribution of power and resources along egalitarian lines. The challenge of achieving equality within this transformation project involves the systemic forms of domination and material disadvantage based on race, gender, class… it also entails the development of opportunities which allow people to develop their full human potential within positive social relations”.

When the ANC came to power as the first democratically elected government in 1994, significant victories were won: for example, political rights such as the right to vote, and to stand for election in public office, amongst others, were guaranteed to all men and women. Furthermore, in order to redress the imbalances of the past, black economic laws and regulations were put in place. Black empowerment is the ruling government’s efforts to legislate increased black participation in the corporate sector. It takes the form of black shareholding, employment equity; requiring employers to hire black management staff, tenders awarded by the state to companies who have significant black management, and procurement from black organizations and other affirmative action policies.

The advancement of black women professionals is regarded as especially critical to this project. And, along with the discourse of black economic empowerment, as the new ‘Truth’, the discourse of the empowered professional woman arose. In the new, democratic South Africa, these professionals are empowered by various institutions and are thus able to confer power on themselves by virtue of being a member of that group, in a true Foucauldian sense of the word. For Foucault (cf. Sawicki, 1991:1) “discourse is ambiguous and plurivocal” and Foucault also “rejected the view that the power of phallocentric discourse is total”(ibid.:1). Black professional women are thus able to question inherited identities and values through the existence of new, alternative discourses, and to challenge interpretations thereof. Although they cannot control the overall direction of history, they are able to choose among various discourses and employ them constructively and creatively.

In just over a decade since the first democratic government was elected in 1994, momentous changes have been effected in South Africa. Significant socio-political change has on the whole continued to take place with an increasing focus on equality, black ownership and black empowerment. The 300 years of white minority rule that had systematically enforced oppression had set a powerful subject matter for the writer in South Africa. The following text, Our generation, can be read as a ‘genealogical account’ in the Foucauldian sense which challenges “the established discourses and histories by
providing alternatives to them and problematizing those discourses and histories” (Prado, 2000: 109).

However, as the analysis of the second novel text will illustrate, in spite of new discourses such as equality and ‘empowerment’ which have been brought about by the change of the government, men have traditionally been the ones who have been the arbiters of knowledge, and their access to power has remained in place. Subjectivity is the unstable effect of power, as women’s identity is assigned by the dominant patriarchal discourse, since men (or the Symbolic order), claim subjectivity as their exclusive property. Thus it is man, or the ‘unified’, rational subject (i.e. the professional woman) who stands at the centre of language and is guaranteed discursive power. The question that needs to be asked is whom does the discourses of empowerment and of equality serve? And: are these women ‘empowered’ as ‘women’ or are they merely ‘empowered’ as mimics of men?

5.4.1 Our generation – Zubeida Jaffer (2003)

Writing from a politically engaged position, this non-fiction novel engages in a powerful and intensely personal narration of the transformation of South Africa from apartheid to democracy. The narrator is Zubeida Jaffer, a female activist and journalist who writes her own story of the struggle against apartheid and finding her ‘own voice’ as told from the perspective of a young mother. Zubeida was initially a journalist with the Cape Times and later with community newspapers. She played an important role in the resistance movement in the Western Cape from the early 1980’s as a key figure in the United Democratic Front (UDF). The novel spans fifteen years and covers the period from her detention to her testimony at the Truth and Reconciliation Committee (TRC) hearings, post 1994. It bears testimony to her attempts to change the systems of apartheid and patriarchy, as an activist.

5.4.1.1 Zubeida Jaffer as ‘unitary’ subject

Zubeida, (Says) constructs her ‘self’ via two distinct dominant discourses, which employ the structure of the economy of Sameness. These will be discussed in detail below, to illustrate her construction of her ‘self’ as ‘empowered’.

5.4.1.1.1 The “I am similar to the Law of the Father” discourse

The first dominant discourse is identified as “I am similar to the Law of the Father” which has two sub-discourses, namely:

i. I silence others, and
ii. I am a powerful decision-maker.

This dominant discourse privileges rationality and independence and has specific implications for the subject’s positioning as a powerful subject. Each sub-discourse will
be discussed in detail in order to reveal how Zubeida positions herself as a powerful subject who is able to make important decisions and silence others in the Symbolic order.

i. The “I silence others” discourse

The policeman as metaphor for the state and its evils appear vividly throughout the text. Zubeida silences this powerful figure by her refusal to engage in a conversation with him: “You stand for apartheid. I am against it. I have nothing to say to you” (36). As a journalist Zubeida is in charge of bringing out a special edition of the University of the Western Cape (UWC) News (52) which is able to silence De Klerk’s regime: “UWC, together with UCT, had taken De Klerk to the Supreme Court asking that the measures be set aside...A full bench of the Supreme Court ruled in our favour on all accounts” (53). Zubeida and other activists are also able to silence the State in court, when her brother is detained unlawfully: “ ‘And that the said Adam Jaffer be released forthwith from the Victor Verster Prison’” (29). Furthermore, through her being involved in anti-apartheid movements, she will be able to ‘silence’ those who betray the trust of the ‘freedom fighters’: “ If he and his party destroy that trust, we will find other caretakers” (108).

ii. The “I am a powerful decision-maker” discourse

Zubeida decides as a young woman to fight against apartheid, and remain unattached all her life: “So I was not going to marry, nor produce children; I would instead be of service to my country and the world” (39). As a journalist, she is asked to be the ‘spokesman’ for the UWC, and will thus be instrumental in transforming the “engine of this apartheid machine” (41). Zubeida is actively involved in many committees, such as women’s meetings (41), a funeral committee (43); she is the Treasurer of the United Women’s Congress (54) and is also appointed by the Transitional Executive Council (TEC) to the Independent Media Commission to oversee the relations between the media and other parties (109) after Mandela’s release in the early nineties. Finally, she is also a political editor of the Daily News and is privy to the national budget (123). As an activist, who has a high position in the new regime, Zubeida is able to ‘choose’ the new leaders of the country: “I have chosen him and his party to be the caretakers of the democracy we all fought for” (108). On a more personal level, she decides to instigate divorce proceedings: “I am painfully aware that it is the marital relationship that I am about to end...” (91).

5.4.1.1.2 The “I am different from the (m)Other” discourse

The second dominant discourse is identified as “I am different from the (m)Other”, which employs the logic of difference. The above powerful subject effectively distances herself via this discourse from the devalued, negative and feminine object position (which is also the absence of identity). This second dominant discourse has four sub-discourses, namely:
i. The “I am a rebel” discourse,
ii. The “I am independent” discourse,
iii. The “I am outspoken” discourse, and
iv. The “I am educated / knowledgeable” discourse

These discourses will be discussed in order to reveal how Zubeida, the activist/journalist actively distances herself from the semiotic, maternal aspects of her life.

i. The “I am a rebel” discourse

As an activist Zubeida rebels defiantly against segregation: “We are always trying to push the boundaries of the law to make a political statement” (27) and “We are protesting against segregated beaches” (63). The novel vividly portrays her life of rebellion against the apartheid-regime, both as an activist and as a journalist. Apart from participating in marches, and writing about resistance activities, she also assisted other activists: “…and had assisted them with raising money, setting up communications and supplying help with various personal needs” (83).

On a personal level, Zubeida is rebellious against the ‘rules’ imposed by her conservative Muslim community and faith. Even in detention, she considers the ways men abuse their faith in order to dominate women and children (29). As a young girl, she rebels against the strict rules for the girls who are not allowed to play in the streets: “…when a girl became a young lady…she was expected not to play soccer in the back street” (72). Zubeida organises a “gadat” (a special family prayer session) and decides to invite only women: “I find that when the men are around, they take centre-stage with the women either preparing food in the kitchen or chatting in the bedrooms adjacent to the lounge” (112). She also rebels against the Muslim tradition of wearing scarves, which cover the woman’s entire head: “I refuse to display proof of my relationship with God through my dress” (114).

When her father dies, both Zubeida and her mother are involved in “a small tussle” (141) with the traditional Muslim men, since they wanted to watch her father’s funeral procession.

ii. The “I am independent” discourse

Zubeida is an educated journalist who is able to provide for herself and her daughter, by means of her professional work. Throughout the novel there are many references to her work, and she states: “I was always fiercely independent and reluctant to sponge off my parents from quite a young age” (40). Her emotional independence is a family trait: “By nature, I am not one to shout and perform. I have inherited the family trait that we consider a strength and a weakness – a quiet stoicism when faced with crises”(13). Furthermore, when she decides to divorce her husband, she asserts her independence: “I am happy that I have had the strength to admit that this has not worked for me” (94). Zubeida had also been an equal contributor: “We had each one been contributing equally to the household and held no monies in joint accounts” (94).
iii. The “I am outspoken” discourse

Zubeida’s ‘speaking out’ occurs mainly through her writing such as Grassroots (71). In spite of being in detention, Zubeida was able to write secretly: “I wish that the policewoman would move away from the door so that I could write. They do not know I have a pen” (35). And, because of her work as a journalist/activist, Zubeida organised many secret meetings “bringing together over a hundred activists identified through our contacts” for the Churches Urban Planning Commission (64) in order to discuss the planned vote for “Coloured and Indian people and excluding Africans” (64).

Finally, though, once Mandela was released from jail, blacks were able to speak freely about once hidden, secret things. In the new democratically elected South Africa, there is a radical change in government and power structures. Zubeida, the journalist, writing in post-apartheid South Africa, in the context of a democratically elected government, is now free to tell her stories. Zubeida is asked to speak about her experiences to the TRC: “The organisers of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission had asked if I would testify at a special hearing” (125). Zubeida agrees: “I tell of how I write the story that changed my life. How the police would not give the Cape Times the detail of who they had killed, and how my editor, Tony Heard, had asked me to track down the families” (128). The transformation process is complete and Zubeida and all other South Africans are allowed to cast their vote: “I look for umbrellas to carry with me to the polling station…Today is the day” (107). Recollecting and remembering the past is important to Zubeida: “I am particularly concerned about how we will keep alive the memory of the wrongs committed against millions in our country” (120).

iv. The “I am educated/knowledgeable” discourse

Zubeida studied journalism in Grahamstown (80). The education of non-whites, such as Zubeida in the apartheid era is a symbol of subversion: “We want your books, Zubeida…Where are your books? …I was released after forty-two days in detention and charged with possession of three banned books…” (131). In spite of being detained, she continues to educate herself. And, in the new democracy, her education is the vehicle of Zubeida’s empowerment. After her release from detention she is free to pursue previously banned knowledge abroad: “In a week’s time I leave for New York to complete my Masters degree in Journalism at Columbia University” (112). There are many instances that reflect the educated and knowledgeable Zubeida’s tireless work for freedom as a journalist and activist, and even foreign institutions employ her services, such as a Canadian news agency, Africa Information Afrique (AIA) (81). Zubeida’s education sees her appointed as “group parliamentary officer” (138) and to other positions of power: “This morning, I held our country’s budget in my hands for the first time. I am political editor of the Daily News and covering parliament, a position long denied to all journalists of colour. Women of colour were especially suspect” (123).
5.4.1.2 Zubeida’s tale of identification and repudiation (abjection)

By constructing herself via the dominant discourses “I am similar to the Law of the Father” and “I am different from the (m)Other”, Zubeida positions herself consciously as a ‘unitary’ subject and emotionally invests in the powerful Symbolic realm. It is both the mother and the mother’s love, who encourage and enable Zubeida’s independence. Zubeida’s “broadminded” father encourages her education: “He had tried to explain to me his obsession with education. He wanted us to be educated so that we could fulfil an important message of Islam and that was to seek to acquire knowledge and broaden the mind” (73). The educated daughter assumes this powerful position because of the (m)Other’s sacrifice. Zubeida remembers her mother playing a pivotal role in her education: “‘You girls must study,’ my mom used to say. ‘I want you to be independent and do the things I could never do’” (115). Although her aunts have been teachers and nurses, her mother was a full-time housewife and mother, but she always read voraciously, in spite of being banned from the white library, and insisted that her daughters get a higher education (116). The Symbolic order is thus erected on the sacrifice of the (m)Other.

Zubeida, in her struggle towards independence, tries hard to please her father (who represents the realm of culture and language): “I went to school just a few weeks before turning five. I remember having to keep up, trying too hard to please…To please my father”(146). However, Zubeida’s identification with the traditionally masculine realm promotes a polarization of subject and object, with the assignment of subject status to the dominant, masculine term and the object status to the feminine. Identification with the realm of the Symbolic entails the repudiation of femininity. And, in order to maintain a separate identity, it is necessary for Zubeida to define her ‘unitary self’ against the devalued Other. Her identification with the ‘unitary’ subject position is an attempt to assert her own independence. She engages in a struggle to violently escape her feelings of dependency associated with the (m)Other, the realm of emotions and the unconscious.

Her struggle to differentiate is visible in many instances in the text, especially her repudiation of her emotional ‘self’: “By nature, I am not one to shout and perform. I have inherited the family trait that we consider a strength and a weakness – a quiet stoicism when faced with crises” (13). Because of a continuing fear that dependency on the (m)Other is a threat to her own independence, Zubeida repudiates and splits off her feminine characteristics and projects them onto her (m)Other. A denial of any dependency on the maternal occurs since any recognition of the (m)Other is a compromise to her ‘unitary’ sense of ‘self’. Zubeida’s ‘unitary’, non-fragmented ‘self’ can thus be read as a construct that erects itself upon the social structures of repression and denial. Her desire for mastery lies in the experience of abjection which is an attempt to break away from the (m)Other, the semiotic and the emotional.
Because of her torture in detention, Zubeida cannot entirely abject the semiotic: “My whole personality is changing. I am screaming more and more”(31). Instead, these abjected and repressed aspects never cease to challenge her sense of mastery and unity. She recalls certain experiences vividly and is haunted by nightmares: “Night after night it haunted me in the days after my release from detention... Now it’s coming back. Why is it coming back? That was then. This is now. The detention. The feelings of terror…” (52).

Because of her repression of the semiotic, she experiences depression and post-traumatic stress disorder (55): “I have been dead, not really feeling anything. Now I am feeling something… Am I losing my mind?” (54). Zubeida is faced with the horror of dependency on the bodily realm, the semiotic, that which she has so long denied and suppressed. Zubeida also suffers a serious asthma attack, which incapacitates her (142) to the extent that she has to be hospitalized. She realizes that she has to “attend to the emotional” (144) and knows that she cannot allow herself to “disintegrate completely” (144). In spite of her stoic manner of dealing with crises and her strong intellect, she is unable to repress the fleeting images and emotions that erupt into the “unitary self”. She admits: “I don’t know who I am…I am not sure. I have been so used to being the journalist or the activist. Now I am able to be neither ...I feel naked, vulnerable, barely able to get through the day” (144).

5.4.1.3 Deconstructing the ‘unitary’ Zubeida: semiotic eruptions and contradictions

The following part of this analysis will focus on a deconstructive reading of the above two dominant discourses in order to make visible the blind spots of Zubeida’s text. This second reading brings the dominant text into contradiction with itself, opening against its ‘intended’ meaning onto an alterity which goes against what the text wants to say or mean. Whilst Zubeida Jaffer actively constructs herself as ‘empowered’ and therefore educated and professional within the framework of Sameness, the oppositional (devalued) discourse of femininity and Otherness, is always present. And, in a deconstructive reading of her construction, when the ‘unitary’ subject constructs (Says) herself as ‘empowered’ she is also implicitly referring to what those things are Not, to what is absent from them (the Unsaid).

5.4.1.3.1 The “I am not similar to the Law of the Father” discourse

Zubeida, the professional woman is not similar to the dominant, valued position of the unitary subject, with the concomitant investment of power.

The not-Said discourses are as follows:

i. The “I do not silence others” discourse, and
ii. The “I am not a powerful decision-maker” discourse.

Each of these sub-discourses will be discussed in greater detail in order to show how Zubeida is not always a powerful decision-maker or silencer of others, but how she is
also often positioned as a devalued object who is silenced by others, who is subjected to the decisions of those who are more powerful and dominant.

i. The “I do not silence others” discourse

Zubeida is silenced by the police presence in her life: “For the past five years, the pressure has been relentless. Detentions, arrests, beatings, shootings, teargas” (33). As an activist and detainee, her life is also filled with secrecy and silence in the service of resistance: “I could not discuss this with anybody. I had been sworn to secrecy” (132). The horrendous flashbacks of her torture silence her, as she is unable to write: “…I fluctuate between feeling normal and writing easily to being overwhelmed by emotion and unable to write” (82).

In spite of her position as an activist and journalist, Zubeida is often silenced by those forces who were in a dominant position, especially during the apartheid years.

ii. The “I am not a powerful decision-maker” discourse

Zubeida, because of her subversive activities is constantly on the move, destroying any illusion of fixity and certainty of life. These journeys are crooked and discontinuous: “So it is always having to walk in a convoluted way. Never a straight line” (12), as they are constantly being watched by the gaze of the apartheid State. The journalist and her husband cannot have a normal relationship, they have been robbed of a normal life and a place to call their own: “But I am not eager to go home because there is no home to go to, really” (18). Their privacy is not respected, and their personal boundaries are constantly violated: “They kept on crossing the threshold and barging in, week after week, month after month, year after year” (61). Zubeida’s passport is confiscated: “A few months later, in May 1981, when I reported on the anti-Republic Day protests at UWC, my passport was withdrawn…” (132). When her father is detained, Zubeida capitulates: “I told them whatever I could and lost my self-respect in the process” (131). When tortured, she is unable to keep her resolve about silence: “I will never forget how they finally wrung answers from me, answers that were mine and not theirs to take” (130). During the apartheid-regime she is unable to decide where to live and how to live her life, as extreme pressure is exerted on her and other activists by the powerful State.

And, on a personal level, Zubeida, who decides to file for a divorce is told by Sheikh Nazeem that “the man can ask for a divorce while the woman can ask for an annulment (faskh) on certain grounds” (92). The decision to divorce her husband is taken out of her hands, she asks Johnny “and he had obliged”(92). Furthermore, she has to adhere to strict rules regarding her behaviour: “My difficulty is that I find it unacceptable that this rule is applied only to the woman” (93).
5.4.1.3.2. The “I am not different from the (m)Other” discourse

Zubeida, in spite of her conscious construction to the contrary, is shown to be similar to the devalued, negative, feminine object position especially as she is herself a woman. This is illustrated by the not-Said discourses, which are as follows:

i. The “I am not a rebel” discourse,
ii. The “I am not independent” discourse,
iii. The “I am not outspoken” discourse, and
iv. The “I am not educated/knowledgeable” discourse.

These discourses will be discussed in greater detail below in order to illustrate how the semiotic erupts within Zubeida’s ‘unitary self’ in spite of her repression thereof.

i. The “I am not a rebel” discourse

In spite of Zubeida’s subversive activities as an activist, she struggles to go to previously ‘white’ areas without a sense of unease, an indication that she has internalised the oppression to which she was subjected: “The school is just down the road…It’s funny when I think of it – this is the first time that I feel comfortable coming into this suburb even though it is right next to my home. There was always some invisible line drawn across the boundary road preventing us from venturing into shops” (97).

The issue of female emancipation is closely associated with the realization that past and present societies are deeply patriarchal. Patriarchy serves to silence and negate women, often in the guise of religion: “I find myself reflecting on how often the basic guidelines of the religion play second fiddle to an obsession with controlling women” (29). It also serves to lay down gender-specific rules and regulations, from childhood, to adulthood: “We used to love playing soccer in the street – boys and girls all together. This was acceptable when we were young children but when a girl became a young lady…she was expected not to play soccer in the back street. This was all very frustrating” (72). And, in spite of her rebellious nature, she adheres to these rules as a young Muslim girl.

Zubeida, even as an adult Muslim woman, is forced to adhere to the strict rules of her faith. She represents the bodily realm of the semiotic order, which is repressed by the Muslim traditions in order to maintain a sense of decorum and tradition. Zubeida portrays herself initially as rebellious and recalls her fights with the imam about the rights of women in Islam: “Sheikh somehow represented an extension of my dad but we had often tussled over the years” (72). When Zubeida’s father dies, the women, according to Muslim tradition, are not allowed to go to the graveyard: “The women want to watch the procession from the stoep, but a relative does not like the idea and blocks my mother from leaving the house”. In spite of the tussle, she does not go: “I keep my eyes fixed on the dark green embroidered cloth covering his body for as long as possible. Then they turn the corner…and I
feel like a part of my body has been torn from my flesh…” (141). Zubeida ultimately accepts her faith and its restrictions.

It is evident from the excerpts that Zubeida as a non-white, Muslim woman is subjected to the decisions of those who are in positions of power.

ii. The “I am not independent” discourse

Zubeida prides herself on her independence from an early age. However, it soon becomes apparent that she is not as independent from others as she asserts herself to be. When her husband visits her in hospital, she revels in his presence: “The muscled arms around my body satisfy the need for solace” (19). She feels lost without her family: “Plucked away from my family, again in a different environment, I felt dazed most of the time” (22). And, although she is able to arrange many secret meetings and assist other activists, she also depends on the support of others, such as Chris Hani: “I feel he is the one person we can rely on to fight back against the might of the apartheid military machine” (48); and later she states: “The man who has the arms to protect us. We need help, Chris. We need you” (50).

When suffering a breakdown after years of persecution, she admits: “I am stubborn and also needy. I need to be with my husband…” (55). And, throughout her life, Zubeida has been able to count on her parents for their support and protection: “But then another part also felt that they had done their best to protect me under the circumstances…” (60). After her divorce, she moves in with her parents: “…my father built an extra room on to the house so that Ruschka and I could have a room each” (59). Even though she divorces her husband, she still feels connected to him: “I have given this man my heart and soul and he holds it in his possession. I have physically torn myself away from him but I cannot speak because emotionally I am still with him” (85). And, when ill in hospital, she has to admit that she needs the help of others: “I am safe and close to help” (142) and “I needed somebody to help me and had needed somebody for three years now” (143).

iii. The “I am not outspoken” discourse

Just like the semiotic is violently repressed, so Zubeida, the activist, is tortured and detained by the security forces of the apartheid State. And, although she portrays herself as a strong person, who resists torture and detention, these experiences, have left their mark. She wishes to repress these awful memories: “‘I don’t want to talk about these things,’ I said to her. I have blocked them out of my memory” (125). Zubeida as the rational activist has had her voice silenced by others and she in turn, also silences her own memory, since this remembering is too horrific. The eruption of the abjected events and memories threatens to destroy the fragile and illusory sense of stability as an emancipated and empowered woman that she has carefully constructed.
The violence that perpetrates this novel leaves Zubeida suffering from depression and post-traumatic disorder after the unbanning of the ANC: “I cannot laugh or cry. I am like a zombie, drugged into a hazy existence” (55). She is faced with her own emotional and bodily exhaustion, which indicate the eruption of the semiotic, the feminine in the positively valued symbolic, the realm of control and rationality.

On a personal level, although she is not in agreement with the different rules, which apply to the different genders, she stoically accepts the rules of the Muslim faith. In response to the unequal treatment of men and women, Zubeida is silent: “I can see Sheikh is expecting me to react but I say nothing” (93). And, when she divorces her husband, she cannot speak because “because emotionally I am still with him” (85).

iv. The “I am not educated/knowledgeable” discourse

In spite of her degree and her vast experience there are also several instances that portray Zubeida as an individual who is not entirely comfortable with her level of education and expertise. She experiences fear and intimidation when she goes from a Coloured school to a white university: “I remembered how I felt coming to UCT and seeing the white students for the first time…and suddenly to be flung into a sea of whites was a frightening and intimidating experience” (96). When Zubeida attends a concert, which blacks were formerly denied access to, she realises how she had been deprived of a cultural education by apartheid: “Enjoying Cape Town’s Philharmonic Orchestra is a novel experience for me…Our lives were cut off from these experiences” (117).

Furthermore, in the sphere of work, her expertise is questioned by her white male colleagues: “‘What do you think the company is going to do with you when you fail?’ he says. ‘Where will you go?’ ” (138). Although Zubeida is now in a position of power (as group parliamentary editor) in the formerly white male dominated workplace, she encounters resistance. And, when she questions traditions, which discriminate against women, she is told: “‘You are pure evil’, said a less-than-subtle colleague when I challenged the received wisdom of the old boy’s club” (144). Zubeida, who is “…the only woman in a sea of unfriendly male faces” (138) experiences “a subtle vindictiveness of a small group of white men inside and outside the company” (143) and this leads to her feelings of inadequacy to meet the demands of the Symbolic order.

These feelings of inadequacy as a woman in the realm of the Symbolic, are powerfully demonstrated by the following excerpt: “I remember having to keep up, keep up, trying too hard to please…To please my father. A small group of men around me in the interrogation room…insulting, swearing, pushing me beyond my limits… My husband’s intense demands. A small group of men at work who finally press all the buttons…” (146).
5.4.1.4 Zubeida: a subject-on-trial

Zubeida reflects on the heterogeneous, fragmented nature of human ‘selves’ at the end of the novel: “Who am I if I am not a journalist or an activist? Who am I? I don’t know” (146). She answers her daughter’s question: “‘What am I, mom?’” (148) as follows: “‘You are not one thing Rusch…You can be whatever you want to be…You are part of everybody…With apartheid gone, you can be many different things at the same time’” (148). She has an acute sense of her ‘self’ as disparate and multiple and of the crumbling of the unity of the Symbolic. Zubeida is faced with her own contradictions, she is both the rational, ‘unitary’ subject (the activist/journalist) and yet she is also the fragile and emotional single mother. Zubeida is a contradictory subject, who is both similar to the realm of the Symbolic, that of language and culture and she is also not different from the devalued feminine semiotic realm, especially as a woman.

5.5 Comparison and conclusion

South Africa has undergone radical socio-political changes in the years since the abolishment of apartheid as described in the first novel, You can’t get lost in Cape Town (1987) and the post-apartheid novel Our generation (2003). However, what is particularly remarkable is that the construction of the ‘empowered’ professional black woman remains unaltered in spite of the legislative moves to ‘empower’ especially black women. Both narrators construct their ‘selves’ consciously according to the logic of the Same at the expense of their feminine capabilities.

The two narrators in the novels, Frieda and Zubeida, can be translated in terms of the Lacanian mirror-stage. They both seek identity in a single specular image only to find an unnerving process of splintering and fission taking place. From the above analyses it is evident that, although foreclosure is enforced it is never secured through the violent exclusion of the semiotic. The ‘unitary self’ is shown to be a construct of the Symbolic order, which is dependent on its repressed, silenced Other. The maternal, feminine realm that has been attributed a secondary social status, and which is the marked term, is effectively marginalized but can never be wholly excluded and so always threatens to disrupt the center. The double reading of deconstruction allows for the movement of alterity to interrupt the closure of the dominant constructs (Frieda and Zubeida as ‘unitary’ subjects) and discovers insights within the texts/subjects to which it is blind. Thus “whatever we presume to be immediately present is always-already a trace structure. All presence is infused with absence…Without the latter, the former cannot exist…all identity is [thus] founded on difference…Presence is built on absence, identity on difference…” (Sampson, 1993: 90). The narrators’ identities can never be pure immanence or simple homogeneity. Rather, it is a continuous intermixture and intermittence, and a dispersal and reassembly of diverse elements.

The binary model and its deconstruction clearly emphasize the dialectic between challenge and unity; between rupture and completion and the analyses of the
narrator’s subjectivities stress the necessity for both terms, which is the crux of Kristeva’s theory. Furthermore, the analyses also verify the Oedipal model empirically. As this dialectic oscillation has shown, these women’s insertion into the Symbolic order is particularly difficult and precarious, hence their tendency to oscillate between power and its denial. What these two analyses further reveal is that there has been no real change in the process of the construction of the ‘empowered’ woman from the years of apartheid to the present day.
CHAPTER 6: The ‘empowered’ professional woman: a deconstructive analysis of nine interviews

In this chapter, another perspective on the construct, the ‘empowered’ professional black South African woman, is given. The same Oedipal model that was applied to the analysis of the novels in Chapter Five will be applied to the nine semi-structured interviews. Each discourse will be explicated by extracts from the interviews to illustrate how the professional black woman discursively constructs her ‘self’.

6.1 The sample: background information

The first analysis is based on the interview with a 27 year old, Indian female, with an Honours degree in Psychology, to whom I shall refer as M. M is single and is currently employed by a large corporation as a Human Resources Manager. She comes from a traditional Indian background where the mother was not allowed to work until her children were grown. M’s one sister stays on in the parental home to assist the mother and neither of them is able to drive.

The second analysis is based on the interview with a 26 year old, African female, who is a chartered accountant, to whom I shall refer as B. She is single and is currently employed by a large corporation as a financial manager. She comes from a traditional Zulu background with a conservative father and a feisty mother who was initially employed as a nurse and currently lectures at university. B and her brother had to go to school at a very early age in order to allow the mother to earn a living.

The third analysis is based on the interview with a 31 year old, Zulu female, who is the director of a marketing consultancy and to whom I shall refer as P. She is married with two children and has a BA degree in Communications. She comes from a traditional Zulu background with a conservative father and a mother who is described as having had a difficult upbringing and who is a senior schoolteacher. P has three male siblings and admits that she has a very close relationship with her father.

The fourth analysis is based on the interview with a 37 year old Indian junior advocate who specializes in constitutional law and who shall be referred to as F. She is from a middle class Indian family, her father works for their family business and her mother, who was initially not allowed to work, now sews clothes from home. She has two siblings, one of which is a very traditional and religious Muslim sister who does not work. She is married to an African businessman and has no children.

The fifth analysis is based on the interview with a 33 year old African senior advocate (B Juris LLB), and who shall be referred to as L. She is separated from her husband and has three children. Her father is a qualified attorney and her mother is a teacher, whom she describes as the one ‘who has carried the entire family’. She has two younger sisters, whom she feels have more support from their irresponsible, fun-loving father.
The sixth analysis is based on the interview with a 40 year old, Coloured specialist dentist. She is called Y and is married with two children. She comes from a family of teachers who were focused on their children getting a higher education. Her late mother was a strict disciplinarian with even stricter rules for Y as the only daughter in the household. Y was one of the first non-white students at the University of the Witwatersrand and now practices dentistry in the affluent northern suburbs of Johannesburg. Her husband, although a skilled draughtsman, is her practice manager.

The seventh analysis is based on the interview with a 35 year old, African dentist, M. She is married to a building contractor and lives with her husband and three children in an affluent northern Johannesburg suburb. She has two dental practices, one, which is predominantly ‘black’ and is situated in Johannesburg central town, whilst the other is situated in a traditionally ‘white’ suburb with predominantly white patients.

The eighth analysis is based on the interview with a 34 year old, African female, T, who is the human resources manager of a financial company. She is divorced with two children and has a diploma in Marketing and Public Relations. She comes from a traditional family where the uncles ‘protect’ the women and see to the payment of ‘lobola’. She is currently in a long-term relationship with a Caribbean man and is mentored by her biological father who is a powerful businessman.

The ninth and final analysis is based on the interview with a 38 year old, Coloured female, who is the vice-principal of a private school in the affluent northern suburbs of Johannesburg. T is married with two children and has a BA degree in Communications. She is considering enrolling for her Master’s degree in education. She comes from a large, close-knit family and had a very close relationship with her late father.

TRANSCRIPT NOTATION:

The notational convention employed in the analyses is loosely based on the system developed by Gail Jefferson as explained in Wood and Kroger (2000:193,194). The complete, transcribed interviews are attached in Appendix C.

6.1.1 Constructing the ‘empowered’ professional woman

The empowered woman, (Says) constructs herself via two distinct dominant discourses, namely “I am different from the (m)Other” and “I am similar to the Law of the Father” both which employ the structure of the economy of Sameness. These discourses privilege rationality and independence and have specific implications for the positioning of the ‘empowered’ woman as a powerful subject. Furthermore, these dominant constructs also privilege one pole of opposites over the other (‘empowered’ woman/Same as man) versus disempowered woman (traditional Woman). The following section will focus on the first dominant discourse, namely “I am different from the (m)Other which is illustrated via four sub discourses, namely:
i. The “I am a rebel” discourse,
ii. The “I am independent” discourse,
iii. The “I am outspoken” discourse, and
iv. The “I am knowledgeable/educated” discourse.

6.1.1.1. The “I am different from the (m)Other” discourse

i. The “I am a rebel” discourse

Interview 1.

M constructs herself as a person who does not ‘fit the mould’; she rebels and resists the feminine subservience and dependency of the (m) Other and society’s stereotypical ideas of how an Indian woman should behave.

Lines 906-908:
M: because as an Indian female they don’t expect you to drink and smoke. As an Indian female they don’t expect you to be able to drive your own car or own your own home.

Interview 2.

B’s rebellion is also based on the belief that she does not behave like traditional African women do:

Line 352:
B: in my culture women are not supposed to wear pants

And:

Line 454:
B: they are subservient naturally

She finds that her interpersonal relationships with men are especially affected by her ‘rebellious’ nature:

Lines 607-608:
B: you know other guys mistake respect (.2) for (. ) subservience, and also no ambition. If you’re ambitious then you’re not respectful

She specifically differs from her (m)Other in her rebellious approach to the outside world:

Lines 546-552:
B: MA: you know, stick up, you know. “And she’ll say, you like to… just leave it, you know”. But also, you know, other things comes with maturity, you know. I’m YOUNG
C: That’s right
B: and uh, rebellious, whereas, at an (.) older age, you get to understand things, look at things differently and, and, and. And, if it doesn’t bother you, you let it go, you know. Only if it bothers you, whereas, I speak for the sake of, of speaking for my rig(h)hts, you know. Hahaha.

**Interview 3.**

P also sees herself as a rebel against African tradition, in line with her emancipated peers:

Line 675:
P: hh My peers are very Western.

And, she argues with her mother that they adhere to Western ‘rules’, not Zulu rules:

Lines 741-742:
P: She says: (1)‘But you must’. I say: ‘NO, I MUSTN’T’. I say: ‘Mommy, we, we, we, have (1) we, we’re WESTERN, we, we’re NOT THERE’

**Interview 4.**

F, even at a very early age rebelled against the conventions of her religious Muslim upbringing:

Lines 44-48:
F: I was always a rebel. I remember that very clearly where I wouldn’t want to go to (.) religious school because I, I, I never ever saw myself being part of a particular (.) sect or community, you know I just, for me it was important that my friends came from, and you must remember in those years we were only

And, when she marries a black man, this is seen as an extreme act of rebellion against the norms of her strict Muslim society:

Lines 154-162:
F: Uhm, with with the extended family, I, I think, you know°<… I mean, they were all there but they all had things to say, you know, they…They, how could you marry a black man, you know.

**Interview 5.**

In spite of her (m)Other’s pressure to remain in an unhappy marriage, L insists on filing for a divorce from her abusive husband:

Line 657:
L: it’s fine, I can do it. I can go it alone.

And she also displays a rebellious stance towards her less educated husband:
L: I said, “Oh my God. Haha, I’m no(h)t taking orders from you,>”

whom she describes as very patriarchal and traditional:

Lines 161-162:
L: (clicking of tongue) hmmm. <HE WANTED TO HAVE, I mean, he’s obviously your South African (.).
Black (.).
hh male that has (.).
that social (.)
sort of background,

**Interview 6.**

Y, contrary to her strict (m)Other’s wishes, decides against following in her parents’ footsteps as teachers:

Lines 135-138:
Y: Ja, so, my mother wanted to push me to go become a teacher as well, o:r if I wanted to I could choose to go do nursing and (.)
I didn’t (.)
want to. hh I refused. Uhm, she (.)
DIDN’T WANT TO send me to Western Ca:pe because (.)
a lot of my school friends
and neighbours have gone to Western Ca:pe but all became very politically involved

Y rebels against the stereotypical female professions such as nursing and teaching, by choosing a profession which is dominated by white males:

Lines 126-133:
Y: then came myself, at which point. At THAT time, political time, in the Seventies and Eighties,
non-whites, particularly, Coloureds, Blacks, Indians, were not accepted in the very uh, cream of the crop professions,

C: Ja

Y: medicine and dentistry, you know. It was .hh it was TOTALLY UNHEARD OF.
You could either do la:w.

C: Ja

Y: Or you could become a teacher

Y also rebels against the apartheid State’s laws of discrimination, with the help of her powerful father:

Lines 202-208:
Y: ( ) there were no, there were no places available for (.)
other than whites
C: And was this at Wits, applying at Wits?
Y: ( )
C: Yes, incredible. So, in spite of being turned down, he insisted that you apply in any case.

Y: Ja. Ja, no he said: “ >Okay fine, go in for the BSc (.). and then if you have to, and then go into second year medicine”, or<
This choice of career as well as her being the first Coloured female student to qualify at Wits is perceived as very different from the norm and thus an act of extreme rebellion:

Lines 10-11:
> I was probably fortunate enough; I was the first Coloured female to qualify from Wits

And:

Line 130:
Y: It was... it was TOTALLY UNHEARD OF

**Interview 7.**

M asserts that she has achieved what she set out to achieve in life because of her rebellious nature. She dislikes being dependent and being told what to do:

Lines 282-288:
C: What drives you to be self-sufficient?
M: Uhm, what drives me? I am not a person who who likes to be ordered around, to be told that, uhm, can you could do that for me, you know
C: Ja.
M: all that, all those things. I’m not a person who likes asking you know.
C: Ja.
M: ... I have to have everything myself. I have to have everything that I want.

**Interview 8.**

T sees herself as distinctly non-African:

Lines 827-828:
T: I at home they call me the whitey hah, you know

She also rebels against her traditional and subservient Other, who did not want her to file for a divorce:

Lines 581-584:
T: >No, she wasn’t<. She thought... I said “Ma you know I want to get a divorce”. She said, “No you can’t get a divorce”, I thought, Oh okay. and I went behind her, I did everything, got everything ready and went and went. I came back home and I had the date, uhm, my court date.

Her decision to file for a divorce is a sign of rebellion against the possible shame it might bring her family in her society:
Interview 9.

T’s behaviour is in contrast to the traditionally feminine behaviour of her sisters:

T: so my brother. My brother and I were the two who wanted to (.) kick balls and to (.) play hockey and to do this
C: Hmm
T: and he was very (.) for sport. ° My other sisters were pretty poppies, uhm you know

T also rebels against her parents’ wishes when she decides to attend the teacher’s college instead of university:

T: It was more (1)ºyou had to go to varsity. You come from a convent, we’ve spent all this moneyº. I said: “I don’t want varsity
C: Hmm
T: it’s not for me um JUST LEAVE ME.”
C: Yes
T: “I’m going to the Teachers Training College .hh that’s where I want to go”. <He was very disappointed (2) but supported me all the way .hh uhm “until he realized I was the chair person of the SRC >and then it was the seventy, just after the ’76 riot,
C: That’s right
T: and um, he was political as well

Her rebellion is also visible in the fact that she is politically active against the apartheid state in spite of her father’s wishes.

T: And when he realised I was the secretary of the, of the SRC and
C: Hmm
T: um we were, we used to toyi-toyi here and .hh we were put in vans there and whatever, ‘he was totally disgusted, totallyº. He was angry, he was, just like he could just say to me: “I’m cutting myself off you. I didn’t teach you (1) to go into politics, I told you its dirty business”

What is evident from the above excerpts is the fact that the ‘empowered’ woman most often sees herself as rebelling against the accepted, traditional norms and behaviour of her society. She asserts her ‘self’ by behaving in the more emancipated ‘Western’ manner, often to the chagrin of more traditional and subservient peers and parents.
ii. The “I am independent” discourse

Interview 1.

M claims her independence as a result of her education, which enables her to afford her own home, car and other material possessions. She repeatedly comments on her independence, for example:

Lines 171-174:
M: I own my own home, I own my own car and I love that independence…it’s something I thrive on and the one thing I passionately believe in.

And:

Lines 305-309:
M: Okay. My mom was your traditional Indian woman, sari and dot everyday, you know, she, she never wo:rked before or anything like that. My mom and my sisters are very dependent, and (.) it angers me, hahaha. It really does, because I always think. It goes down to locus of control, which is, is another core thing with me. I BELIEVE (.) that you have it within your power to be whatever you want to be.

Interview 2.

B places a great deal of importance on her independence, in a similar manner to M (Interview One). B claims this independence as a result of her higher education, which like M, enables her to afford her own home, and car.

Lines 490-492:
B: ‘cause I know she was the first car she bought was in 1989, this was (when she had her car for the first time) you know. .hh So:, no, I’m okay, and even now, I live on my own now, I’ve got my own house,

B indicates that her independence is a source of conflict, especially as African men appear to feel threatened by her affluence and independence:

Lines 610-611:
I found with guys, if you have, if you earn a good salary and drive a good car, then you’re not respectful

B struggles to accept their ‘traditional’ approach:

Line 617:
B: I don’t see what’s wrong with going to a restaurant and paying for your own meal
Interview 3.

As with the previous two interviews, P also places a great deal of importance on her independence. P claims this independence as a result of her education.

Lines 42-43:
P: hh So: uh, I enjo:yed the, the thrill of what one (.) of what one could do, you know. Uhmm, a:nd I then bought in, I bought out the other partners,

And:

Line 45:
P: and got 51% shareholding

She is able to purchase her own business and manage it independently in contrast to many traditional African marriages:

Lines 857-859:
P: So, the decisions I take, my husband (.) doesn’t have to know, or be involved in it (.) and he’s comfortable with that

Interview 4.

F also claims her independence as a result of her education, and her work as an advocate, which enables her independence at a variety of levels. And, even from an early age, F describes herself as a fiercely independent person:

Line 1070-1072:
I was completely independent of my family (.) now. AND I REALLY DIDN’T WANT TO, I COULD HAVE GONE BACK TO DURBAN, lived with him, with them and you know

F also displays pride in her financial independence from her affluent husband:

Lines 714-724:
F: We, we have our shared responsibility at home, and I run my own finances and he runs his own finances. You know, I don’t, I never get involved in what he
C: So you are quite independent
F: Very independent
C: of one another
F: and, uh, the marriage is accrual with ANC accrual thing and .hh in that sense he never asks me about and I think that would, you know, if we had to have some kind of joint account or
C: Hmm
F: I’d have insight into his finances and he into mine, then I think that would (have) cause problems ’cause that takes away your independence to a large extent, you know
And, whereas F was once dependent on a certain legal association for a small income, she now acts as an independent advisor to them:

Line 1222-1227:
F: and they’re completely dependent on me, they love me…they’ve asked me on various occasions to come back to them but I can’t work for them for the salary that they pay, you know, it’s just impossible

And:

Lines 1212-1214:
F: …and the IRONY of it is that when I came to the Bar, these people were then briefing me and they were paying me for one case what they (.) paid me in a month there

**Interview 5.**

L’s independence is made possible by her high level of education and is seen by her as a ‘gift’ which her mother had bestowed upon her:

Lines 661-662:
L: and I’ll cope, and I think she feels that’s the best gift she has given me (.) education and the, the ability to: to fend for myself

And, her financial independence grew along with her legal expertise, in spite of the initial struggle:

Lines 453-455:
L: <doing divorce matters, uh for (.) impecunious people. °So, it was quite (.) hard, I mean, in terms of (.) survival, generally. I wasn’t writing any good fees at all. hh But for some reason, survived and uh, things have changed no:w, doing good wor:k, uhm> °

**Interview 6.**

Y, by virtue of being in a ‘cream of the crop’ profession, is financially independent. She owns her own home and practice in the affluent northern suburbs of Johannesburg. She had to be pro-active to gain this independence:

Lines 720-721:
I’d better go out there and do something °for myself and for my children, ° give it a go. Uhm, things happened (.) and I negotiated with L and I (.)

And:

Lines 736-738:
Uhm, our house wasn’t sold. I said to L, “Look I’ll go out and I’ll put my house in the market”. I put my house in the market, (1) Sun:day. The next Sunday I signed ( )
Y’s independence is the result of her extensive, specialist training:

Lines 789-791:
< by virtue of the fact that you had been teaching, been involved in (1) training at different universities, sort of run a lot of courses, training courses, (involved in implantology )>

Furthermore, Y is able to employ her less qualified and formerly unemployed husband as manager in her practice:

Lines 359-365:
Y: he did some management courses. He is a, he actually is a draughtsman by ORIGINAL (trade)
C: Ja, and was he a draughtsman then?
Y: Ja, when I met him. Uhm, JA, NOW OF LATE, he’s done lots of courses, management courses, which I have no doubt, is probably also, just an influence on my part because I have been studying. So, he’s had to (.) fill his time as well. So: we just become a family (.) of on-going (.) development.

Interview 7.

M takes pride in her independence and states that she was independent from an early age:

Lines 252-254:
M: Uhhh, ye:s, but (. ) you know. I was, I was (. ) very independent
C: Hmm
M: since from when I was young. So, most of the things, > I did them myself.<

It is this specific characteristic that has led her to achieve her goals in life:

Lines 256-263:
M: Most of the things. Even the Khanya Colleges, the, etcetera. > had to discover them myself<.
C: Ja
M: .hh. Bursaries, etcetera, at school, I had to get them myself. I had to do (. ) everything (. ) myself. So: YES, I mean (. ) she did guide me in a way, but she knows, that everything, I did it for myself.
C: So you’re very independent and a very strong person?
M: Ja: when I want something, I, I get it.

Because M did not have the parental support, she felt that she had to get the necessary career information herself. As such, she was the ‘master’ of her own destiny, whose independence was a necessity for her survival.
Interview 8.

T also places a great deal of importance on her independence, and states that she was independent from an early age, a fact that her traditional mother had to accept:

Lines 94-95:
T: you know what, I have to let go at some point (1) because I, I, I, I, became independent very early

Because of her financial independence, she is able to afford gifts for members of her family:

Lines 1016-1017:
T: and I mean at home I take care of everybody. When I have money I buy things for everyone, they call me the extravagant one. Hah

When T files for a divorce, she insists that she does not wish for maintenance from her ex-husband:

Line 330-331:
T: …I said to the magistrate: “I don’t want anything”

She found that her marriage was stifling her sense of being independent:

Lines 341-348:
T: the way I wanted to be, you know, I, it was more about my (1) way of life I wanted to be my own woman.
C: Hmm
T: I didn’t want to be someone’s subject.
C: Right
T: or submissive to anybody.
C: Right
T: I didn’t want the abuse

T’s independent attitude created difficulties in her marriage:

Lines 614-619:
T: >°and they forget that, you know what, you are independent from them and .hh they cannot, they don’t have the power of telling you what to think, your mind is your own mind it’s independent from theirs, you know°<

And, when her uncle dies, she assumes his role as caretaker and provider for the elderly grandmother:
Lines 997-1003:
T: they tell me things, last uhm, two years ago, her last-born child(.) passed away, my uncle .hh and (1) she, she was devastated “and (2) > I, I kept on talking to her< and I say, “You know what <Grandma (2) .hh the little that I have, I will help you (2) because I know that my uncle helped you so much you didn’t feel anything, and, and, and I will do everything in my power to make sure that you don’t feel the gap, you don’t feel the void”(.). And ever since it has been like that>

Interview 9.

T’s independence is visible in the excerpt below, when she states that she is the only head of the household, since she regards her husband as a ‘child’.

Lines 584-593:
T: because I’ve got three boys. I don’t have a husband.
C: Hah
T: No, I’m being DEAD SERIOUS.
C: Yes
T: I, when people ask me, “How many kids,
C: Hah
T: how many kids do you have?” I say, “I have three”.
C: Yes
T: My husband. .hh, we we got married when I was 30 “when I got married.” We were going out for eleven years, and he was 36. So he was a spoilt brat.

T’s independence is further made possible by the fact that she is a vice-principal and as such she earns a bigger a salary than her sisters and her (m)Other. This allows her to send ready-made food as a gift to her nephew instead of baking it herself like the other traditional females:

Lines 1064-1069:
T: and say,“Have your break”. .hh Whereas today, “I don’t do it”. When my nephew was writing Matric, I said to my sister, “Here, there’s Woolies vouchers (2) you go”. I’m not going to come and bake for my - he’s my godchild.
C: Hmm
T: I said, “I’m not baking or whatever, I’m not there for him, .hh go to Woolies (.) buy whatever (1) pre-packed and let the child have it”. And so YES, becau-, because of money

Because of her yearning for independence, T rejects her mother-in-law who is regarded by T as weak and dependent:

Lines 856-857:
T: So, she felt very out (1) and I didn’t help the situation quite honestly because I was just, “Stay away from me and my family, do your own thing”<.
All the ‘empowered’ women are shown to place a great deal of importance on their independence, which is often in stark contrast to the emotional and financial dependency of the traditional females (and sometimes males) in their lives. This independence is situated in the masculine domain and it is claimed by all of these subjects as the result of their higher education and income.

iii. The “I am outspoken” discourse

**Interview 1.**

As a professional woman with a degree and who is situated within the public world of work, M acquires the right to speak; she is able to express her opinions and her professional knowledge.

Line 958:
M: “Because more often than not I tend to argue with people. HAHAAAA.

And:

Lines 419-421:
M: and feel comfortable enough to talk about certain things if it’s within my area of expertise.

**Interview 2.**

As a professional woman with two degrees, B is able to express her opinions and her professional knowledge.

Line 551-552:
B: I speak for the sake of speaking for my rights, you know. Hahaha.

And, she finds that she sometimes speaks on behalf of her more timid mother:

Line 546:
B: “MA: you know, stick up, you know, anymore and she’ll say, “You like to… just leave it, you know”

**Interview 3.**

P feels that men and women must have equal say:

Line 653:
P: I mean, if HE says, I’m gonna say back.

And:
When confronted by the wise old women at her bridal shower, P retorts to their advice initially with an attitude of rebellion:

**Interview 4.**

As a junior advocate who has her own private practice, F is able to express her opinions and her professional knowledge. Her outspokenness is a strong feature in all spheres of her life, such as her decision not to be secretive about her marriage:

Lines 160-162:
F: >I wasn’t going to do it in the quiet and not, you know. Uhm, so, I did everything out in the open, had a proper wedding and everything. I mean, they were all there but they all had things to say, you know, they <

In the work sphere, her legal knowledge is a powerful way of speaking:

Lines 1046-1047:
F: I can stand out there and I can argue these cases

And:

Lines 1510-1511:
F: Ja, ja.º I’m now involved in that. We have now set up a new transformation committee and we work, we’re working. We’re not part of the Bar Council anymore

And because of her expertise, she is in charge of the legal arguments:

Lines 1124-1126:
F: allow me: you know, to run the case (.) in a way that I wanted to in a sense. ‘Cause ultimately I was the one who was arguing the case in court as opposed to THEM. You know, they’ll do the b, the basic preparatory work, we’ll do the, the actual argument

**Interview 5.**

As an advocate, L often expresses her legal opinion:

Lines 454-457:
L: …for some reason, survived and uh, things have changed no:w, doing good wo:rk, uhm> …<.hh you know, uhm, corporate work>

And:
Lines 729-730:
L: so: the more senior ones, I think, tho: . Those that are senior to me, I think they are getting (. ) good work and I’m senior as well so I’m getting good work.

In her personal life, L refuses to be silent in front of her traditional, patriarchal husband:

Lines 707:
L: I said “Oh, my God. Haha, I’m no(h)t taking orders from you” , >

**Interview 6.**

As a professional woman with a Master’s degree and her own private dental practice, Y is able to express her opinions and her professional knowledge. She is also politically outspoken on behalf of women’s rights on the campus:

Lines 648-649:
Y: (. ) I had joined the uh, the sexual, racial harassment panel. Wits wanted to *rewrite* their (. ) whole mission statement.

She also speaks out against the racist comments made to her by her superior, a white male professor at work:

Lines 502-503:
Y: we had a major fight in the Departmentº. Uhm (1) and I was one of the people that was *instrumental* in this.

Y is vehement in her resistance to this racial oppression:

Lines 623-629:
Y: < and I said to him: “The fact that I stand up against something, must tell you that I don’t appreciate it >… I *resist* it. I have *all the right* to resist it… I have all the right to resist (1) and I have *all the right to question*. If I *see* something I’ll question it”.

**Interview 7.**

As a professional dentist, M is able to express her opinions and her professional knowledge. This ‘outspokenness’ is especially visible in her marriage:

Lines 297-298:
M: I HAVE THE SAY. I SAY I WANT THIS AND THIS HAPPENS. I WANT THIS AND THIS HAPPENS YOU KNOW.

Her opinion has credibility because of her professional status:

Lines 301-307:
C: How does that come about, that you actually have so much say in your marriage?
M: Hmmm. I think because (background noise)) >I think, he believes in me. He believes in what I do, he believes in my vision, you know.<
C: Ja.
M: > That’s why he lets me. I mean, he, he’s a builder, he’s a, he’s an everything but (.). hh most of the things in the house I’m the one who changes them. I’m the one who tells him I want to build this there and there, I want you to change this and that and that<

**Interview 8.**

T is also very outspoken and regards this trait as a strength:

Lines 858-859:
T: Whereas *me*, they know (1) I will *say anything*. I will tell them if I’m not pleased.

And:

Lines 869-871:
T: They think you’re rude. I say, “No, Ma, < it’s not being rude it’s being open-minded, it’s telling you how I feel, it’s letting you know where I AM (1) right now>”

T admits that her outspokenness is not the traditionally accepted way to behave as a woman:

Lines 845-852:
T: (.). she feels that she doesn’t have to say anything. >Most of the time she keeps quiet, she keeps very much to herself.<
C: Why is that?
T: .hh I think it’s part of (2) being a woman,
C: Hmm
T: <and saying ‘I’m a lady’. A woman is not very loud, you don’t have to be like that, you don’t shout, you don’t do those things, you have to keep your calm, you know (2) >KEEP IT IN.

In her marital relationship, she is also outspoken, especially when she realizes that her husband is incapable of running the household expenses properly:

Lines 638-640:
T: he didn’t like it. I said, “You know what, we (2) this is how we run (.). the household. This what we pay this month, next month, this is what we do, and all that”

**Interview 9.**

T is outspoken against her (m)Other’s dependency when her father dies. She, along with her siblings, refuse to ‘spoil’ the (m)Other and instead, encourage her to become independent:
Lines 136-138:
T: and then we said: “Sorry, hold it,
C: Ja
T: enough is enough, sorry. Get yourself somebody else or otherwise (1)”

T also voices her uprising against the oppression of the apartheid State by participating in acts of resistance:

Lines 423-425:
T: And when he realised I was the secretary of the, of the SRC and
C: hmm
T: um we were, we used to toyi-toyi here and .hh we were put in vans there and whatever

And, although she initially hands over her salary to her husband (like her father used to) she realizes that she is doing herself a disservice and speaks out:

Lines 649-651:
T: I just said to him,”Hold it brother, hold it. Enough is enough. YOU tell me what I have to pay. You know what I earn (.) and then you work out what I must do >because you know what, I also want my own money<”.

T is also very outspoken towards her sisters-in-law and mother-in-law, which reflects the difference between her and their traditionally silent and subservient behaviour:

Lines 638-639:
T: So it’s all that I, I, I even say to his sisters you know, I often say to them, “You people spoiled him and now I’m sitting with this brat”.

All nine of the subjects are highly qualified, and as such these ‘empowered’ women automatically acquire the right to speak; express their opinions and feelings and assert themselves in both the private and public sphere. This is often in contrast with the silences of the more traditional and subservient women, in their lives.

iv. The “I am knowledgeable/ educated” discourse

Interview 1.

M positions herself as a powerful subject by virtue of her university degree and her qualification as a human resources manager:

Line 171:
M: Yes, a:nd ah, I’m the only one who’s been to university.

And:
M: “I don’t know, it’s because I feel when I am at work I have to be professional” when I started here < I’ll never forget, one of the first things I had to do, was sit on this panel.

**Interview 2.**

B is also university-educated and this knowledge and expertise set her apart from her others especially in the public sphere of work.

Lines 140-145:
B: So: okay, I did my. I was lucky ‘cause I got a B**** bursary when I was doing Matric° ‘cause they went around, uh, black schools and, and sponsored like the, uhm (.) good students. So: they paid for all my tuition, you know, uhm. So, I star., I did my degree for, over four years at Natal and then, uhm, did my postgraduate diploma after that. And I did my articles with E******* a:nd uhm, for three years a:nd so: because they sponsored me I had to come back and work for them,

**Interview 3.**

P also constructs herself as educated via her university degree and her business acumen within the world of marketing.

Lines 11-16:
P: so to speak, as they call them the S*****. a:nd uhm, through that I worked in the finance department. So did not give up the career in Hotel uh,uh, management, finished studying that. Did my internship, then had the job at S******, which then led to working in the public relations department, because it was only just one woman, and (   ) they wanted to grow that. .hh And then °I had an opportunity to actually study a BA Communications through Unisa,

**Interview 4.**

F, an advocate, sees herself as an expert in her legal field because of her specialization in a specific area of the law.

Lines 1325-1326:
F: where I’m now kind of seen to be the (. ) specialist in my area and I’m brought (. ) into cases because of my specialization

And:

Lines 1328-1330:
F: .hh although that’s the one, the one is (. ) litigation wise in the sense where you. Ja, most of the cases I work on are (2) °precedent setting cases in the sense, it’s a new area of the law.°
F feels that she is able to contribute to the other attorneys’ legal knowledge by virtue of her expertise:

Lines 1116-1122:
F: I think I learnt a lot from them, but I think (. ) with coming in with new ideas, and also coming in with specific litigation uh skills, which uhm, uhm, they, you know >they were attorneys (. ) that had kind of been working (in one area ) of land or whatever< … uhm, and I came in (. ) with kind of those (. ) writing skills and argumentative skills, that, you know, THAT THEY WERE THEN PREPARED to kind of

**Interview 5.**

L, also an advocate, is knowledgeable by virtue of her legal expertise:

Lines 476-477:
L: uhm.hh I THINK .hh < slowly, but you know, slowly, one is beginning to crack it and beginning to get (. ) the real kind of work.

And, in spite of her professional status, she asserts that her educated, older boyfriend does not feel threatened:

Lines 288-291:
L: <But I find that with (. ) him, we sort of connect (. ) at the same sort of (. ) level. If not, he’s higher, I mean, he has to be because he’s older, more experienced .hh So:, he’s not worried about, he’s not, the small things like uh .hh he’s not intimidated by my career success (if, and just put it, uh bluntly) you know.

**Interview 6.**

Y is placed in a very powerful position of knowledge by virtue of her expertise in the field of dentistry.

Lines 763:
Y: I had gained a lot of experience.

And:

Line 757-769:
Y: Ja, you just basically. I just basically had to come with my competence…and (. ) perhaps a lot of uhm (. ) professional acumen…I had had a lot of preparation time in academia, having had a practice, even though it was part-time. But it dealt with the management…<knowing how patients respond, (how you deal with). How you write letters. ‘Cause I had been involved in post-graduate training>…
**Interview 7.**

M sees herself as more educated than her peers because she was educated at a Catholic school instead of an apartheid-era ‘black’ school which was regarded as providing an inferior education:

Lines 4-5:
M: (2) I: went to a: (1) Catholic School which was (.) you know, privileged at that time to

go to that school.

In spite of having been born to a teenage mother, M is a qualified dentist and regards herself as an professional:

Line 161:
I mean, I’m a professional.

Not only is she a dentist but she is also a qualified geneticist:

Lines 272-275:
M: <Uh, just from the career guidance, I just loved it. And then the BSc, the BDS like I
told you. While I was doing the BSc, uh, BSc Genetics, uhm, you know, I used to go to
different faculties and look around, etcetera and then (.) it took my fancy. And then uh, it,
it got emphasised after I, I realised that there are no jobs in Genetics>

**Interview 8.**

Although her (m)Other could only afford to send T to secretarial college, she is currently regarded as a role model in her new position as Human Resources manager:

Lines 1042-1048:
T: “Really am I?”’, she says to me, “>Yes, you drive a beautiful car, you stay in Sandton,
you do all these things< Wow (1). I wanna be like you”.
C: Good role model.
T: I say: <” “Wow, so I am a role model>” >My daughter thinks that of me too,
my grandmother thinks you, hmmm, know what I’ve never done this but I
know T** will do, will make me do this for me, you know<

And, T admits that she has managed to educate herself and become knowledgeable:

Lines 1252-1257:
T: I have come a long way, from a school kid, to a receptionist to a PA
C: Ja
T: to a manager, MAN I’M A MANAGER, yo(h)u know
C: Exactly
T: Wow, I have, I have risen through the ranks, you know. ° I have got two kids
I’m a divorcee (1) but I’m a MANAGER,
She feels that the new position has changed her life dramatically, both financially and also socially:

Lines 1264-1268:
T: Wow, and I can talk to my dad about business you know
C: Ja
T: >I am no longer this little person<
C: Ja
T: and I make a difference in other the people’s lives, because I talk to people.

**Interview 9.**

T similarly positions herself as ‘knowledgeable and educated’ by virtue of her tertiary education:

Lines 257-260:
T: “and all my mother’s children (. ) went into the teaching field, cause my uncle and my aunt were teachers”. C:Yes
T: SO THEY had such an influence over us and my mother had such an influence over them

And, she prides herself on the fact that her family is highly educated:

Lines 262-265:
T: that the two it was so, it was so (. ) fun that everytime we applied (. ) my mother would say, “Where are you going to?” Then she’d look at my sister and she’d say, “I’m going into education” and she’d look at my cousin and she’d say, “No, I’m going to become a doctor”. It was so fun .hh but it was a bond that was so close. We used to wear the same clothes…

Professionalism and education are encouraged in her family:

Lines 1075-1077:
T: “But uhm JA we are still there, the encouragement is still there° …°professionalism is still there.

All of the above excerpts illustrate that the subjects are ‘empowered’ by virtue of their knowledge and education. On account of their high levels of expertise and qualifications, they enter the Symbolic realm as rational subjects. As with the previous discourses, this sets them apart from their traditional, less educated Others.
6.1.1.2. The “I am similar to the Law of the Father” discourse

The professional woman also constructs herself as ‘empowered’ via a second dominant discourse, which portrays her as “Similar” to the dominant patriarchal discourse. The ‘Law of the Father’ discourse refers to the (mostly) male figures of authority such as the father in the private, home sphere and often also to the white, middle class male, who symbolizes the former apartheid state, in the work sphere. This discourse has associations of authority, dominance and assertion. It includes the powerful and positively valued rights and responsibilities of the public sphere with which the professional woman identifies.

Her similarity to the Law of the Father is expressed by two sub-discourses namely:

i. The “I silence others” discourse, and
ii. The “I am a decision-maker” discourse.

i. The “I silence others” discourse

Interview 1.

M portrays herself to be agentic and assertive when in a conflict situation, especially at work:

Lines 461-463:
M: Definitely. I wouldn’t be with someone, if they treated me. I’ll be honest with you, Carita, if someone has to talk down to me, ooooh, that gets my blood boiling, because then I would do everything in my power to show you differently.

And:

Lines 476-478:
M: It, see, those sorts of things don’t bother me, but it’s as soon as someone, someone condescendingly, addresses me in a condescending manner or treats me as if I’m an imbecile. It, it just, it pisses me off >It’s one of my hot buttons, I know it <.

Interview 2.

Even though she is encouraged by her (m)Other to pretend to be less intelligent and dominant in her relationships with men, B refuses:

Lines 556-564:
B: What would I not let go? No, at this age, uh actually nothing, uhh, that’s why my mom always says, I won’t get married if I, I go along this way ’cause with guys, sometimes, even though, you know you’re right;
C: Yes
B: you have to pretend you are wro:ng and ah,(I always tell her that’s not on) Uhh, I can’t.
C: Would you do that, B?
B: I would neve: r, maybe that’s why I don’t have a relationship, you know.° My relationships don’t la: st °because uhm, gu: ys, one, feel threatened, you know.

B acknowledges in turn that she also silences her mother:

Lines 1040-1041:
B: I’m like…undermining her beautiful personality.

And, in contrast to her (m)Other, she voices her displeasure at bad service in a restaurant:

Lines 527-532:
B: You know, my mo:m, if somebody. If you are in a restaurant and she gets bad service, she’ll accept that and it’s so unlike her. She’ll accept that and she’ll (.) wouldn’t stir trouble, you know.
C: Right
B: Whereas, if I get bad service, I’ll ask immediately, what is (.) going on, you know. I want, I demand, good service, you know.

Interview 3.

P portrays herself as extremely assertive, especially at work. As the major decision-maker of the business, she effectively silences others:

Lines 823-833:
P: I make and I take the rap for them if they don’t work out, at all. But when it comes to cli:ent pitches and cre:ative .hh and uhm operational stuff… uhm, then I do let them make their decisions… and, I’m quite fine for them to fail, ‘cause they’ll fail once, learn their lessons and hopefully if it’s the right staff, move on… So, uhm I’m easy. Just depends on the decisions. Then, I, if they invo:lve finance then I take them, ja,ja

And:

Lines 857-858:
P: So, the decisions I take, my husband (. ) doesn’t have to know, or be involved in it (. ) and he’s comfortable with that

Interview 4.

F is especially assertive in conflict situations in the work sphere:

Lines 1192-1195:
F: You know. Oh, and then this caused such a .hh raucus at the ******C because
you know I then put in my resignation. OBVIOUSLY I went through the proper channels, and all of that stuff

And, when she resigns from a powerful position, which clashes with her value system, she effectively silences those whom she opposes:

Lines 1427-1428:  
F: <but I RESIGNED. I was elected on the Monday and resigned on the Tuesday

**Interview 5.**

L’s assertiveness is especially visible in her marital relationship:

Lines 168-177:  
>he wasn’t making sense to me anymore. So, it was difficult for me to entrust (. ) MAJOR DECISIONS IN HIM…HE WANTED TO BE the sole decision maker. >I was happy to let him make decisions, except his decisions were not appealing to my sense of lo(h) gic! <

She later refuses to follow any instructions from her husband:

Lines 707-708:  
L: “Haha, I’m no(h)t taking orders from you,”

And, because she is brought in as senior counsel in a legal case, she effectively silences white, male advocates in the work sphere:

Lines 486-492:  
L: .hh No, those (1) you’ll find. I think (. ) ultimately it’s about ha, >distinguishing (. ) yourself. Obviously they’ll come to you because client has (. ) forced you down their throat.  
C: Okay  
L: client will insist (. ) that uh, “I want you to brief L T, in this matter”. >“They’ll say “But I’ve never used L before”<and they’ll say pfoo (sound made with lips), ““I don’t care”.

**Interview 6.**

Y is, similar to the other subjects, very assertive when in conflict situations, which often occur in the work sphere. She tackles the racist comments from the head of department head on:

Lines 514-516:  
Y: <You are a head of the department and I will keep you accountable. If you give me instructions that I don’t wanna carry out I’m NOT gonna do it.
Y’s proactive attitude forces her superior (a white, male professor) to apologize:

Lines 554-555:
L: Apparently I made a BIG mistake, your colleagues came in to tell me that I made the mistake of my life.

Even her affluent predominantly white patients, are eventually silenced by her display of expertise:

Lines 783-791:
Y: They just phoned N, they’d want the X-rays, they’re going somewhere else. And they went, they came back,
C: That’s incredible
Y: came back. Uhm, after (.) speaking to people and so forth. <Uh, I SUPPOSE YOUR NAME THEN, GOES AHEAD OF YOU>
C: Ja
Y: <by virtue of the fact that you had been teaching, been involved in (1) training at different universities, sort of run a lot of courses, training courses, (involved in implantology) >

**Interview 7.**

M, who is far more educated than her husband, often argues with him and silences him:

Line 322:
M: Uhm, hey, what do we argue about? About everything! Hahaha!

**Interview 8.**

T’s silencing occurs frequently in her marital relationship:

Lines 646-655:
T: >I said, “Okay, this it how it works. Okay, I am the woman of the house, (.) let me run the household,
C: Yes
T: let me run the household **fully**, you run everything else let me run the household”.
C: And how did he respond to that?
T: you know what, > I didn’t work< because he didn’t pay for the bond (1) on time. “Every time it was in arrears, and I said, “You know what, I gave you the chance and you blew it.
C: Hmm
T: Now it’s my turn, let me run the household”.

She also voices her opinion that she is more intelligent than her husband is, thereby silencing him:
Lines 632-634:
T: The reason (1) he got so mad is because (1) he always referred to me as, “Oh you think you’re the most intelligent one”, I’d say, “Yes, I am the more intelligent than you. It’s just that you don’t wanna admit it, if you admit it, then we’ll be fine”.

And, her decision to divorce her husband silences him in front of their friends:

Lines 706-707:
T: No. NO AND I KNOW PEOPLE that know him that, hh when they ask him, they say, “So where’s T***?” He says, “Oh, she’s at home”. Hah

Interview 9.

T’s silencing of others occurs especially in the private sphere, as is illustrated in excerpt one below, where she can be seen to be the strict disciplinarian who scolds her sons:

Lines 736-737:
T: BUT uhm JA, I DON’T KNOW IF WE, IF WE GET TO USE IT. Because, you know I, look we do hit them, we do scold them but

She also silences her mother-in-law after her husband arrived home drunk, which precipitated their moving into their own place:

Lines 890-894:
T: <and she came into the room and she said, “What did you do to my son?” and I said, “NO IT’S HOW YOU BROUGHT YOUR SON UP.”
C: Ja
T: (Old mother, spoils) your son rotten and he drinks (.) and then he hurts himself and I HURT him? It was a big fight because then, in, (in the state of course)

And, by her insisting that they move out of her mother-in-law’s home, she effectively silences her husband who gives in to T’s wishes.

Lines 907-913:
T: “It’s either your mother or me OR your mother comes to stay with us (.) under my roof
C: Okay
T: not under her roof (2) because here I have no say, I can’t do a thing, I just got my little room, that’s mine personally.
C: Ja
T: everything else is hers, “everything else is your sister’s, she’s welcome to stay with me under my roof”.

T also silences her sister-in-law who insists that she does the female chores of washing up at family functions, since T is the youngest:
T: But don’t tell me to do->

All of the above excerpts illustrate that the subjects most often silence their traditional Others, especially in the private sphere. However, they are, albeit to a lesser extent, also able to silence their often male Other in the public sphere.

ii. The “I am a powerful decision-maker” discourse

Interview 1.

M portrays herself as a powerful subject who is able to make her own informed decisions in the work sphere:

Lines 307-313:
M: It really does, because I always think. It goes down to locus of control, which is, is another core thing with me. I BELIEVE (.) that you have it within your power to be whatever you want to be. You create your own limitations, you allow people to impose barriers onto you. I, I cannot handle, uh “I’m a function, of the system”. I hate that attitude and I tend to argue and fight with people a lot, based on that. I’m not saying the world is ideal, I’m quite a realist, >but I’m saying< if I want something, only I can go out and get it.

Interview 2.

B is also able to make her own informed decisions and in her personal relationships, she comes across as a strong, independent decision-maker who is able to decide when and how often she sees her boyfriend:

Lines 576-580:
B: But I, I could never see how, what he meant by that. I mean, I come back from work, sometimes I’m just tired, I just need to be by myself, for like three hours maybe have a bath, my own time, then maybe see him after that. Or if I don’t see him in one day, it’s okay with me, you know, or, or for a whole week if I don’t see him, it’s okay with me.

At work she is allowed to make important decisions, unlike her black peers:

Lines 990-998:
B: I’ve just started working. I neede, I needed something like that which has helped me, °made me a stronger person, you know. Whereas, maybe if I’d started working in an environment where, I, I knew that I was black and felt that I was black, maybe I wouldn’t be where I am today, you know °.
C: When you say uhm, you knew you were black and you felt that you were black, what specifically, do you mean?
B: Specifically, like OPPRESSED…somehow, I couldn’t make decisions or, or PUSHED…
Interview 3.

P owns her marketing business outright, and as such, makes all the major decisions concerning the business.

Line 803:
P: I now SOLELY own the business >‘cause I bought my partner out <

And:

Line 810:
P: I make all the decisions

Unlike traditional African women, she does not see the need to consult her husband about her business decisions:

Line 855:
P: Uhmmm, my business is mine and not my husband’s. That’s point number one

Interview 4.

F is often able to make her own decisions in the work sphere. She is for example, able to decide whether she will remain to be a part of an association or a committee where she does not feel valued.

Lines 1321-1323:
F: and you become, you can earn 200, 300 thousand Rand a month. I don’t want that.
SO I MADE DELIBERATE CHOICES EARLY (.) in my career as an advocate. It’s now paid off, you know,

Furthermore, by virtue of her being very involved in the transformation body at the Bar, she is instrumental in making many important legal decisions:

Lines 1420-1421:
F: uhm (2) and I, I mean, I think that (2) and I’m very involved in the, °in the transformation body at the Bar council, those sorts of bodies at the Bar °

F, as a powerful decision-maker, is actively engaged in empowering other women in the legal field:

Lines 1491-1496:
F: °...opportunities and unless the attorneys are prepared to brief them (.) they’re not gonna gain any experience. And, and, now we’re trying to change those briefing patterns
C: Right
F: and uhm, just (.) you know we’re introducing various scholarships and funding and soft loans, and, you know, where we might have to sacrifice a bit (.) general (.) population at the Bar, may have to sacrifice a bit

And, in her private life, she asserts that her marital relationship is one of ‘equals’ who share decisions equally:

**Interview 5.**

L makes her own informed decisions in the work sphere. She is able, through her legal expertise and professional standing, to make important decisions by way of her legal advice to her clients.

Furthermore, she also makes the important decisions in her household as she does not feel confident about the decisions made by her husband:

Her stance on making important decisions, leads to many difficulties in her relationship with her husband:

Lines 189-192:
L: hh (2) Agº I think, everything, heyº. I mean (.) from not liking my fri:ends, to (1) .hh not agreeing on the sort of schools (.) the children should go to. He wants the kids to go to public school, I want them to go to private scho:ols because I feel it’s a worthwhile investme:nt and ( ) you know.
Interview 6.

Y is able to make her own informed decisions in the work sphere as is illustrated when she decides on her own career path in spite of protestations from her (m)Other:

Lines 160-162:
C: So, how did she handle the fact that you then applied for dentistry?
Y: WELL SHE DIDN’T WANT TO. Uhm, she wasn’t impressed about it. >But I, the fact that I had applied for medicine as well <

And she is also able to sell her house in order to purchase the dental practice in the northern suburbs:

Lines 736-737:
Uhm, our house wasn’t sold. I said to L, “Look I’ll go out and I’ll put my house in the market”. I put my house in the market, (1) Sun:day. The next Sunday I signed

Interview 7.

M’s decision-making occurs mainly in the private sphere:

Lines 297-300:
M: I HAVE THE SAY. I SAY I WANT THIS AND THIS HAPPENS. I WANT THIS AND THIS HAPPENS YOU KNOW.
C: Ja.
M: But, although I’m not contributing to tha-h-a-t, but I make the decisions.

Interview 8.

T is an assertive woman and a dominant decision-maker, and this is particularly visible in her dissolving marital relationship:

Lines 636-643:
T: YEAH, I made the ma, the major decisions.
C: But he didn’t like it.
T: He didn’t like it. I said, “You know what, we (2) this is how we run (. ) the household. This what we pay this month, next month, this is what we do, and all that.”
C: Yes
T: I said: “Everything will run smoothly, as if do what you want a lot of things will be, will get left behind”

She is also the one who instigates the divorce proceedings:

Lines 687-690:
T: Exactly, “but (. ) after that I said, “No more, ‘I don’t care what people sa(h)y,
this is my life. >if they think I am stupid for that, it’s fine<.
C: How did you, so you filed for divorce?
T: Yes, I filed for divorce.

Furthermore, she now makes important financial decisions due to her high income:

Lines 1257-1262:
T: I’m a divorcee but I’m a MANAGER, wow, that means I can buy a beautiful car.
C: Hah
T: I can get a house you know, I can start thinking about bigger things, you know
C: Ja
T: and I can take my kids to a better school.

**Interview 9.**

T is shown to be a powerful decision-maker especially in the private sphere since she insists on moving out of the mother-in-law’s home and she also decides which chores she is willing to do at the family gatherings as illustrated earlier.

She rebelliously decides not to obey the rules of the extended family:

Lines 958-959:
C: How would you say things are different now?
T: Very different. I put my foot down immediately.

Her decision-making also extends to the way her sons are raised:

Lines 1104-1106:
T: and sometimes you’re just not speaking, and THAT’S WHY WE DECIDED “enough is enough” .hh Give his pocket money I .hh I taught him, I said, “Ten percent goes to the church, ten percent to savings”.

All of the empowered subjects are able to make important decisions in both the public and private spheres of their lives. This is in stark contrast to the traditional Others’ lack of power who are often subjected to the decisions of the powerful patriarch.

**6.1.2 A tale of identification and of a struggle toward independence**

The ‘empowered’ woman’s construction of herself as “different to the (m)Other”, illustrates her attempts at ‘differentiation’, which is also a denial of any dependency on the (m)Other. She also constructs herself as “Similar to the Law of the Father”, which is associated with the masculine values of being powerful, rational, autonomous, self-confident and in control.
Her identification “with parts of an object can be regarded as a “taking into” the self-representation aspects of an object-representation” (Sandler, 1987:16), which in this instance, means those powerful aspects of the Symbolic order. Her identification with the phallic position of difference and separation, is a turning away from the (m)Other and indicates her wish to be recognized as a subject with her own desire, like the father who is a desiring subject: “on the one hand, the identificatory impulse functions defensively to avoid the ambivalent mother; on the other, the wish to be like the father expresses an intrinsic need to make desire one’s own…not as the property of the object, but as one’s own inner desire” (Benjamin, 1995:123).

6.1.2.1 Of identification and Love

The excerpts below will illustrate the ‘empowered’ professional subjects’ tentative identification with the (m)Other and ultimately with the realm of the Symbolic. Attention is also paid as to how each subject is encouraged to become independent by the (m)Other and her desire, the Father.

Interview 1.

M initially identified with her first love object, her (m)Other:

Lines 238-240:
M: I, my mom used to be the centre of my universe (.) easily. I could say that, I would defend her, for anything and against anyone and over time, that relationship has changed.

Now, however, M shifts away from identification with her (m)Other which is illustrated by her emphasis on independence. This independence and differentiation is encouraged by the (m)Other:

Lines 76-78:
M: I, I would deliberately do things because I thought…My mom always taught me to be different is to be unique, and that’s something I’m very proud of.

The above excerpt illustrates that it is the (m)Other’s love that encourages M to become an independent subject. The mother’s desire, the father, however, desires a son, a role that M felt obliged to fulfill:

Lines 389-392:
M: …I always had to ensure that the house was clean, that chores were done, and with my Dad, I think he always wished he had a son because I used to get even more chores from the point of view of turning the VCR, I know it’s a stupid example-

She also states that she sees no difference between herself and men in the workplace, implying her identification with the Symbolic realm:
Lines 894-897:
M: but I also think sometimes .hh both the parties, I mean> B*** is a very male
organization and, once again you’re gonna think I’m an idealist but when I walk into a
meeting, I don’t think of myself as a female. I’m a competent individual and that’s all
that matters<.

And, as such, she is equal to men:

Lines 708-710:
M: Uhm, but I, I believe in equal rights for all, I do. I don’t believe people should be
treated unfairly because of arbitrary things. And, at the end of the day, all our blood is red
hh .

Interview 2.

B identifies with her first loved one, her (m)Other, insofar as her (m)Other displays
typically male qualities, namely being independent and being a sound decision-maker:

Lines 474-478:
B: YE:S, no definitely >You know sometimes I look at myself and I think I, oh my god,
I’m so much like my mo:ther <you know.
C: Yes, what way are you like that, would you say?
B: Okay, like I’m very independent. Like, at (.) 20, I bought my own car, you know, even
though I, I stayed at, at, with my parents, I bought my own car.

B’s independence and differentiation are encouraged by the (m)Other:

Lines 261-271:
B: Ja, I mean even when I had to choose what to do, my father, wanted ( ) to do, to
pursue medicine, you know, but my mo:m said there’s no money in medicine, you know.
She’d lived with do:ctors and she (.) sees do:ctors everyday and they work ha:rd and
there’s no money in medicine. I must just do this thing called chartered accountancy, you
know. THEN, that was 1992. There was one black female South, CA in South Africa,
you know. >And I don’t know where my mo:m had heard of this career<.
C: Hm
B: She brought books, she made sure I met somebody, a guidance teacher who told me
about it, you know. She got this, uh, I don’t know, she got this booklet >from the
University of Natal, all the companies who are sponsoring people who want to be CA’s
and I applied to each and every one of them.

Independence and differentiation are also encouraged by the (m)Other’s desire, the
father:

Lines 256-259:
B: you know. We were going to have to, it was going to dis, disrupt our education, you
know. My pare, parents had to send us AWAY, into boarding school, (.) SEE US O:NCE
IN THREE MONTHS > but at least we got the best education< and no: dis, disruptions, you know.

And:

Lines 506-509:
B: I think they’ve been married now for 40 years you know and they’ve been, throughout these years they’ve been, my father I’m sure (.) has never cheated on my mother.< He’s been very loyal > you know. Ja: <Even though he didn’t earn a lot of money, but every cent he brought home> you know.

Her father’s support is a constant in her life:

Lines 436-437:
B: Ja. Nothing. He says nothing to me. You see, it’s because of his supportiveness. I think he’s learned to understand, you know,

B’s focus on independence shows a closer identification with the realm of the Symbolic and the Father as the route to individuality. B admits that she idealized her father as a child:

Line 392:
B: I thought my father was perfect.

And, similar to her private life, B is supported by the ‘father-figure’, her boss who encourages her development at work:

Lines 1007-1019:
B: So, when I joined here, he sat down with me and discussed my development plan and says, “B, this is where you are now, you know and, my: this organization would like to see you there, you know. You’re not; you’re not going to get there (.) easy and to promote you every month.
C: Right.
B: to get to that position, but if you do this and this and this and, study this and this and this, you will definitely get there”, you know. Whereas, my other colleagues, or (.) my other friends out there in other organizations, do not have somebody (.) that (.) committed to their change, you know.
C: Right
B: Or to their development, you know. Whe:re people just get promoted without even understanding why: I’m being promoted you know.

Interview 3.

Although P identifies very strongly with her father, she acts in a protective manner towards her (m)Other, her first loved one:
She acknowledges that it is her (m)Other who encouraged her independence:

P’s focus on independence is firmly based on her identification with her father and the Law of the Father as the route to individuality, which in turn is based on his power and the male monopoly of desire.

Her identification with her father is extremely strong, so much so that she feels she is the son he wished for, in spite of his having three sons:

P’s identification with her father is such that she is seen as closer to him than his wife:

P longs for recognition from both the (m)Other and her desire, the father:
Interview 4.

F initially identifies with her (m)Other:

Lines 346-347:
F: and, uhm (.) I think my sort of outgoing personality and, just my, my, my approach to life is her approach to life.

However, her independence and differentiation are strongly encouraged by her (m)Other:

Lines 279-281:
F: Business. > uhm, and because he didn’t have a son he wanted my dad, my brother to get into the business, my mother didn’t allow that. She said, you go to university and you study, you know<

And:

Lines 310-313:
My mom said, “NO, NO, NO. These kids are not gonna grow up in this family situation. They need to …get educated”.

F, similar to M (Interview One) and P in (Interview Three), expresses her uncle’s desire (as the powerful patriarch) for male successors, a role that she felt she fulfilled:

Lines 283-284:
F: >and he thought, he thought, I would then be interested because I was very boyish, you know, sort of.

And:

Lines 306-310:
F: >and he had three daughters and they didn’t really go further in education and stuff and got married quite early <. .hh So, he really saw us as as having the potential to – to take over the business, whichever way. You know, he didn’t mind us studying, (1) ultimately you had to come back into the business.

F is further encouraged towards professional independence by a father-figure (a white male attorney) in the work sphere:

Lines 1085-1088:
F: So, I had a relationship with them< uhm, he said,“Come work with us and we’ll pay you and you can then do your pupilage at the Bar (1)”, you know. Uhm, and then I got a special, you, normally you’re not allowed to earn a salary, while you (. ) spend those six months in training at the Bar<
And, by virtue of her being in the traditionally male profession as an advocate, it is evident that she strongly identifies with the male domain:

Lines 1040-1047:
F: you know, uhmm. At that point I, you know, we’d sit in court every day and watch (2) the advocates here from the Bar arguing all these matters before us.° They were essentially male, I, ja they were essentially male, I think. (Maybe) one or two women (2) that appeared, uhm (1) >and I kept looking at them and I kept thinking < but you know why do I want to (.) pursue this academic°
C: career
F: career (.) in law (.) when I can, you know, I can stand out there and I can argue these cases

**Interview 5.**

L acknowledges her (m)Other’s role in her personal development, since her (m)Other was the decision-maker and the sole breadwinner for several years in her parental home:

Lines 50-51:
L: And uh, she was (.) the one carrying (.) the entire family, so uh, in a sense (.) I think she made it possible for me (.) to be where I am today, you know ( ).

And, her (m)Other is the one who encouraged L to study law rather than medicine:

Lines 372-373:
L: My mother, again, haha. She said, “Look L, medicine, no”. She discouraged me And:

Lines 388-391:
L: so how about trying law? I said, “Law”, I said? She said listen to this, “Law (.) all you do: read stories”. Now, stories (.) are cases (.) according to her.° “Oh, they’ll tell you, so and so did that and this is what the court found. Don’t you think that could be lovely? It’s stories, man, ultimately”. So she sold .hh (hahaha)

L’s independence is also made possible by the (m)Other and her desire. In spite of her initial resistance, the (m)Other agrees with her daughter’s decision to divorce:

Lines 646-648:
L: “<You know, just leave him, my baby don’t worry, you’ve got a good education, you’ve got beautiful kids, leave him”. .hh You know, so and she keeps coming back to the point, that uh, “don’t you worry my baby you’ve got your education”°

Her focus on independence is strongly based on her identification with the ‘Law of the Father’ as the route to individuality. L expresses her regret that, as a young girl, her father had not acknowledged her, even though they share the same profession:
Lines 114-116:
L: and >I didn’t really enjoy the support<. SO, I THINK, now, it has suddenly dawned on him, “that God, I haven’t been there for my daughter, now she is this (. ) successful; in his eyes I’m this successful thingº.

However, in spite of her father’s earlier ‘neglect’, he is ‘supportive’ of her career:

Lines 397-401:
L: So I went for it. And, uh, well, I went through (   ) studied, I kind of loved it. I had the support of my father (. ) in a sense (. ) there intellectually,
C: Hmm
L: because I’d go to him. He knew the stuff, said Dad (this, this, this) .hh he’d help me whenever I (had a) problem so, pfoo (sound with lips), something very difficult .hh

Interview 6.

Y acknowledges her (m)Other’s role in her personal empowerment. She is encouraged by both parents to become empowered and educated:

Lines 75-76:
Y: Had teachers for parents which, and they actually were (. ) instrumental in (. ) encouraging us and pushing for education

It is especially the (m)Other who can be regarded as the driving force behind Y’s personal empowerment:

Lines 78-83:
Y: <we were never pro-active , encouraged to not be pro-active in all the political activities because she, she was adamant> that (. ) you need to sort of empower yourself first
C: Right
Y: and then you have the mouthpiece. “Then you have an instrument or something behind you”. But if you don’t have, it’s like an empty tin makes the loudest noise.

Y’s choice of a typically male profession against her (m)Other’s wishes is a move towards identification with the traditionally male domain of dentistry:

Lines 160-162:
Y: WELL SHE DIDN’T WANT TO. Uhm, she wasn’t impressed about it. >But I, the fact that I had applied for medicine as well <

And, it is the (m)Other’s love, the father who is instrumental in her becoming independent:

Lines 112-115:
Y: my father was a school principal (. ) ° in Potch at that time for about 9 years. (They used to travel in and out)°. So, when it came to (. ) academic decisions, going to scho:ols,
applying to universities, meeting people, applying for finances, bursaries, etcetera. My father did that.

**Interview 7.**

In spite of M’s insistence that she had to obtain her own career information, it is evident that her (m)Other was supportive since M is educated because of the sacrifices of the (m)Other and grand(m)Other. The excerpt below also illustrates her identification with the masculine characteristic of ‘independence’:

Lines 379-387:
C: Is this your Granny?
M: Ja, you know because my mother was at school at that time.
C: Of course, being so young.
M: So she was responsible for both of us, because my mother was in boarding and I was uhh, uhh, living with her. And then, uhm, ja: she used to, do everything for me.
C: Who do you think you take after the most, your Gran or your Mom?
M: I think I take for my Gran.
C: In which way, if you can give me some examples?
M: The independence. The: ja, she was very independent.

And:

Lines 376-378:
M: And then, >she used to be the breadwinner. She used to do everything for me< She, she was, she was really, really, really a, (1) a strong lady that one. Uhm, she: My primary school, she was the one responsible for it. (   )

After M’s grandmother passed away, M’s own mother and stepfather (the mother’s desire) provided for her:

Lines 430-434:
M: And then, uhm, ja:, I could say (2), he, he: also contributed. I mean, we were living in his house.
C: Yes
M: .hh He used to, you know, buy the groceries, and everything. Pay for everything. Ja, he, they did contribute a lot also.

She admits that her (m)Other played a role in ‘guiding’ her:

Line 260:
M: … So: YES, I mean(.) she **did guide** me in a way…

Her identification with the realm of the Symbolic is evident in the excerpt below:
Interview 8.

T identifies with her (m)Other (and grand(m)Others) insofar as they are perceived to be very strong women:

Lines 301-304:
T: thing about her and .hh it just came up. And for me to have such powerful women in my life, I had three most powerful women,
C: Hmm
T: the two grandmothers and my mother.

It is also the sacrifices of the (m)Other(s) that enable T’s independence:

Lines 10-12:
T: I mean, she has been this single-handed woman doing things by herself seeing to it that every one of us gets a bit of education, and uhm, I’m glad to say that she has been very strong for me.

The grand(m)Other also advises T how to deal with men in particular:

Line 274-277:
T: She was very open, she will tell you, “>Men will play you,
C: Hah
T: men will ring your neck; men will do all these things”. I mean, she will, she will explain things about, from sex to politics< >She didn’t shy out<

It is further the (m)Other’s desire, the father, who is especially important in T’s drive towards independence. She aspires to be as successful at business as her father, who is also supportive when she decides to file for a divorce:

Lines 188-193:
T: .hh Well, uhm .hh > being a divorcee himself, he’s in a second marriage
C: ( )
T: Uhm, he said to me, “You know (2) the only person (1) that makes the decisions finally (1)
C: Hmmm
T: is the individual (2) person”. That was hi-

And:

Lines 204-205:
T: “…so whatever decision you take I will be supportive of it”.
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She strongly desires the love and approval of her successful father:

Lines 119-122:
T: Jaa, but uhm, in my case, I always when I speak to him, he. I mean, he loves me. He tells me how much he loves me all the time.
C: Hmm
T: He, I, I was never a mistake.

And, asks him to become her mentor when she is promoted:

Lines 155-156:
T: Ja, we talk about business and I, I he is got business. I ask him the other day if he could be my .hh mentor, because (1) he has (1) risen through the ranks

T also expresses a desire to have been told of her late stepfather’s admiration for her in person:

Lines 388-390:
T: And I said, “Wow, why didn’t he tell me?” He said, “You know men, <men don’t really te(h)ll you how they feel about things, women are more on the feelings side than men do”.hh I said, “I wish he could have told me, you know”

Finally, her stepfather (the (m)Other’s desire) also advises T and by so doing, encourages her to become an assertive individual:

Lines 530-531:
T: Ja, you know and that has taught me so much (1) that if you go out anywhere (1) never ever rely on anybo(h)dy.

**Interview 9.**

Similar to many of the other subjects, T also identifies with the (m)Other insofar as the latter exhibits characteristics which belong to the traditionally male sphere:

Lines 106-109:
T: Ja, you know .hh so she SHE survived um and I think that is where we get our survival skills from
C: Hmm
T: You know, my granny was also the type of person (.) with all her kids. .hh my grandfather was in both wars, uhmm, you know (.) he was busy

And, it is the (m)Other and the (m)Other’s love, the father who encouraged T to become educated and independent:
T: “<I will wait for you, I’ve taken leave and I will put you back in my car ºand you will go home and you will study>”.
C: Ja, so he was dedicated,
T: Very, very, very, and very education, you know (and he)
C: Hmm
T: MY MOTHER WAS THE SAME,

It is their sacrifices that enable T to become educated and independent:

Lines 246-247:
T: “We were always you know smartly dressed” ( ).hh always bought the best for us, she was always the last to get something.

And, it is the (m)Other’s love who guides T:

Lines 482-484:
T: …You know (.) with my father he, he guided you, you did what you had to, you got your dog, you got your this, .hh you got your that, it was always what you had

Her identification with the father is visible in the excerpt below:

Lines 363-368:
T: He was (.v)ery sporty okay,
C: Okay
T: he was the sporty type and <he was the musically inclined person >.
C: Hmm
T: So, my brother. My brother and I were the two who wanted to (.) kick balls and to (.) play hockey and to do this.

In the above excerpts the daughter identifies with the (m)Other often on the grounds of a typically masculine trait such as ‘independence’. Her independence is further encouraged by the (m)Other and the (m)Other’s desire, which then leads to a closer identification with the realm of the Father and a move away from the maternal realm as will be illustrated in the section that follows.

6.1.2.2 The struggle towards independence and the repudiation of the (m)Other

As illustrated in the previous section, the ‘empowered’ professional woman’s focus on independence is based on her identification with the Law of the Father as the route to individuality. By associating with the realm of independence, the devaluation of the (m)Other is inevitable. The ‘empowered’ woman, as an independent subject, repudiates her commonality with her mother through dis-identification. She does not see her (m)Other as an independent person and instead, the (m)Other is related to as an object.
The ‘empowered’ woman’s contradictory positioning as both a professional and a woman further fills her with anxiety as it threatens to destabilize her sense of a unitary subject. She constantly tries to manage this anxiety by employing splitting as defence mechanism. She now actively introjects the positive values of the Same as part of her conscious identity and her defensive ‘masculine’/empowerment stance promotes a dualism, a polarization of subject and object, with the assignment of subject status to the dominant, masculine term and the object status to the feminine, devalued term. Furthermore, the ‘empowered’ professional woman’s own feminine values and qualities, which continue to be identified with passivity, and of having no desire of her own, are repressed and projected onto the (m)Other.

The excerpts that follow in this section will focus specifically on the ‘empowered’ woman’s struggle toward independence from the maternal realm and her negation of the feminine capabilities.

**Interview 1.**

The following excerpts illustrate M’s struggle toward independence, in the work sphere:

Lines 311-312:
M: I tend to argue and fight with people a lot

And, in her family home, she ‘battles’ the patriarchal father:

Lines 399-401:
M: and I would challenge and continuously get swatted down, ‘cause how dare you challenge the authority.

Furthermore, M also relinquishes her erstwhile identification with the (m)Other in a violent disavowal:

Lines 238-241:
M: I, my mom used to be the centre of my universe (. ) easily. I could say that, I would defend her, for anything and against anyone and over time, that relationship has changed to the point where I thought, hh and hh, maybe resentful is, is the wrong word,

It is especially the dependency of her (m)Other and siblings which she disavows vehemently:

Lines 305-307:
M: Okay. My mom was your traditional Indian woman, sari and dot everyday, you know, she, she never wo:rked before or anything like that . My mom and my sisters, are very dependent, and (. ) it anger me, hahaha.
Interview 2.

B’s struggle to gain independence is continuous, both in her private life and her work life:

Lines 592-593:
B: Quiet time to just cool off, you know. So, we always used to fight about that, you know. Ja° eventually, the relationship never worked, you know. °

And, at work:

Line 1055:
B: I’m looking, who w(h)ants to sta(h)b my back, you know. Haha.

When the (m)Other displays typically feminine qualities such as ‘timidity’ and ‘weakness’, B disapproves which reveal her negation of the (m)Other:

Lines 500-504:
B: Actually, sometimes, I think my mother is not assertive. She’s a loud mouth, but she’s not assertive, you know ((smiling)).
C: Yes, she’s not strong enough ( )
B: Ja, she’s not strong enough for, for her, to stand for her rights, you know< Ja: Eh, my father, I’ve got that and uhm, honesty.

B also dis-identifies with the traditional Other, such as her peers who fall pregnant at a young age.

Lines 99-106:
B: I know, quite a lot of my friends, immediately, after Matric, being exposed to the outside world, fell pregnant, you know, have kids, you know. You’ll find a lot of .hh black professionals, female, most of them, have kids, you know.
C: Ja
B: Because of uh all these hidden, uhm, sort of like, ru:les and, and, and-
C: When you say the black professional women, that you’re specifically referring to?
B: Yes, women. Yes, women. Ja, I’ve got, uh, it’s, it’s not uncommon fo. , to have, to know a black professional, who’s got a chi:ld, you know.

She also distances herself from her less fortunate peers who are perceived as ‘puppets’:

Lines 914-923:
B: Tokenism, you know. Whereas uh, here, °when my boss told me when I joined, that you know what B, .hh you’re not going to be: (. ) earning the best salary a:nd whatever, but .hh (. ) .if you (.2) work hard, prove yourself, you will get the rewa:rs, you know>
C: Hmm
B: >Whereas, I know, with many companies, they load you with money, they (just tell you, you’ll be earning so much) they don’t tell you that you’re just in a position for the sake of being in the position
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C: Mmm
B:…uhm. Not being involved in any decision-making or uh, whatever, you’re just a puppet-

**Interview 3.**

P’s struggle towards independence is visible in both the private sphere, when she ‘battles’ with her more traditional mother about being a subservient wife:

Lines 762-763:
P: Then I thought, you know. Then my mother said to me “What skin is it, it’s no skin off your nose”.

Her struggle is also visible in the public sphere, and she wishes that all black women would fight for equality:

Lines 888-889:
P: what I wish is that black women (1) specifically can take the bull by the horns.

P negates her (m)Other and the less dominant br(O)thers when she states:

Lines 464-470:
P: and that was ( .) very apparent. The the boys were my mother’s. The boys never rode. They did ride bikes and whatever.
C: Ja
P: But they didn’t do any manly stuff .hh so: it ( .) disappointed my father a lot, you know. >They didn’t run, they didn’t do sport<.
C: Ja
P: I was ( .) athletics captain and I,

The distance and difference between P and her (m)Other is especially evident in the sphere of work:

Lines 847-850:
P: Gosh, it’s ( .) quadrupled. I mean the decisions I take now, my mother (2) could never take or understand. I mean, I rea:lice even when I try to speak to her about it now.
C: Hm
P: I just speak to (her on it) in a very basic sense you know.

**Interview 4.**

F’s ‘struggle’ towards independence occurs especially in the public sphere:
Lines 1412-1413:
F: But (.) you still don’t have the same opportunities that the, that the (.) male has and we’ve gotta break through that:
F uses the words ‘battle’ and ‘fight’ to indicate the difficulty in achieving this independence:

Lines 1394-1396:
F: you know, they had to fight through (.) many more … battles to get there

And:

Lines 1459-1460:
F: We really need to go out there and, and fight our own battle as black people…

And, because of her powerful position, she is able to differentiate herself from black female advocates who are less empowered and who are in need of assistance and training:

Lines 754-758:
F: .Uhm HOWEVER, AT THE BA: R I’M NOT SURROUNDED with very, very successful Black women (1) you know
C: When you say that, what do you mean?
F: Uhm (.) I think women as laywers still struggle.

F appreciates her (m)Other and sister’s lifestyles and contribution to society, yet sees it as dramatically different from hers, which is evident in the use of the word “little” in both instances:

Lines 209-216:
F: but the point is that she wanted. You know, she (.) hh she had accepted what he wanted for her in the sense. >It’s only now ten, twelve years later that she’s realized that she made a big mistake and that she now needs to-<
C: educate herself
F: >(ja, edu:,) she was educated but she never( )<
C: never got any practical experience
F: >but she never got any practical experience. She she’s now set up (4) you know she’s now got a little designing studio and she’s doing that sort of thing

And:

Lines 383 – 387:
F: but she helps in a small way. Or I would take on a public interest case…with the *** ( ) but she does in her own little way. >I’m always saying, “Mommy, but why are you doing this, do you have the time for this” and Ja, but that keeps me going in a sense or she’s happy to.
Interview 5.

L acknowledges that her becoming an advocate has been a ‘struggle’:

Lines 402-408:
L: Went through it all and uh, hh when I completed LLB it was very difficult to (. ) come, you know to get articles, you know.
C: Why was that?
L: I really don’t ( ) know…I guess ( ) the big ( ) fence >obviously, historically, historically big ( ) attorneys firms are white firms<.

And:

Lines 425-428:
L: Aah, it was, it was challenging. I mean, straight from varsity, no: ( ) practical experience… So it was quite tough, but .hh we all have to go through ( ) challenges in li:fe.

However, she distances from the Other in the sense that she is ignorant of the less successful practices of other female attorneys:

Lines 481-483:
L: I do know that there are some of my black colleagues who are not ( ) enjoying good quality work. .hh <I don’t know why that is so> but speaking for myself, I think I’ve got to be fair and say: “Hmm, I’m getting good work”.

She also distances herself from the traditional (m)Other who “stuck it out”; for the sake of her children in an unhappy marriage:

Lines 644-645:
L: And obviously, like I told you when I told her about my divorce, “but I stuck around”.

Interview 6.

In the predominantly ‘white’ practice, Y initially struggles to win over her white nurse:

Lines 751-755:
Y: that’s N, ja… <been working for L for fourteen years. No:w ( ) this kind of thing, lots of change. What’s gonna happen? Insecurities, anxieties and so forth. So, she stayed in the practice. I believe that made ( ) a big difference.>

And, at the university, she is involved in many battles to be heard and accepted as equal:

Line 435:
Y: lots of bickering, backstabbing
And:

Line 502-503:
Y: we had a major fight in the Department

Furthermore, as the only Coloured student, she soon realizes the ‘fight for equality’ is not one shared by the white students:

Lines 264-265:
Y: You know. >It was not as if they were fighting for your cause. You had to get in there and fight for your own cause<

Y’s identification with the realm of the Father, is a devaluation of the maternal realm which is projected onto the (m)Other, as is illustrated in her description of her traditional peers:

Lines 143-145:
Y: so: small town get involved with social activities in the town etcetera. So: the trend was either, when you just finished Matric, your next step, your next profound (.). hh thing to look forward to is to get married and drive a car and have children, type of thing.

**Interview 7.**

M’s becoming independent has been a hard struggle. M did all the research for her first career as well as the financial funding through bursaries on her own steam:

Lines 259-261:
M: .hh. Bursaries, etcetera, at school, I had to get them myself. I had to do (.). everything (.). myself. So: YES, I mean (.). she did guide me in a way, but she knows, that everything, I did it for myself.

Initially, she became a geneticist, but found that is was a financial struggle since it was a low-paying career:

Lines 95-96:
M: It’s not like that anymore. There is no money, there is hassles, there is problems there is anything you can think of.

And, even now that she has re-qualified as a dentist, she has found that practicing in a traditionally ‘white’ suburb is extremely taxing:

Lines 121-122:
M: When they come, they come, you know, they expect, I don’t know, heaven and earth from me.

In her private sphere, M is also engaged in a struggle to be accepted as an equal:
M: o(h)h well, uh, we argue about a lot of things. We can argue about him coming late at home. We argue about me going (. ) to shopping, you know… about me spending money on shopping. We can argue about taking the kids to school in the mo(h)rnig. Hahaha.

Her negation of the maternal realm is especially visible when M accentuates the differences between her (m)Other who was a teenage mother, which is in sharp contrast to her own life:

M: Uhm, <it’s different from my mother’s, because (. ) I’m married, I have got my (. ) own house… <My children are raised by both parents.

**Interview 8.**

T’s journey towards independence has been filled with hardship:

T: and she said (2) I inspired her. I said, “How did I do that?” (She said to me) You are SO STRONG, WITH ALL THE THINGS THAT HAPPENED, HAVE HAPPENED IN YOUR LIFE, YOU STILL (. ) ARE HOLDING YOUR HEAD HIGH”.

And:

T: I have come a long way, from a school kid, to a receptionist to a PA.
C: Ja
T: to a manager, MAN I’M A MANAGER, yo(h)u know
C: Exactly
T: Wow I have, I have risen through the ranks, you know. ° I have got two kids I’m a divorcee (1) but I’m a MANAGER,

And:

T: Despite all the hardships I’ve come out this strong (1) and this tall (1) and this self- assertive (1) and confident and > if I can make a little difference in other people’s lives<

When T disagrees with her (m)Other about her ‘unladylike’ behaviour, it is clear that she distances herself from the maternal realm:

T: >we don’t REALLY care if, if, haha you know< if, my parents don’t like it. I always say, “You know what Ma, I uhm, I know you not comfortable with this,
“but this I am doing this for T***i .hh and if T*** is happy, you have to be happy for me”

This difference is rationalized on the grounds that it is generational:

Lines 89-93:
T: I mean, if you (1) compare that to (1) this VAST difference. I mean (. ) things, the technology we have now, things that happened then ( 1 ) the money everything. You know everything has changed, the economy, who is in the government and all those things have got so much to do with how we live right now.

And:

T’s differentiation from her traditional Others and (m)Other becomes especially visible in the manner that she conducts herself socially:

Lines 814-830:
T: Mom is not a huggy person, kissy, kissy person, you know.
C: Is it the way she was raised?
T: Yes, because you know what, uhm, the hug thing is not a black thing, actually. > It, it just started now, it’s a trend<.
C: Oh, that is interesting. Do you think it is American?
T: You know it’s a, it’s a trend.
C: Ja
T: It is a trend (. ) because uhm, I realised, everybody is hugging and kissing. Hugging and kissing, hugging and kissing.
C: Hmm
T: It’s a good thing. Like, at least it brings people closer,
C: Ja
T: but with us (. ) hugging your mom, you hug her on her birthday, give her a kiss on her birthday and .hh you know you try. I, I at ho(h)me they call me the whitey hah, you know,
C: Hmm
T: because I am more, so modernised with everything.

Interview 9.

The struggle towards independence is clearly visible in T’s text, especially when she asserts herself against not only her own (m)Other but also against her (m)Other-in-law:

Lines 899-910:
T: At that time I was fighting with my mother,
C: Oh my word!
T: >ºso it was so difficult for me to say, I’ll have to pick up the phone and say please somebody fetch me, but I had to do itº<.
C: Ja
T: And then he came and said, no he is sorry and he won’t do it and I said, “You know what? It’s time for us to move.
C: Hmm
T: It’s either your mother or me OR your mother comes to stay with us (.) under my roof
C: Okay
T: not under her roof (2) because here I have no say, I can’t do a thing, I just got my little room, that’s mine personally.”

She differentiates herself from her (m)Other and negates the maternal realm after her father’s death:

Lines 131-140:
T: …She, she did nothing so we had to take over.
C: Hmm
T: from what HE did and we realized how he had spoilt her.
C: Ja
T: And then we said “Sorry, hold it,
C: Ja
T: enough is enough, sorry. Get yourself somebody else or otherwise (1)
C: Learn to do it yourself.
T: learn to do it yourself”.

She also distances herself from her grand(m)Other, even though she stated that they were similar, on the grounds that the grand(m)Other never qualified as anything:

Lines 1003-1007:
T: Uhm, my grandmother, shame (2) she was an ordinary housewife.
C: Hmm
T: So, so, so, ja she changed and yet she produced a lot of (1) professionals (2),
C: Yes
T: despite the fact that she was a total housewife >.

All nine of the ‘empowered’ women have been, and continuously are, engaged in a vehement struggle to become accepted as individual subjects in a male-dominated society. This entails a denial of the (m)Other and their own feminine capabilities. However, as I will illustrate through the deconstruction of the two above dominant discourses, the repressed (m)Other is the necessary condition for the possibility of the existence of the subject as an independent, ‘empowered’ professional woman.

6.1.3. Deconstructing the ‘unitary’ subject: eruptions and contradictions

Whilst the ‘empowered’, professional black woman actively constructs her ‘self’ as an ‘empowered’ woman within the framework of Sameness, the oppositional (devalued) discourse of femininity and Otherness is always present. Within this construction she is also implicitly referring to what those things are Not, to what is absent from them. A
deconstructive reading counteracts the tendency to objectify and deny recognition to those who are less independent or different, and does not obliterate difference.

The feminine realm, the semiotic order, which has been attributed a secondary social status, and which is the marked term, is consciously marginalized but can never be wholly excluded and so always threatens to disrupt the ‘unitary’ subject. The ‘empowered’ professional woman is in reality dependent on the (m)Other for her existence.

6.1.3.1 The “I am not-different from the (m)Other” discourse

When the dominant discourse “I am different from the (m)Other” is deconstructed, the repressed silences become visible which disrupt the first theme. In the ‘empowered’ woman’s text, it is evident although she says that she is different, she is also not–different from her less powerful Others within both the private and the public spheres. Instead, her more powerful male counterparts position her as the powerless, passive and dependent feminine within this discourse. Excerpts from the texts will now be discussed to illustrate that the ‘empowered’ woman is indeed not Similar to the Law of the Father.

i. The “I am not a rebel” discourse

Interview 1.

M, in spite of portraying herself as a powerful woman who ‘rebels’ against the norms imposed on her by society, is shown to be conservative and conformist, especially in the presence of men and those more powerfully positioned than her.

Lines 875-877:
M: you watch the politics, you understand how it impacts on you, but you never play it. I will never play politics with anyone.

And:

Lines 275-277:
M: I DON’T KNOW WHAT THEY WERE THINKING. THEY WERE FIFTY PLUS WHITE MALES, AND HERE WAS THIS TWENTY O(h)NE YEAR OLD, HAHA, .hh INDIAN FEMALE AND I, I didn’t know how to react in that situation.

M does not participate in the office politics, she does not “rock the boat” at the work place, for fear of retaliation by those who are in more powerful positions than her. Especially when she is faced with white males who are traditional figures of authority, she is not a rebel, but rather timid.
Interview 2

In spite of her high income and professional status, B still desires to be loved and taken care of by a man in the traditional, historical sense of interpersonal, heterosexual relationships:

Lines 566-568:
B: by the fact that, not because. I just think they like that understanding (1) that uhm, (.3) in spite of (.) what I may have, what I may have achieved, I still need love, little things still make me happy, you know.

She rationalizes not being in a relationship as a good thing since she has to work overseas for a while:

Lines 883-892:
B: I won’t just (. ) go out with somebody, for the sake, you know, or marry them, just because they (. ) proposed, you know. whereas, with my friends, the moment (they’re in a relationship), it’s all working towards (. ) marriage, you know. Whereas, with me, I think, uhm, you just give it a bash, if it works out, it works out, if it doesn’t work out, it doesn’t work out, you know.

C: Ja
B: So, if you get married it’s good, but if you never get married, it’s ok, also good, you know > .hhh ( ) And, actually ( ) I’m also now, I’m quite grateful now that I’m not married, because I wouldn’t be able to take this opportunity to go to C****<, ‘cause if I had a husband, I think it would be selfish (. ) to leave him ( ) behind and, you know ( ).

She further admits that she is not able to behave in any way she pleases at her father’s home. She has to behave submissively, out of respect for her father:

Lines 776-784:
B: Out of respect, you know and, and, and leave quietly. So: that’s why I say, I know I’m grateful. So, what’s the use to argue (. ) about something that I know that I can do: in my home here, in, in Johannesburg.
C: Yes
B: °I can do whatever I want here, >whereas when I’m at home in Maritzburg, I must just behave, accordingly, you know< He must feel that he’s the father °,
C: Ja,
B:° that I’m the daughter, I’m the child °.
C: and it keeps you both happy that way.

Furthermore, she tolerates the authoritarian demands of her boyfriend for two years, who reminds her of her father:
B: very handsome, but (.) he was so much like my father, he was very (.) *women rule, male rule* you know. I couldn’t do this, I couldn’t do that. .hh and, okay, we went out for like two years you know°.

**Interview 3.**

P, although she initially rebels against the thought, accepts that she has to serve her husband with a tray as part of her traditional (and subservient) role as a wife:

Lines 739-746:
P: “You won’t believe it. Benny demands that I serve him with a tray”. She says: (1) “But you must”. I say: “NO, I MUSTN’T”. I say: “Mommy, we, we, we, have (1) we, we’re WESTERN, we, we’re NOT THERE...” She says: >“No, but that’s a sign of respect. How can you give your husband food just by (.) throwing it. That’s what you do with a dog. You take a pan (.) you throw it on the floor (1) Give him the tray”.

She also agrees with the African tradition of ‘lobola’ where the man pays for the bride:

Lines 614-618:
P: you know what .hh I agree with it, I agree with it. I believe that uhm, not in the sense that I’m, I’m I’m being bought…but I believe in life, °if you do want something you must work hard for it and you must put something in it°.

From the above excerpts it is evident that P is not rebellious with regard to the traditions of her culture, which pervades the private aspects of her life.

**Interview 4.**

Even though F is at pains to explain how she rebelled against conventions, and was never considered a ‘proper’ Muslim, it is evident that she could not always rebel against her strict Muslim upbringing:

Line 41:
F: °I was **forced** to go to madressa

And:

Line 43:
F: after school you have to go to madressa to learn the religious study

She also moves from Durban to Johannesburg on the insistence of her then boyfriend:

Lines 949-958:
F: I suppose, ja, because my **boyfriend** was here in Jo’burg and I wa(h)s, I was in
Cape Town. He was, he was also (2) he had lived (.) in America for about 14 years when I had met him…we kinda still had a relationship .hh (3) and at the end of that year he decided uhh, he thinks he wants me, you know he wants me in Jo’burg.

Furthermore, even though she works in a profession that is dominated by males, she agrees to have a baby for her husband and his family’s sake:

Lines 663-664:
F: You know, I can go on with my life without having this baby but it’s important for you a. I KNOW it’s important for you and its important for your family.

F clearly conforms when faced with the traditional behaviour expected of a woman in a male-dominated society.

Interview 5.

Although L states that she had outgrown her husband and that she would not be taking orders from him, she bows to her children and their father’s wishes for visitation:

Lines 707-708:
L:  I said “Oh, my God. Haha, I’m no(h)t taking orders from you” , >but then I look at the children, “Mommy we wanna go see Daddy” , I say, “Fine babies, I’ll take you”<.

In the workplace, it is also clear that although she may have portrayed herself as a powerful subject, she still feels the need to impress the white male attorneys and clients with her expertise and legal skill:

Lines 496-497:
L: to show to him, that (.) brother, I’m equally. “So, so, it’s hard. But we also, we always try to rise to the occasion. °

Interview 6.

Within the strict, authoritarian family home, Y has to obey the parents’ household rules, as the only daughter:

Lines 88-89:
Y: >strong discipline, particularly females< uhm (.) <I was never allowed out at clubs and things like that> It is especially the traditional mother who is very strict about her only daughter’s upbringing:

Lines 96-97:
Y: Ja, no she particularly, for me, also kind of had a very watchful eye over the FRIENDS that I chose
And:

Lines 99-101:
Y: and uhm well, who I was out with, when I was out with. JA, things like that, <<it was, not not an accepted thing for her (.) to not be involved in your life and the choices that you make>>

At work she is unable to rebel against the historically entrenched structures at the university and this forces her on to find employment in private practice:

Lines 709-717:
Y: where, what’s happening? (   ) where do you see yourself in five years time? Because I’m still at Wits and I thought, ‘‘well I’ve been here now seven years. If I project three to five years where am I gonna BE? I am gonna be in exactly the same place where I am now.
C: Ja
Y: you know. There’s absolutely, with the way they set up, or their whole structure, very flat structure, sort of thing,
C: Hmm
Y: or very hierarchial.

**Interview 7.**

Although M insists that she has the major ‘say’ in their household, it is evident that she still fulfills the traditionally feminine chores and she is responsible for the household cooking:

Line 333:
M: Sometimes I have co:oked and then he doesn’t like that food and I get upset.

They also argue about her expensive spending habits and parental responsibilities:

Lines 324 – 330:
M: We argue about me going (.) to shopping, you know…about me spending money on shopping. We can argue about taking the kids to school in the mo(h)rning. Hahaha…And fetching them. We can argue about (2) uhm,°what°, sometimes about food, you know.

**Interview 8.**

In spite of constructing herself as a rebellious African woman, T behaves obediently in her parental home, when supervised by her stepfather:

Lines 359-362:
T: I do(h)n’t mind, I had my o(h)wn game going so, hah what I used to do is if you tell me, “You’re back late at 5 0’ clock”
C: Ja
T: I would come back at 4h30 >then he won’t have anything to say<

**Interview 9.**

T’s parents decide which school she should attend, in spite of her construction of herself as a rebel:

Lines 558-561:
T: because they knew when we left the schools to go to this supposed multi-racial school.
C: Hmm
T: (coughing) Sorry. So, hh it was a case of - We weren’t outcasts ‘cause we never allowed ourselves to be (.) but it was that we were (.) tarnished.

And, in spite of her portrayal of her husband as a ‘child’, she is a subservient wife who fulfills her duties, just like her mother-in-law:

Lines 616-621:
T: If I go on tour I must take out clothes for him every day, I must pack it in the spare room, from socks to underpants to everything,
C: Hmm
T: okay. I tell you his mother had nothing better to do, she used to iron everything from socks to under (1) underpants. So I’ve inherited this (1) spoilt brat, so if people say to me, “How old are your kids?” then I say, “The eldest is forty-four…”

**ii. The “I am not independent” discourse**

**Interview 1.**

M states that she knows she can depend on her ex-boyfriend to “take care” of her, thus implying that she is as dependent on the male in the relationship as her siblings and her mother.

Line 455-457:
M: ° Yes°. I’m rational enough to, to acknowledge that, as IS HE. Uhm, but the good thing is, that we’re at a place now where we’re still (.) constantly in contact with one another and we can go on holiday and I know that he’ll take care of me.
In spite of the repeated expressions of her ‘independence’, she also expresses a desire to be a child, of needing to be taken care of:

Lines 379-382:
M: I can provide them with whatever support, financial or emotional, it is, that they need. I would never wanna place my children in the role that I was in as a child, to be a parent. ‘Cause now, I crave to be a child, hahaha
Interview 2.

B, in spite of referring to her mother and herself as being very independent contradicts herself in the excerpt below when she states that they still need her father’s blessing and money to go on holiday.

Lines 290-295:
B: But then, my father >that’s why I say I respect him< because he understands my mother’s personality and he doesn’t stifle her growth you know, instead () supports her, you know. So like, now, over the holidays, my mom, went down to the Eastern Cape with me, and my father remained at home, you know and he didn’t phone, to say that we must come back now, or this and that and that, gave uh, us his blessing, gave us pocket money, and you know…

Furthermore, although she initially states that she doesn’t see anything ‘wrong’ with paying for her own meals in a restaurant, she also expresses the desire to be treated in the traditionally feminine manner and expects the man to pay for the meals.

Lines 615-626:
B: Okay (this is not) wife material, you know. <Wife material is somebody who’s not ambitious, who’s a local teacher, who: has no dreams, who depends on them for, you know. I don’t see what’s wrong eh, going to a restaurant and paying for your own meal, you know, eh >
C: He couldn’t take it.
B: <And they couldn’t take things like those, you know>. But, I also find it to be abusive, you know. Sometimes when I paid, he’d (allow me to pay) you know. So, when it suited him, you know.
C: Interesting
B: Ja, when it suited him, <he would forget that) that I’m female,
C: Yes
B: you know. Men are very selfish ( ).

Interview 3.

In spite of her insistence on being an independent businesswoman, P still has traditionally feminine expectations of the male role in a woman’s life as is portrayed by her extremely close relationship with her authoritarian father:

Lines 229-239:
P: You’ve heard of that. Ja, it’s called () ughodusa. So: uhm, A: my father could NOT bear >that I was getting married< He could not, he (2) he, he, it just took him forever just to accept it.
C: Why is that?
P: I was leaving him.
C: Yes, you’re so close.
P: Yes, I was leaving him and (.) hh who is this man that’s now going to take care of me and (.) if he can take care of me, I mean (2) i. It’s impossible that somebody else can take (.) care of me (.) better than him. Uhm, to that, I MEAN THAT UPSET ME IMMENSELY, but no:W I do understand, you know, where he was coming from. So: that tradition,

And:

Lines 330-331:
P: …we’re still very close, I’m still Daddy’s girl,

As the above excerpts illustrate, P sees her father as her protector and she positions herself as the ‘little girl’, quite the contrary to the astute businesswoman. She also expects certain traditionally male behaviour from a man in a relationship:

Lines 992-997:
P: to provide and protect…Ja, he must provide for the security of the house, >and not necessarily finance<…Provi:de in terms of security for a house .hh and protect her and love her and cherish her and honour her (1).

In the private sphere, P has a need to be protected by both her father and her husband, thus positioning herself as a vulnerable woman.

Interview 4.

In spite of her protestations of independence, F as an advocate, is dependent on referrals from attorneys (especially white males) for work:

Lines 758-770:
F: Uhm (.) I think women as laywers still struggle. Especially as advocates. Uhm, we’re in a very, very white, male-oriented (1) uh, profession…Well, not broadly the law profession but advocacy itself… the advocate profession itself. …hh Because it’s so specialized …(3) uhm, and we’re completely dependent on attorneys for work, so: the work doesn’t come directly from ( )… ja, your work comes in from an attorney, so you really need the attorneys to. gain confidence in you and you, you need to actually build up (. ) profile before, you know they know who you are and that you are good at what you do and (whatever).

And, in spite of her legal expertise, she found that when she worked for a public interest firm, she was dependent on others for work:

Lines 1090-1093:
F: but they, but they gave me a special dispensation because I, it was, °I was part of a public interest firm and I, you know, wasn’t part of the (.) coM,commercial world where that was competitive. I mean, here you were purely dependent on (. ) funders and funding for, for your litigation<.


**Interview 5.**

Although L states that she is independent because of her legal knowledge and intellectual prowess, it is evident that she feels dependent on her older, equally intellectual boyfriend:

Lines 305-306:
L: Ih I don’t really feel. *In fact, if anything >I might be an intellectual liability to him< because I think it’s more, *hahaha

And:

Lines 321-323:
L: I guess men (.) would like to know that we depend on them, >which was difficult for me to depend on the other one, ’cause he had nothing to offer<

L is thus positioned by others and positions herself, as the traditionally feminine object in the sphere of her personal relationships.

In the work sphere, which is the traditionally male domain of the legal world, L indicates her acute sense of dependency. She constantly states that she is still a mere ‘infant’ in the legal field when she compares herself to the senior, white male advocates:

Lines 211-213:
L: …I, on the other hand was, at all times (.) I mean I had to (.) grow intellectually. I mean, if you’re servicing CEO’s of some companies and you’re this black ti(h)ny gi(h)rl.

And:

Line 603:
L: I still consider myself a baby…

Also:

Lines 612-613:
L: That’s just how I think. I consider myself (.) still a juvenile in the profession.

As well as:
Line 618:
L: But I consider myself an infant still. Perhaps it’s because (.) I measure myself against…

**Interview 6.**

Although Y stresses her independence because of her expert status, it is also evident that she is not always independent. At the university she has to take a back seat when the white, male professor promotes other, white students instead of her:
Y: He had like selective CV building, he would like add stuff, J**’s stuff, PROMOTE them like you can’t believe.

She is also dependent on the Jewish patients’ acceptance of her ‘difference’ in order to make a living in the northern suburbs.

Y: for that matter. In fact, even at, pre-1994 (2), I mean, really, you as another colour, walked into one of the practices here, you’d really be frowned upon. Okay. Uhm, in terms of your youth, in terms of your gender, in terms of your race

And, when she applied for a bank loan, she is stonewalled because her husband is unemployed. In spite of her expert status, she is still treated like a traditional woman.

Y: Uhm and he had left. (1) He was very accommodating (in the sense when I said, “Look I can’t (come up with (.) ) I can first work there and see”, at the time the banks wouldn’t even accommodate me because my husband wasn’t working; I was the only one working.

Interview 7.

M, by her own admission, acknowledges that she is not financially independent:

M: Uhmm (2). It’s funny, I make the decisions, but the mo(h)ney doesn’t co(h)me . co(h)me from me. Hahaha.
C: Hahaha. So, you have the say.
M: I HAVE THE SAY. I SAY I WANT THIS AND THIS HAPPENS. I WANT THIS AND THIS HAPPENS YOU KNOW.
C: Ja.
M: But, although I’m not contributing to tha-h-a-t, but I make the decisions.

In spite of M’s professional status, it is the husband who is the main provider for the household. Likewise, she is also dependent on the acceptance of her white patients to earn a living. This acceptance means that M does not want to be discriminated or negated because of her African surname. She desires to be accepted because of both her professional status and on the grounds of a shared humanity:

M: <°I don’t think it’s possible. It can be done but I don’t think it’s, it’s taken very seriously°. °Uhm, (1)you know, to me, a human being is a human being, regardless of colour or what. So, if, if we can achieve that thing, it will be great. If we can look at a person as a human being.
C: Ja.
M: >If we can start looking at each other as human beings and forgetting about my hh surname and everything. This will be a great, great, great, uhuh, country that we live in. <

**Interview 8.**

T, who prizes her independence, admits that she was dependent on her stepfather:

Lines 512-516: 
T: He did give me my space cause you know from time to time I would go to him and say, “Uhhh, I, I really need to go the movies may I please have, like
C: Hmm
T: 20 bucks?”, sure, no problem, he would give me. He, he was strict in his *own way*.

And:

Line 428: 
T: and you know (1) he did **everything**.

T also admits that she is currently dependent on her Caribbean-born lover, both emotionally and financially:

Lines 1092-1094: 
T: JA, >HE DOESN’T HOLD YOU BACK HE SAYS: “OH, YOU WANNA TAKE A TRIP? NO NO PROBLEM. WITH YOUR GIRLFRIENDS, SURE HOW MUCH DO THEY NEED, DO I NEED TO SIGN ANYTHING”,

Being in a relationship with him gives her a greater sense of confidence:

Lines 1133-1134: 
T: but right now I feel much more confident. I think, I, I KNOW I can take people on

Her partner also helps her to look after her children and assumes the traditionally male role of being the caretaker:

Lines 1112-1116: 
T: I mean if, when I’m away, *<I know I can count on him >,*
C: Ja
T: he cares for them; he takes them out (he does).
C: He’s very supportive.
T: He’s VERY SUPPORTIVE. HE’S THE DAD.
Interview 9.

Even though she is vice-principal at a private school, T indicates that her husband is the caretaker of the family.

Lines 603-606:
T: and I, <and I took this brat, I still got the brat>. Look he, he he pro-, my husband, I mean he provides for us,
C: Mmm
T: he does everything.

She also initially used to give him her salary cheque:

Lines 653-655:
T: And um it worked, it it was a big (.) blow to him because he used to brag to everybody (.) .hh <that his wife gives him (.) her salary. > And you know today it’s not a case of , >I mean I used to just hand it over just like that < here’s my cheque and we had a joint account, but I

T realizes that she allowed herself to be dependent and is chastised by her brother for this:

Lines 663-668:
T: hh Man, one day, I won’t lie to you, I forgot (1). Well because also I’m, I’m depe-, it’s its also reverse. I also depend on him with transport and things .hh and I forgot to take transport money,
C: Okay
T: and I couldn’t get home and I phoned my brother and he said, “No I’m far from you”, he said,“<It’s GOOD, it will teach you >, you don’t have”, I didn’t have a bank card, I had nothing. He said, “I told you (1) to become independent”. ..hh To ME it was not a problem it was, it was

iii. The “I am not outspoken” discourse

Interview 1.

Although M asserts that she likes to argue and be heard, she also admits that she prefers to observe, rather than be an active participant:

Lines 68-70:
M: I always have uh; whether it be life experiences or just the way I view the world. I’m the sort of person, you can leave me in the corner with my cigarettes and some wine and I’m more than comfortable watching everybody else.

Instead of being the subject who silences others, M is silenced by her more powerful Other, the father at his home:
Lines 401-402:
M: Until today I do it, and the last time I did it, was two mo(h)nths ago where I got told, “Don’t tell me what to do in my home”.

She is physically assaulted and silenced by a white, male colleague, at a conference:

Lines 577-578:
C: Can I ask you, why were you beaten up, do you know?
M: hh ‘Cause I dared challenged a man.

And she cries, just like her abused mother:

Line 619:
M: I sobbed my heart out because I was devastated.

M is thus positioned as a passive object, who is acted upon by the more powerful and dominant males in both the personal and the public spheres.

**Interview 2.**

B repeatedly states that her family is different from traditional black families in the sense that her parents are very open-minded and liberal and talk about everything. Yet, the excerpt below reveals that silence is present in her parental home, especially concerning her relationships with men:

Lines 729-737:
B: sort of like keep your relationships a secret. So, he, he knows I’ve got relationships but I must respect him<.
C: Yes, yes.
B: Ja. But I must respect him enough that I don’t bring those guys home, you know. Only the guy that I’m going to marry, I must bring home for him to meet.
C: But, he knows about it.
B: But he knows exactly that I’ve (got relationships).
C: But, but it’s quiet.
B: °It’s quiet, you know. It’s just understood°.

And when she was in a relationship with a traditional man (like her father), she did not have the courage to break off the relationship in person:

Lines 803-811:
B:° No, I didn’t. I just phoned him° ‘Cause he has a very (demanding) personality. I was very scared to tell him in his face, you know.
C: Hmmm
B: So what I did, he was also very much uh was seven years older than me, you know. So: one day I just phoned him, hahaha,
C: Hahaha
B: and then he said he would like to see me and then I said, “No, I’m not available”, hahaha. Then, one day, I saw him, (when I) like a year later, you know and then I couldn’t be bothered, you know. Ja.

**Interview 3.**

Although P often states that she speaks out on behalf of her (m)Other, it is also evident that she is not outspoken when faced with African traditions. Although she does not actually perform the ‘ughoduswa’, she does agree to stay at her in-laws’ home for the required period:

Lines 603-615:
P: You go there and you prepare food for them. hh and they test how you do it, test your food, see how you can handwash and (.) the nappies or give birth and there is a specific job that a woman does, so: when they pay lobola;
C: Yes
P: it’s not a freebie. A woman ( )
P/C: (value for money)
C: Tell me did your parents pay lobola,
P: B’s parents?
C: Yes.
P: Yes.
C: for, for you, that’s right and how do you feel about being paid for, so to speak?
P: You know what? .hh I agree with it, I agree with it. I believe that uhm, not in the sense that I’m, I’m, I’m being bought;

She also bows to her husband’s desire to have a less close relationship with her father:

Lines 294-295:
P: where there is a point where, my husband felt that I actually need to divorce my father at some stage

P, although initially hesitant, ultimately considers her (m)Other and other wise, older women’s advice on relationships:

Lines 653-661:
P: I mean, if HE says, I’m gonna say back. But no it’s that old sense of mindful. Be mindful. Be mindful -  
C: So, it’s not, in other words, not speaking?
P: tolerate. It, it, it doesn’t mean not tolerate. 
C: What does it mean? 
P: It means (. ) be mindful, 
C: Right
P: and to be mindful, you have to be quiet. And when you are mindful, you are able to be clear in your decisions.
Interview 4.

F is powerless and effectively silenced in her professional capacity as an advocate and as a woman when faced by society’s demands for male advocates:

Lines 1248-1264:
F: you know and because they’re white men… or because they’re black men. Now, you find now there’s black men are doing very very well, because attorneys (.) through government pressure …or other agencies, have to (. ) bring in (. ) black males… uhmso (. ) if if an attorney has to make a choice between (. ) somebody that’s a constitutional expert… that’s a woman (.) and (.) bringing a black male that has no constitu, you now so you need to BECAUSE YOU HAVE TO BRING A BLACK MALE, you bring in a black male who’s got some experience of constitutional law … with a lot of experience you know and, and, and I find that the attorneys are also not seeing Indian women as being black women. Indian and coloured women are not being seen as being (2) black

When F does speak out against the poor pay at the ‘association’, a more powerful, and female, director silences her:

Lines 1197-1198:
F: and it came to EXCO and (2) one of the women directors then said, “Absolutely not, why should we pay her a higher, a higher salary?” you know

Interview 5.

L is dependent on the attorneys to put her name forward as senior counsel, yet she is uncertain, or hesitant to reveal the true reason for her being chosen, silencing herself as a capable, rational subject:

Lines 504-505:
L: I don’t know. People s. think, well, let’s give her, let’s give her a try or something like that, I wouldn’t knowº

When questioned about whether she feels that she is successful, L is reticent:

Lines 597-598:
L: haha, a:h .hhh hahaha because I DON’T KNO(h)W. I DON’T KN(h)OW, I REALLY, HOW A(h)M I SUPPO(h)SED TO KNO(h)W?

When L is encouraged to apply for a position as a judge, she refuses, thus further silencing herself and her knowledge:

Lines 517-518:
L: So, yes, <I kno:w that we need female, black female judges and all that >. But I don’t wanna commit suicide and go to the bench, hahaha.
L is not yet able to commit to the position of being a judge:

Lines 538-543:
L: Of course. I think I will, I’d want to give back to the community and sit as a judge, yes of course.
C: Hmm
L: hh But only when I’m sufficiently learned.
C: Right
L: For now I just want to perfect the art.

**Interview 6.**

Y is devastated when she is chased off the campus by the professor, and her white colleagues decide to speak up on her behalf:

Lines 556-557:
C: So they spoke up for you?
Y: Yes, that was J (. ) S in particular.

Instead of speaking back to the professor, she is initially only able to respond with tears:

Lines 532-537:
Y: Never mind that they all do it< <He (. ) went off (. ) at a tangent and in front of R and them, screamed and shouted at me and said, “I want you (. ) out of my department (. ) now. GO! GET! ” he says to me>
C: Like a dog.
Y: I said, “That’s okay”. I cried like you can’t believe. R just said to me, “Sorry, Y.” All of them sorry.

**Interview 7.**

M is shocked and silenced by the questions of the patients in her ‘white’ dental practice:

Lines 160-162:
M: >I didn’t expect it all. I mean, it was a shock, it’s still a shock to me that sometimes I have to show people .hh uh, where I dispose my needles, I mean, I’m a professional. <I could lose my profession, I could (. )

She feels that the continued questioning of a basic procedure such as sterilization is a questioning of her professional status, and by implication an assertion that she is not as professional as for example, a ‘white’ dentist.

**Interview 8.**

T, albeit very outspoken in her marriage is not outspoken in the presence of her stepfather:
Lines 505-510:
T: Ja, what’s gonna happen, the fights, everything. I don’t want to be part of, okay. And fu(h)nny enough "my mom was there, very helpful, we cooked together, we did everything, my friends came over it was a nice party. People left 2 in the morning.
C: Hmm
T: It was great, no fights no nothing. I enjoyed my 21st birthdayº

She is silenced by her traditional uncles:

Lines 932-936:
T: Um like you know, if you say, mmm. Uhhmm you can never say, “I’m having my menstrual, my menstrual cycle”. They are like, “YOU ARE KIDDING! C: Yes, very conservative
T: DON’T EXPECT ME TO TALK TO YOU ABOUT THAT, WHY DON’T YOU TALK TO YOUR MOTHER!” You know, hah. They freak, they freak out so.

**Interview 9.**

In spite of being politically aware when she was a student, T acknowledges that her father’s conservative views were correct:

Lines 563-566:
T: You’d run your way from the situation and we definitely went with the ’76 riot. So it was a bit (.). hh HEAVY AND I THINK THAT impacted on me, and I just thought,
C: Ja
T: enough. But it was, it was FUN. I, I won’t, .hh I won’t encourage anyone

And, she is silent when her husband punishes the boys:

Lines 784-792:
T: because (. ) when he disciplines the one I feel he’s too harsh and .hh it, it’s it’s and you know what that is why I also just keep quiet.
C: Hmm
T: You know, if they do something like T**wrote on the wall .hh I paid my niece
C: Yes?
T: to scrub the walls,
C: Hah to hide it!
T: (dots and) to hide it and their father came and he looks and he says, “There’s some green on my wall, can somebody explain it to me?” and I looked at him and I said, “WHERE’S the green?”

Evident in all the excerpts above, is the ‘empowered’ woman’s silencing by those who are in more powerful positions than themselves, and then the latter is most often the male superior. This silencing occurs at work and at home in spite of the subjects’ high level of education and expertise. Furthermore, the silencing positions the ‘empowered’ subjects in the object position.
iv. The “I am not knowledgeable/educated” discourse

Interview 1.

Although she is a university graduate, M experiences feelings of inadequacy and of being not knowledgeable or educated enough. These feelings occur especially when she is confronted in the public sphere by older males, who are assumed to be the ‘arbiters of knowledge’.

Lines 279-282:
M: Not insecure. The only time I feel insecurity is if I, if I think I’m out of my depth. And what I always do, is make sure I do my research before I go into a meeting. I will, if I don’t understand something, I will ask someone to, to rephrase it and, if I don’t know the answer, I will tell someone I’ll get back to them.

Interview 2.

B reiterates that she is not a ‘puppet’ like many of her black peers in the workplace. Yet, she displays a lack of confidence in her own sense of knowledge and professional status, especially in the presence of her boss, a senior white male.

Lines 932-937:
B: I mean, I pushed myself to do that, when I first joined it was very difficult for me to go to my boss, and, ‘cause he’s also old, you know, he’s like my father-figure to me.
C: Oh, I see
B: you know, he’s 50 years old
C: Ja
B: and he, go, uh, an Afrikaans background ( )

Furthermore, B states that if she were perceived as ‘black’ in the work sphere she would feel less progressive and empowered:

Lines 991-996:
B: Whereas, maybe if I’d started working in an environment where, I, I knew that I was black and felt that I was black, maybe I wouldn’t be where I am today, you know °.
C: When you say uhm, you knew you were black and you felt that you were black, what specifically, do you mean?
B: Specifically, like OPPRESSED…

To B, being perceived as ‘black’ is associated with being inferior and oppressed.

Interview 3.

In spite of owning her own business and making important financial decisions on her own, P is subdued in the presence of her father-in-law. He is a traditional patriarch, who believes that her business is merely an extension of her private home and as such is
automatically owned by her husband. The excerpt below illustrates that P does not rebel against this powerful male figure or the traditions that he symbolizes:

Lines 924-934:
P: So, he sat in front of (1) my ( . ) desk and they served him tea. I think he had about three or four cups >You can imagine how many hours that was<.
C: I can imagine
P: No: completely comfortable, yes.
C: Ja
P: Very comfortable and fi:ne. No qualms.
C: Ja
P: So: I don’t think the next generation will suffer that, hahah.
C: Yes,
P: Ja. So: ( .) in in that aspect it’s gonna take a while to entrench that in the minds of the women ( .) >as well as in the minds of the men<.

Instead, P feels that this behaviour is something, which the next, possibly more emancipated, generation will be capable of addressing.

Interview 4.

F, in spite of her broad and expert legal knowledge is overlooked in favour of male advocates, just like other female advocates, whom she has described as ‘less empowered’.

Lines 1396-1397:
F: So: it’s very unfortunate. hh you, and and you’ll also find that their practices are also not as busy as the male senior counsel.

And, they are discriminated against on account of their gender:

Lines 1289-1292:
F: So I think at the end of the day, women whether you are black, white or green ( .) will always…are always, are still ( .) uhm, disadvantaged at the Bar.

She feels that this discrimination may be because of the female advocates’ lack of knowledge and experience:

Lines 1340-1341:
F: and I also find that the women that are senior counsels don’t have the same (6) knowledge or experience that the male ( .) senior counsels

And:
Lines 1383-1386:
F: .hh > they’re still not (.) as knowledgeable as men because they’ve never had the same … experience

**Interview 5.**

L firmly believes that she is still an ‘infant’ in the legal field and as such she is not yet sufficiently knowledgeable. She does not feel confident enough to be a judge. She explicitly states this lack of knowledge in the excerpt below:

Lines 513-515:
L: .hh I don’t wanna rush things. I think (.) I still wanna learn.
C: Hmm
L: I don’t (.) consider myself sufficiently learned.

Her lack of knowledge is seen as the legacy of apartheid:

Lines 582-583:
L: I would like to be somewhere else where we haven’t been (.) as a people (.) because of history.

This ‘historical’ disadvantage is especially pertinent when she compares herself to the senior white, male advocates:

Lines 570 - 571:
L: And they are so: mature in their understanding, in their knowledge of the law and those are the sort of people that inspire me. Because I wanna be like them

**Interview 6.**

Although Y sees herself as a student equal to others, she soon realizes that she is overlooked, and not viewed as knowledgeable enough, because of her race:

Lines 520 – 524:
Y: there was a major disagreement. He had (.) like selective CV building, he would like add stuff, J***’s stuff, PROMOTE them like you can’t believe. Uhm, books to review C: Ja
Y: because you know for your CV you have to review books, you have to do certain things.

And, although she is extremely skilled, Y realizes that she lacks certain critical skills required for private practice:

Lines 821-822:
Y: <in terms of, of, dealing with people, you know, strategy, operation all of those things. ((sound of phone ringing in the background)). We’re not skilled in it, at all>
She also lacks the confidence in her own skills when faced by the prospect of taking over a predominantly white practice:

Lines 690-693:
Y: Ja, uhm.> Anyway, the negotiations went on with L****, we started chatting. “I said, “L, I’m very scared, I don’t know whether your patients are gonna take to me”, predominantly Jewish. “<Ag, genade, the house>(   ) where am I gonna get the money and all of these things

**Interview 7.**

M is not outspoken against questioning by the white patients and is perceived as not being educated or knowledgeable enough:

Lines 160-162:
M: >I didn’t expect it all. I mean, it was a shock, it’s still a shock to me that sometimes I have to show people .hh uh, where I dispose my needles, I mean, I’m a professional.< I could lose my profession, I could (.)

Furthermore, M also states that even though she attended a ‘private school’, unlike less fortunate black children, she still needed to attend a bridging year:

Lines 13-20:
M: a bridging university (.). people who are from underprivileged schools. (1) U:hm, after Khanya College I went to Wits university…Because (1) it has been perceived. >Not perceived, it was like that < if I’m from a, a black school… to a white university, >there’s a vast difference, there, there’s a transition, you, you cannot cope<

And, M, in spite of her professional status, feels that her children might have better opportunities to achieve in the future, thus implying that she feels she herself has not achieved sufficiently:

Lines 438-439:
M: I, I, I pray every day that .hh they must achieve even more than I achieved. If they can achieve even more than I achieved. I, I’ll be very much glad.

**Interview 8.**

T does not always feel knowledgeable, and admits that it is the strong presence of her Caribbean lover who instills confidence:

Line 1129:
T: <I feel, I feel> > much more confident about myself now

Her lack of confidence is especially visible in the presence of her successful father:
Interview 9.

Although T is a vice-principal, she remains responsible for the rearing of the children.

Lines 992-995:
T: No, I’m being dead serious, he’s the ON- I’m not lying <he’s the only one who doesn’t lift a dish, who doesn’t wash dishes, .hh he won’t bath the children>.
C: Ja
T: <If I calculate the times that he (.) changed the children’s nappies>

This traditional role as well as her much lower remuneration as an educator implies that T is not educated or knowledgeable enough:

Lines 456-457:
T: The other three earn MORE than us and didn’t STUDY FURTHER

The ‘empowered’ subjects are shown to be not-different from their traditional (m)Others at all, especially when confronted by the powerful (most often more senior) male who positions them as an ‘object’. This is applicable to both the subjects’ private and public spheres.

6.1.3.2 The “I am not-Similar to the Law of the Father” discourse

When the positively valued and powerful discourse: “I am similar to the Law of the Father” discourse is deconstructed, the negative, repressed “I am not similar to the Law of the Father” becomes evident. This deconstruction carries with it associations of the devalued, less powerful and traditionally feminine position.

i. The “I do not silence others” discourse

Interview 1.

M does not silence the violence that she was subjected to; rather she is silenced by the attacker and by the Psychological Association, who answers with ‘silence’, thus collaborating in the violence that she was subjected to. She also has no say in her parental household; the father does not accept any challenges to his authority.

Lines 398-401:
M: “My dad, without any doubt°. They weren’t, you SEE, they weren’t. It was never consultation in my house, it was dictation, which, there’s a very clear difference and I
would challenge and continuously get swatted down, ‘cause how dare you challenge the authority.

**Interview 2.**

In spite of being one of the few black chartered accountants in post-apartheid South Africa, the traditional father figure still dominates B’s household:

Lines 363-364:
B: See, my father doesn’t fight, he just says one word that destroys you, haha.

Even the outspoken (m)Other who is purported to make all the decisions in B’s parental home is silenced by the father:

Lines 388-399:
B: In pa(h)nic, ja. °My father told her to go and change and she then changed°. Ja, so: I THINK THEY DO FIGHT but I’ve never heard them (.) like, fight. My fa:ther will just say one word. You know when I was younger,
C: Hmm
B: I thought my father was perfect.
C: Yes
B: Because he doesn’t fight with my mo:m, but the older, I begin to, no, no, no, this is ab(h)use, you know. Haha.
C: Hahaha
B: ONE WORD AND YOU CHANGE EVERYTHING. Hahaha
C: Hahaha
B: You quickly go to the bedroom and change, you know.

Similar to the (m)Other, B feels intimidated by her father’s disciplinarian stance in his household regarding the dress and behaviour of black women.

Lines 711-724:
B: Never, never, ever, ever, whereas in our culture people get hidings all the, parents just give hidings. My father never, has never given me a hiding, you know.
C: Yes. What is the one word that he used to sort of crush you? Is there a word ( )
B: Ja. WHY ? He just asks you why and then (.) you can’t answer. Hahah (You just go h h h) ((Makes strangling noise)). Hahaha.
C: And would you argue with him sometimes?
B: Ja:ja: But we don’t argue(.) really. We just talk and I (.) present my facts. And .hh he ( ) sometimes, it’s okay not to agree with each other, what (is) is to respect each other, so: (2) you know (1) I can’t (.) give an example, but (.) I know that (there) are things I can’t do in my father’s presence, and yet (.) he knows that I do those things when, when he’s away. >Or maybe like bringing a a guy ho:me<.
Interview 3.

P is shown not to silence Others, especially those in her private life, for example the men and the older women who insist that she behaves subserviently as a sign of respect to traditions. She is silenced by her (m)Other when the latter insists that she serves her husband with a tray and she demurely accepts her father-in-law’s visits. She also accepts that her close relationship with her father will have to take a back seat to that with her husband. And, as the excerpt below illustrates, her (m)Other silences her speaking about her personal (marital) problems:

Lines 715-719:
P: VERY WESTERN, something that you would do with your buddy. °We:ll, we get married (and) the first six months, I phone my mother in a frantic. ‘Cause my mother always said to me, you know what, if you want me to love your husband,
C: Ja
P: don’t tell me your problems. I actually don’t want to know.

P, by expressing her disdain for her mother-in-law’s outspokenness, reveals that she unconsciously agrees to the silencing of women:

Line 273:
P: Because it’s the man that should voice out how he feels.

Interview 4.

F, in spite of all her transformation work at the Bar, is not able to silence what she believes to be the norm, namely the privileged position of whites and males of all races, in post-apartheid South African society:

Line 1418:
F: Because (. ) society will always see white people as being better than black people.

And:

Lines 1289-1292:
F: So, I think at the end of the day, women whether you are black white or green (. ) will always … are always, are still (. ) uhm disadvantaged at the Bar…

She also actively silences herself (similar to traditional women) and her strong feelings towards her husband’s reticence to go for medical tests, when she states:

Line 649:
F: But you cannot (get a) go on nagging:

F is thus silenced in both the work as well as the private sphere, and then especially so when she is positioned as a typical ‘woman’ by the more powerful males.
Interview 5.

Because L feels she does not have sufficient legal expertise, she is not confident enough to act as a judge, and thus she remains at the mercy of the predominantly white, male legal practitioners:

Lines 606-613:
L: >I remember I was sitting with senior counsel; I was working with, .hh in another group. There was an advert, an advert .hh I think they, they were looking for a judge to act in one of those (.) remote divisions. .hh So: his secretary said, “L, here is an ad, don’t you wanna go act in”, I think it’s Kimberly, one of those. I said “N(h)o”.
C: Hahaha
L:  I mea(h)n, I’m just a baby, do(h)n’t you, and this girl. M(h)y se(h)nior was, he was like, surprised, how, how can she, yeah but. That’s just how I think, I consider myself (.) still a juvenile in the profession.

Interview 6.

Even though Y is a specialist dentist, the traditional, white male bank manager nonetheless silences her as a woman, when she applies for an overdraft:

Lines 734-736:
Y: >Never mind, when I went to apply for my first overdraft with the bank manager, he like kind of laughed at me, you know. It wasn’t (kind of taken) seriously.

Interview 7.

It is especially in the sphere of work; at her white dental practice that M is a passive, silenced object. Her white patients effectively force her to show them her sterilization bay and by agreeing to do so, she is silenced as a professional and as a black woman:

Lines 128-134:
M: Okay, when they come, they’lI want to know. They’ll want me to show them, uh, the, my sterilising room, my autoclave. Some of them phone and ask if I use gl(h)oves, haha.
C: So, they question your integrity?
M: Exa(h)xtly. .hh Some of them will ask if I’m using glo:ves. Some of them will ask if I dispose my ne:edles. Can I show them where I dispose my needles. .hh Okay, I, I don’t have a problem with that, I mean, it’s, it’s, it’s my health also.

This is in stark contrast to her ‘town’ and predominantly black practice:

Lines 145-147:
M: I DON’T KNOW HOW THE MIND WORKS, YOU KNOW. WE, ARE ALL INDIVIDUALS, WE ARE ALL DIFFERENT, BUT I’VE NEVER HAD THOSE QUESTIONS IN TOWN ( ) -
At home, when she has had a disagreement with her husband, she is the one who swallows her pride and starts speaking first, effectively placing herself in the position of being the less dominant partner:

Lines 347-349:
C: And then, who do you think is the one that asks the, the first, whose the one who gives in the first? Like, who starts talking?
M: It’s me.

M also states that in broader society there is still a silence that surrounds the racial differences amongst people and she cannot yet see a future where this bias can be overcome. As a black woman she feels she is silenced by stereotypes and history:

Lines 470-477:
M: “No, uhm, in terms of, of the race and everything, the, the, the way we, we, we still treat each other and the way that we still look at each other. hh They also think that it’s far-fetched.
C: Ja.
M: That it cannot, it can never be, it can never, it, it, it can never be achieved. hh Uhm, people are still, you know, they are still stereotyped, they are still whatever they are. You know when they grew up whatever they were taught, when they, they grew up. It’s still instilled in their minds and everything. hh And, unfortunately it’s like that, I don’t know.

Interview 8.

When T was still a teenager, her uncles were the figures of authority in the household:

Lines 898-902:
T: No people didn’t talk to you because they were afraid, your, the uncle, my uncle(h)s would beat them up, if not (1)something would happen to them. ‘Cause you know, I had three uncles,
C: Ja
T: and having three uncles means you have MUSCLE in the ho(h)use you know

T is also overawed by her own daughter’s sense of confidence, which silences her as a mother:

Lines 881-885:
T: hah she makes me feel like I’m old. Some questions that she asks me its like mmh what do I say to her now? But I try to be as open as (1) possible, I tell her what I think she should know
C: Hmm
T: and I consult with various friends and say, “Do you think it’s OK if I tell her this, you know. Don’t you think she’d be traumatized in any way?”
Interview 9.

T, even though she was an activist at university, could not silence the powerful apartheid State’s legislation:

Lines 525-531:
T: NOW (1) “you couldn’t walk through that park if you were not white." So the joke was < my granny, my mother, my sisters would walk through that park,
C: Ja
T: nobody stops them>
C: Ja
T: .hh My father, myself and my brother would have to walk around and meet at the bottom. >But it was a BIG joke<

And in her private life, her husband has access to her finances. He silences T and reprimands her for overspending:

Lines 710 -716:
T: To him nothing is too much .hh but if you do squander (1) <he screams>. “So .hh ja he checks my, well he, he’s got access to my bank account o
C: Hmm
T: “and if he just sees something happened” he says,“WHA-, WHAT DID YOU NEED THIS MONEY FOR, WHY DID YOU NEED THAT MONEY?” and you know .hh very strict but
C: Ja
T: but also LOOK MAYBE I NEED IT you know, uhm

He also silences her when her reprimands her for not being a ‘strict enough’ mother:

Lines 821-822:
T: and then he said to me ““Do you see you how you spoil your children? Now this is the first of the embarrassments, more is going to come, if you don’t stop it””.

All nine of the subjects are effectively silenced when they are positioned as a ‘woman’ by their male counterparts and also by older, more traditional women, such as their (m)Others. Their silencing also occurs in the work sphere, where it is often the dominant male, in particular, who silences them.

ii. The “I am not a decision-maker” discourse

Interview 1.

M finds herself in a powerless position when she is exposed to the inescapable politics within the large, male-dominated organization:
M: and I wish that, or I know that I would never compromise any of them if a more senior person were involved;
C: Yes
M: “and I wish that it were reciprocated”;

In her parental home, her authoritarian father remains the decision-maker:

C: Now, can I ask you, if you view yourself as the parent, from being a very independent uhm, young woman, even an independent child, uhm, who used to make the decisions in your household?
M: “My dad, without any doubt. They weren’t, you SEE, they weren’t. It was never consultation in my house, it was dictation, which, there’s a very clear difference and I would challenge and continuously get swatted down, ‘cause how dare you challenge the authority. Until today I do it, and the last time I did it, was two mo(h)nths ago where I got told, “Don’t tell me what to do in my home”.

Interview 2.

B’s father, in spite of being less educated than either B or her (m)Other, is still very much the disciplinarian and decision-maker in their household, just like other, traditional, black fathers.

B: “I can do whatever I want here,>whereas when I’m at home in Maritzburg, I must just behave, accordingly, you know< He must feel that he’s the fa:ther,°
C: Ja
B:”° that I’m the daughter, I’m the chi:ld °.

A similar pattern is present in B’s workplace where it is clear that her senior white male boss decides on the important matters, in spite of her expertise:

B: So, when I joined here, he sat down with me and discussed my development plan and says, “B, this is where you are now, you know and, my: this organization would like to see you there, you know. You’re not; you’re not going to get there (. ) easy and to promote you every month,
C: Right.
B: to get to that position, but if you do this and this and this and, study this and this and this, you will definitely get there”, you know.° Whereas, my other colleagues, or (. ) my other friends out there in other organizations, do not have somebody (. ) that (. ) committed to their change, you know.
C: Right
B: Or to their development, you know. Whe:re people just get promoted without even understanding why: I’m being promoted you know. But (. ) for the numbers, you know,
the Employment Equity requires that at this management level, there should be (. ) maybe 40% black -

In spite of BEE legislation and the boss’ acknowledgement that the wrongs of the past had to be addressed, B was not the one making the important business decisions, she had to fulfill certain obligations first and her ‘empowerment’ would then be decided upon by the senior male in charge of the department.

**Interview 3.**

Although P makes all her business decisions independently, she is unable to make any decisions regarding her culture’s expectations and rules regarding ‘a woman’s role’ within a marriage.

Lines 238-246:
P: So: that tradition,  
C: Hmmm
P: and ughodusa, it’s like, it, it, it’s a ritual where the groom’s family, uhm (1) tests the bride out. Can she cook, can she clean. You know, the usual male chauvinistic way.  
C: Housewife
P: Housewife, you know. It it it’s very much that way.  
C: How do you feel about that?  
P: >Oh, I think it’s completely degrading<. Ja (1) but it, it’s done.

And, even though her close relationship with her father is extremely important to P, she submits to her husband’s decision to see her father less often:

Lines 294-295:  
P: Where there is a point where, my husband felt that I actually need to divorce my father at some stage,

**Interview 4.**

It is especially in the male-dominated sphere of work that F finds that she is not able to make independent decisions:

Lines 1412-1413:  
F: But (. ) you still don’t have the same opportunities that the, that the (. ) male has and we’ve gotta break through that:

And in the excerpts below she reveals that she is discriminated against because of her being an “Indian”:  
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F: and I find that the attorneys are also not seeing Indian women as being black women. Indian and coloured women are not being seen as being (2) black.

And:

F: >if they had to choose between me and an African woman, they’ll, they’ll choose an African woman…<

Although F serves on the transformation committee, she is discriminated against and silenced by other more powerful males and females who make decisions, which do not serve her interests. She is at the mercy of the ‘attorneys’ for referrals, in spite of her powerful positioning as a legal expert. F is shown to be as dependent and unable to make decisions similar to her less empowered female colleagues.

**Interview 5.**

Because L is an advocate, she is dependent on referrals from the mostly white, male attorneys who get the corporate work:

L: Yes, private sector work is not coming, because private sector is still in the hands of your male, white people who are not really buying in.

As such, in spite of her expertise and powerful position as an advocate, she is not able to freely decide which work she accepts or not.

**Interview 6.**

Although Y is accepted to study at Wits, her father and Y have to abide by the decisions of the apartheid state. Y, as a full-time student, is not allowed to live on-campus:

Y: So, uhm, when I came, “the fact that we were not allowed at that stage, to stay on campus, we were not allowed there”

She also finds herself in a powerless position when faced by the decisions of the new, post-apartheid government:

Y: but then. Gee, this government came to make lots of ridiculous decisions and rulings and stuff. You know there was, there were a lot of irregularities associated with the overtime issue and how they were paying and what they did, you know.
Interview 7.

Although M states that she is the major decision-maker in the private sphere, she feels powerless when confronted by the bureaucracy of the powerful Medical Aids in the public sphere:

Lines 108-109:
M: I've had it with the medical aids. Okay, uhm (2). That was the main reason, that, that, that. The main reason that’s making me so sad now

Because of her struggle to obtain the payments from the medical aids effectively and timeously, M feels victimized and ‘sad’. She is at their mercy and in a brief discussion after the interview; M admitted that she was planning to quit her profession due to her frustration with dealing with the medical aids.

Interview 8.

T, the woman, is at the mercy of the husband’s decisions. She feels betrayed by her husband who impregnated her under false pretenses:

Lines 749-753:
T: he was coming back for revenge because I still had that one child, I didn’t have children with anybody else.
C: Right
T: I didn’t get married and all that, he just wanted to come back, give me that second child and (.) LEAVE ME.

His sexual escapades also leave her feeling powerless and feeling like an object that was ‘played’ with:

Lines 726-741:
C: How did he play you?
T: “By having all these women, my goodness he loved (women)".
C: Womanizer
T: Ooh, he loved too much women, you know what, there is one thing that God gave to that boy,
C: Ja
T: it is a sweet tongue.
C: Ja
T: That man,
C: Lovely, hah!
T: My goodness, that man, he will talk to you, he will charm you, he is a charmer.
C: Yes
T: I mean, he managed to charm me TWICE IN MY LIFE. I left him at one point
C: Ja
T: >and I moved on with my life and he cha(h)rmed me back into his li(h)fe.
Interview 9.

T fulfils traditionally feminine household chores, as decided upon by the extended family members:

Lines 25-29:
T: it’s like you actually feel you don’t want to be anywhere and you were actually given, you you knew that if you went to so and so’s home you had to be in the kitchen.
C: Yes
T: If you were at somebody else’s place you were a guest, so there were little groups of us who knew who had to be in the kitchen at times, .hh so there were times when you had fun.

Her choice of career is also limited by the apartheid legislation:

Lines 1036-1047:
T: they, they went. In those days you either went into teaching,
C: Hmm
T: or nursing,
C: Hmm
T: or furniture work, you know. If you were supposedly of the Coloured community .hh
C: Hmm
T: cause there was nothing much (1) for you (.r) really. And then my uncle went to varsity and he completed his degree >with with medicine< and things like that. But (1) it was a long struggle, you know.
C: Hmm
T: You know, so, so. That was all. That that was the careers (.r) that we were (1) sort of exposed to you know.

All nine professional women are often unable to make important decisions; they are at the mercy of those more powerful than them, for example, the government, large institutions and the patriarchal society in which they live.

6.1.4. The ‘empowered’ professional, black woman: a subject-on-trial

The ‘empowered’ subject is constructed upon the apparently genderless ideal of rationality and independence (“I am similar to the Law of the Father” and “I am different from the (m)Other”) and is shown by deconstructive readings to be an extension of masculine power which reveals the logic of male dominance and female exclusion. When the dominant discourses are deconstructed, the repressed parts of the ‘empowered’ woman’s identity are brought to the fore. She represses her negative parts, and projects them onto her (m) Other, thus revealing a continuing fear that dependency on the (m)Other is a threat to her own independence and that any recognition of the (m)Other is a compromise to her ‘self’. The conflict between dependency and indepenendency becomes so great and she defines herself in terms of a movement away from dependency, away from the (m)Other.
Yet, the dominant ‘empowered’ subject is unable to systematically and consistently exclude that which is Other to her, the repressed and the silent (m)Other. For, the very condition of the possibility of the ‘empowered’ woman includes precisely what this construct attempts to exclude and repress. The condition of the possibility of the ‘empowered woman’ is paradoxically the condition of her impossibility as a ‘unified’ subject. The complexities and ambiguities of her position acknowledge the aporias, the irresolvable contradictory tensions in each claim, and the impossibility of assigning a singular meaning or identity. Her identity as an ‘empowered’ professional woman is inherently unstable; she is neither One nor the Other, neither the Same nor simply Different.

The ‘empowered’, professional, black woman is both “I am not different to my (m)Other” and “I am similar to the Law of the Father”. These multiple subject positionings that constitute her subjectivity reveals a ‘self’ that is shattered and fragmented by conflict and contradiction. And, it is these contradictions, which reveal the irreducible flawedness of closure of her ‘self’. It is further in the space of these contradictions where she functions, and as such the ‘empowered’, professional woman operates both across and within the competing discourses of traditional femininity and masculinity, in a dialectic oscillation between the semiotic and the Symbolic orders.
CHAPTER 7. A new ethics: the journey towards difference and inclusivity

7.1 Introduction

As is evident from the analyses in Chapters Five and Six, the ‘empowered’ professional South African woman is a paradox, constituted by the dialectic between the semiotic and symbolic modalities. She is diffused with negativity, and whilst she consciously posits her ‘self’ as unitary and autonomous, she is shown not to be an all-knowing, all-powerful, coherent ‘I’. Instead, her inner struggles reveal the emergence of the repressed semiotic in the Symbolic order, so that her subjectivity is “…a process, a movement that constantly transgresses the limits of identity” (Boulos Walker, 1998:145).

In this chapter, the focus will be on a possible ethical solution to the above paradox. Ethics, to Kristeva, need not imply a moral or normative code or a series of abstract regulative principles. The ethics that Kristeva develops differs from traditional ethics which focuses on the rational, unitary subject of liberal humanism. Instead, her ethics is a relational dialogical practice that acknowledges both the otherness of the Other and the otherness of the self to itself. Kristeva (1984:234) argues that the ethical “cannot be stated, instead it is practiced to the point of loss”. It is dialogic and heterogenous and an embrace of the Other. It is a personal ethics, which runs a lesser risk of effacing differences and of doing violence to the Other than the master narratives.

7.2 ‘Herethique’: a maternal model

“Herethics” is Kristeva’s new ethical conception based on the woman as mother as a metaphor for one who deals with the Other through love. The word ‘herethique’ is coined by joining the French word for ‘herethical’ (herethique) with the word ‘ethics’ (ethique). “Herethics is founded on the ambiguity in pregnancy and birth between subject and object positions. It is an ethics that challenges rather than presupposes an autonomous ethical agent. Herethics sets up one’s obligations to the other as obligations to the self and obligations to the species” (Oliver, 1993b: 183).

The neologism ‘herethique’ or her-ethics is exemplified by motherhood and pregnancy, which challenges the view that self and Other can be clearly demarcated. Oliver (ibid.:183) states that it is an “outlaw ethics” which is “founded on the ambiguity in pregnancy and birth between subject and object positions”. Kristeva finds in the experience of pregnancy a relation to an ‘Other’ who is never entirely other but also not entirely oneself. Unlike “the clear separation and noncoincidence between the signifier and the signified, the subject and the Other, the maternal body requires the thought of alterity in terms of infolding, as the imprint of the other within the same” (Ziarek, 1991:102).

Maternal love for the child is the model for this ethics, which is a love for herself and her own mother. Herethics “sets up one’s obligations to the self and obligations to the species…the model of ethical love is the mother’s love for the child, …a willingness to give herself up, to embrace the strangeness within herself” (Oliver, 1993b: 183).
maternal love is thus a willingness to embrace the stranger within and to give up her love for herself, treating the self as an Other.

‘Herethics’, like pregnancy, breaks down the borders between identity and difference; which problematizes the notion of identity, and calls for a practice that is sensitive to the inescapable ‘nonidentity’ of the subject. The ethics based on the maternal model challenges rather than presupposes an autonomous ethical agent, which assumes the Other to be the same as himself. Instead, the herethical sujet-en-procès will accept and love the Other in herself, that which is different. Recognizing our processual subjectivity expands our conception of the social and allows humanity to become an open system. It is ethical because “it assumes that we recognize, on the one hand, the unity of the subject who submits to a law – the law of communication, among others; yet who, on the other hand, does not entirely submit, cannot entirely submit, does not want to submit entirely” (Kristeva, cited in Oliver, 1993a: 16).

However, in order to enable such an ethics, we need to re-evaluate the ‘maternal function’, as a site of innovation and creativity rather than the silent, repressed realm. We need to reconceive of maternity, which problematizes the traditional association between mother and nature so that maternity is viewed as the foundation of culture rather than its threat. And, if our relationship with our mothers is the model for all subsequent relations, as posited by Freud, then it follows that we need to analyze our relationship with our mothers. In current society, this relationship has been figured as a relation to nature, which threatens the social. “In this view the relation with the mother is not a social relation and therefore not a model for an ethical relation. In order to conceive of an ethical relation, we need to conceive of a relation with the mother as a social relation with a speaking being” (Kristeva, 2000:156). Maternity cannot be reduced to either nature or culture, but straddles the two, “ a woman as mother would be, instead, a strange fold that changes culture into nature, the speaking into biology” (Kristeva, 1987:259).

Only with a new discourse of maternity, can we conceive of ‘herethics’. The new discourse of maternity can provide the ontological foundations for a new conception of the ethical relationship. And, these new metaphors and metonymies can assist us in forming a new image of the social mother by articulating her as desiring and not as phallic.

7.3 The stranger within: embracing alterity

Apart from the need to conceive a new discourse of maternity, there can be no real socio-political transformation without a transformation of subjects. Rational autonomy which represses the abject origin of images within the chora from which subjects emerge, cannot be the essential ground for a new ethics. The central focus of a new ethics must be on the ethical consequences of self-knowledge or lack thereof. For, it is only through self-knowledge that an objectivity can be obtained which makes it possible to exist ethically with others who are different to us. According to Kristeva, reconsidering the dynamics of the psyche may offer ways to renegotiate the logic of the social contract and by taking the processual psyche as a model we can possibly recreate the social ethics.
The logic of the psyche, which sets up the relation between the conscious and the unconscious, is analogous to that of the social that sets up the relation between the self and others. We are split subjects whose unified subjectivity is illusory and radical strangeness is a constitutive factor of our subjectivities. Our ‘identity’ is formed on the basis of exclusion, yet, what we exclude as a society is part of our very own psyche. Our unconscious is projected onto those we exclude and by so doing we protect our own stable identity, both as individuals and as societies. If we struggle with the alterity of others it is because we are fleeing our own unconscious. We can only respect incompatible, irreducible differences in larger society if we accept ourselves as ‘split’ subjects. The continual encounter with difference and negativity enables the ethical subject to be open and accepting of others. This practice involves recognizing “that the tendency to project difference and otherness outward is at the core of violence and ethical atrocities and therefore means attempting to contain the struggle with otherness in the place where it belongs: within the psyche itself” (Graybeal, 1992:133).

In the context of ‘herethics’, the foreigner becomes the figure of otherness, which inhabits intersubjective as well as intrasubjective relations. The foreigner, the one different from oneself, disturbs one’s identity in a similar manner to the abject that disturbs one’s identity; for it signifies the return of pre-subjectivity. The one that differs from myself, is the abject, a “manifestation of no origin, an other tongue, an abyss or gulf, the frail borders of our psyche, and an encounter with the other within us” (McAfee, 1993:123). The one who is different from us is our projection of the stranger-within and is symptomatic of our own unease.

The individual must learn to deal with its repressed Other and accept alterity, which is only possible if we are able to confront the stranger within. It demands acceptance of a tentative identity that is riddled with alterity. “Uncanny, foreignness is within us: we are our own foreigners, we are divided” (Kristeva, 1991:181). Kristeva (ibid.:182) holds out the hope that we can reconcile with the alterity within: “It is through unraveling transference – the major dynamics of otherness, of love/hatred for the other, of the foreign component of our psyche – that, on the basis of the other, I become reconciled with my own otherness-foreignness, that I play on it and live by it”. The abject, the stranger, is a dynamic possibility, giving us a new model of intrapersonal and interpersonal subjectivity, one which is open to the inevitability of change. If the ‘I’ can become aware of its own internal differences, and simultaneously acknowledge the differences of others, reconciling internal as well as external alterity becomes a possibility.

For Kristeva, the trace of the Other signifies as a disturbance, which calls the “I” to responsibility for the Other. It demands a genuine dialogue among equal voices that reflect different perspectives. The dialogic framework leads us to “expect multiplicity within as well as between people, no one form of which is in itself unitary, integrated or whole” (Sampson, 1993:113) rather than hegemonic dialogues. We know that the self needs the Other in order to be a self at all. Otherness and differences must not be denied, and, instead of a politics of equality-as-sameness, we need to practice a politics of equality-as-difference.
7.4 Practising a ‘herethique’

‘Herethics’ is an ongoing practice, which requires “investigating the unconscious, the body, and the process of the production of practice and knowledge itself” (Oliver, 1993b: 9). However, Kristeva does not formulate specific ways to achieve such an ethical model. Jessica Benjamin (1988) offers a model of an intersubjective ethics that elaborates and develops a Kristevan ‘herethics’ further.

Benjamin’s intersubjective ethics specifically focuses on recognizing the mother as a social and desiring subject. Her intersubjective approach “postulates that the other must be recognized as another subject in order for the self to fully experience his or her subjectivity in the other’s presence” (Benjamin, 1995:30). The concept of “recognition” is developed by a superimposition of Winnicott’s idea of destroying the object on Mahler’s description of ‘rapprochement’ (cf Benjamin, 1995: 36-46). She argues for the development of a symbolic space within the infant-mother dyad, which fosters a creative relationship of mutual understanding rather than destruction, therefore a balance of destruction with recognition. “Recognition is the essential response, the constant companion of assertion…it includes not only the other’s confirming response, but also how we find ourselves in that response. We recognize ourselves in the other…” (Benjamin, 1988: 21).

Benjamin regards the relationship between the infant and the mother, between the self and the Other, with its existing tension between sameness and difference, as a continuous exchange of influence. And, “sameness and difference exist simultaneously in mutual recognition” (ibid.: 47). The mother can only recognize the child if she is herself recognized as an independent identity, as having her own independent subjectivity since the need for recognition entails a fundamental paradox. “(A)t the very moment of realizing our own independent will, we are dependent upon another to recognize it. At the very moment we come to understand the meaning of I, myself, we are forced to see the limitations of that self” (Benjamin, 1995: 36-37). The mother must be recognized as a separate and equivalent center of subjectivity since a denial of her subjectivity impedes our ability to see the world as inhabited by equal subjects.

And, like Kristeva, Benjamin asserts that the loss of ‘recognition’ between male and female as equal subjects and the ascendancy of male rationality result ultimately in the loss and distortion of recognition in society at large. The psychic repudiation of femininity, (the establishment of identity by splitting off the feminine capabilities), includes a denial of dependency and of mutual recognition (of the mother as a desiring, social subject in her own right). This reduces the mother to object, and refuses to recognize the subjectivity of the feminine Other. This denial of feminine subjectivity carries with it the seeds of domination since “freedom means fleeing or subjugating the other; autonomy means an escape from dependency” (Benjamin, 1988:221).

A Hegelian struggle to death does not allow for the recognition of someone outside the ‘self’, since it is conceived in terms of two ‘selves’ who both wish to be absolute. This struggle displays the logic of domination, which is set in motion by a refusal to recognize
the original (m)Other, who is reduced to an object. “The resulting structure of subject and object (gender polarity) thoroughly permeates our social relations…and it is this gendered logic which ultimately forecloses on the intersubjective realm – that space in which the mutual recognition of subjects can compete with the reversible relationship of domination” (ibid.:220). In contrast, the (m)Other who is recognized as an independent subject with her own desires is a social subject. She is no longer associated with nature, or viewed as an instrument or object, as the Phallic mother.

To recognize the Other ‘within’ expands our concept of the social and allows humanity to become an open system. It entails an embrace of that which had been lost and forgotten through the logic of a traditional identity. The alterity ‘within’ seeks to open the barriers of identity that shut difference out by acknowledging the proximity and dependency of the self on the (m)Other.

7.5 An ethics of alterity: ‘ubuntu’ as a South African alternative

In a South African context, it is important that we acknowledge that the structures that uphold seemingly autonomous constructs, such as ‘empowerment’ is upheld through a denial of the (m)Other. Above all, it is crucial that those who oppose dominant structures do not fall victim to similar untruthful structures and systems of thought employed by those who have previously dominated them. Here, and in society at large, there is an urgent need to formulate an ethics of interpersonal relations that acknowledges our violence towards the Other. It is an ethics, which takes place between individuals, who, by virtue of their difference, are not the self-possessed, autonomous agents of Kantian ethics. Recognizing the Other within (the multiplicity of positionings and selves) as well as those who differ from ourselves, can be interpreted in the South African concept via the African concept of ‘ubuntu’.

‘Ubuntu’ (‘ubuntu ungamntu ngabanye abantu’) is a Xhosa proverb translated as “that one’s identity is ideally expressed through relationship with others; and in turn, the community manifests through proper recognition of personality and individuality” (Battle, 1995:113). It implies the harmony of individual and community, through the interaction amongst persons. It further proposes that a person is able to recognize that their humanity is bound up in the Other’s humanity and within this African view of humanity, the person is ultimately defined as a person by their community. ‘Ubuntu’ makes sense of how individuals can act in ways other than on the basis of a unitary identity and thus counters an obsession and valorization of individualism and self-achievement. Instead ‘ubuntu’ sees community as vital for the acquisition of personhood, contra the Western approach, which sees the individual as the one who alone defines self-existence.

Furthermore, ‘ubuntu’ implies more than a non-racial, non-sexist and non-exploitative society, since it is the touchstone by which the quality of society has to be continually measured. This conciliatory approach of supplementary humanities is in contrast to a reversal of roles and positions or a denigration of the ‘marked’, the Other. Domination ultimately deprives the subjugator and the subjugated of recognition and the “ascendancy
of male rationality results …in the loss and distortion of recognition in society as a whole. It not only eliminates the maternal aspects of recognition …(i)t also restricts the exercise of assertion, making social authorship and agency a matter of performance, control, and impersonality – and thus vitiates subjectivity itself” (Benjamin, 1988:218).

‘Ubuntu’ is therefore a useful vehicle in the South African context for practicing an ethics in the Kristevan mould that proposes a relationship between two that is neither identical nor autonomous. It is a model for a local ethics that allows for a simultaneous process of transforming and being transformed by the Other.

**7.6 Transcending the Oedipal**

The new ethics as illustrated in this chapter, is predicated on a reaching out to, rather than overcoming, of the Other and is a sacrifice of a singular, unitary identity. It offers a viable alternative to the individualism of patriarchy, which seeks to establish the primacy of the knowing subject at the expense of the Other. It is a form of inclusive thinking and an admission of the proximity of the Other, moving beyond the discourse of opposites toward something more plural and diverse than the simple axis of Sameness and Difference. It is not a Lacanian-Hegelian struggle for recognition, but an embrace of that which had been lost and forgotten, recognizing the blind spots of cultures and histories, and that which have been passed over or erased in the construction of a hegemonic identity.

Furthermore, an ‘ubuntu’ politics or ‘politics of recognition’ – the gaining of awareness of the excluded, repressed and disempowered (thus the semiotic, the feminine) is always complemented by a dialogue, by the voices of the silenced and feminine Other which are irreducible to the hegemonics of the dominant and dominating culture. Such a dialogic approach emphasizes the multiple and diverse possibilities for transformation through encounters with an Other.
CHAPTER 8: Beyond equality and difference: a conclusion

8.1 The black, professional South African woman and the ‘male logic’ of empowerment

The principles of the equality of all human beings and universal human rights which are embodied in the notion of a representative democracy, and which formally recognizes equality in the principle of one person, one vote, has since 1994 become a reality for South Africans. Furthermore, South Africa’s constitutional rights embody a firm commitment to the achievement of equality. Apart from being a constitutional value, equality or empowerment, is also listed as a right in the Bill of Rights. This emphasis on equality is evidence of a shift in the law’s approach to women, specifically with regard to their legal status.

At a formal level many organizational and socio-political structures seem to promote gender equality, yet, as illustrated by the analyses in Chapters Five and Six, women’s real experiences of oppression are rendered invisible by the pervasive ‘logic of the Same’. As the Kristevan theory of subjectivity illustrates, rationalization and autonomy pervade our economic and social relations. And, Western rationality and individualism, as defined by the Oedipal model, are implicated by the structures of gender domination. The ideal of the self-sufficient individual, which dominates our discourse, and an analysis of the Oedipal model points to the fact that the traditional form of individuality is neither universal nor neutral but masculine. Therefore, the construction of the ‘empowered’ woman is gendered since, in the current Logos, the mind and reason are coded as masculine and the body and emotions are coded as feminine. It thus follows that when the ‘empowered’ professional black woman identifies her ‘self’ with the rational mind, she masculinizes her ‘self’, which mimics and approximates the masculine ideal.

The tendency therefore, to promote feminine autonomy as an ideal as exemplified by the phenomenon of the ‘empowered’ woman, is counterproductive since it echoes hegemonic constructs where “being an autonomous subject is a masculine cultural prerogative from which women have already been excluded” (Baxter, 2003: 35). The ‘empowerment’ of women which is constructed upon the apparently ‘genderless ideal’ of rationality and independence is a mere extension of masculine power for it is based on the logic of male dominance and female exclusion. And, “it is precisely this objective character, with its indirection to personal need, that is recognized as the hallmark of masculine power. It is precisely the pervasive depersonalization …that reveal[s] the logic of male dominance, of female denigration and exclusion. Invisible, the structure of gender domination is nevertheless materialized in the rationality that pervades our economic and social relations” (Benjamin, 1988:187).

Regardless of women’s increasing participation in the work sphere, the world in practice and principle, remains one, which is dominated by patriarchy. Within the Oedipal model, difference is constructed as polarity, which maintains the overvaluation of one side, and the denigration of the other. Identity is formed by repudiation rather than recognition of the repressed semiotic Other. Identification (I am similar to the Law of the Father) only
confirms likeness. This individuality is one-sided since it is based on the masculine ideal, which militates against a recognition of difference.

And, as a psychological principle, autonomous individuality derives from the male position in differentiation: from the repudiation of the feminine realm and identification with the mother. Equality based on Sameness to the realm of the Symbolic is based on a denigration of the feminine. The site of femininity is thus at stake in the feminine subject’s construction of her ‘self’ as ‘unitary’. As a woman she is simultaneously the instigator and the victim of the sacrificial crime, for she both silences and is silenced by the repression of the (m)Other. And, by silencing and repressing the (m)Other, she silences and represses herself. This silencing is more than a simple logic of exclusion, for with the “structure of denial we are dealing with voices that speak from an excluded place internal to that logic” (Boulous Walker, 1998:49). The deconstruction of the construct, the ‘empowered’ professional black woman uncovers the masculine identity of the seemingly neutral universal individual of modern thought and society. It reveals that neutrality is the sign of the masculine realm of the Symbolic order and it also exposes the power-suffused, struggle-produced quality of all truth, such as equality based on sameness.

8.2 The paradox of feminine ‘empowerment’

The paradox of ‘empowerment’ lies in the fact that the professional women who have been involved in a struggle against oppressive structures such as patriarchy (which is an identity based on exclusion), constitute their own ‘empowerment’ through the same processes of exclusion and so reinscribe existing power relations, which produce silencing, exclusion and other forms of disempowerment. The ‘empowerment’ discourse is thus implicated in the interstices of patriarchal functioning; and the ‘empowered’ women in post-apartheid South Africa, is caught in a ‘male logic’. Her attempt at rightful political equality manifests in a denial of sexual difference, which is a support of the phallic discourse of wholeness.

The creation of difference (or Sameness to the Symbolic realm) distorts rather than encourages the recognition of the Other since difference is “governed by the code of domination” (Benjamin, 1988:135). Paradoxically, the ‘empowered’ woman’s identification with the Law of the Father undermines the concept of difference, since it legitimizes the authority of the father and the denigration of the (m)Other and her subjectivity. As is illustrated by the Kriste van theory of subjectivity, any ‘unitary’ subjectivity is a denial of the (m)Other, since the subject’s ascendancy in the Symbolic entails that she dis-identifies with the maternal capacities, repudiates the maternal and by implication, her own feminine ‘self’. By this positioning, she negates her typically feminine qualities, which are characterized in the current economy of the Same, by corporeality and silences.

The idealization of masculine values and the disparagement of those that are feminine are shown by the analyses to persist even though men and women are perceived to have equal access to power and resources. The ‘empowered’ woman, similar to the male
subject, adopts the ideal of masculine subjectivity, the same ‘false differentiation’ at the expense of true recognition of her feminine ‘self’. Her sense of individuation does not allow for the reconciliation of agency and desire with femininity. Instead, the Father’s power and the male monopoly of desire are accepted as the only routes to individuality. These women are admitted into liberal society on the same terms as men, which instead of empowering them as ‘women’, merely strengthen the masculine privilege, which is implicit in society. As long as the ‘father’, or the Law of the Father stands for subjectivity and desire at the level of culture, and ‘empowerment’ is constructed along the norm of the Same, the (black professional) woman’s desire will always have to contend with devaluation.

In spite of the construction of the ‘empowered’ woman’s ‘self’ as ‘unitary’ and along the lines of the economy of the Same, Kristevan theory as applied in this study, clearly reveals that these women are subjects-in-process. In spite of her attempt to fix her identity as ‘empowered’ and powerful, the contradictions in her identity reveal how meaning can only ever be fixed temporarily and is always open to challenge and redefinition. It is in the space of these contradictions where the ‘empowered’ woman functions. She operates both across and within the competing discourses of traditional femininity and masculinity. Her identity remains inherently undecideable, as she cannot opt for one side of an opposition without at the same time remaining implicated in and complicit with its opposite.

8.3 A practical route toward feminine empowerment: life skills coaching

Coaching is a relatively new concept in South Africa, which would enable the professional, black woman to become ‘empowered’ without repressing her feminine capabilities, and to accept her own inner diversity. Meyer & Fourie (2004:5) define coaching as “the systematically planned and direct guidance of an individual …by a coach to learn and develop specific skills that are …implemented…and …translates directly to …outcomes that are achieved over a short period of time”. Coaching, which is often practiced by psychologists, but which must be distinguished from therapy, creates the environment for individual development and personal as well as organizational change. The very nature of the coaching process with the close personal contact between coach and client suggests a great potential for growth, trust and conflict resolution, both on a personal and professional level.

With the tremendous changes in South African society since 1994, there has been an increasing demand for coaching to assist individuals and organizations with the transformation process. There is a recognized need for guidance from professionals who can support, encourage and help individuals and organizations to master changes and succeed in an increasingly competitive and challenging world. Coaching is essentially effective because it is a short-term intervention where the coach acts as the sounding board and works with the client to develop strategies and alternatives in order to deal with specific issues.
Although there are many different types of coaching, such as executive and business coaching amongst others; life skills coaching, which pertinently focuses on aspects of emotional intelligence (the so-called ‘soft’ skills), could assist the professional woman to achieve a greater awareness of being a ‘subject-in-process’. According to Zeus & Skiffington (2003:18) life skills coaching or personal coaching “…focuses primarily on personal growth and development …[and] (t)he life coach works with individuals who want to change and grow, to restructure or improve their lives, to work through transitions and to find fulfillment and balance”. The emphasis on ‘softer skills’ such as communication, managing cultural diversity, self-awareness and so forth, will enable the professional woman to meet the demands of both the male-dominated, ‘rational’ workplace, whilst appreciating and acknowledging the repressed feminine aspects of her ‘self’. An example of such an approach, as developed by McCallum (2003) is attached in Appendix E.

Life skills coaching could further assist these professional women to acknowledge their processual subjectivity in their fight for equality. This struggle for equal rights should be combined with an understanding and acknowledgement of their sexuality, with the maternal as the model of an “other that is not based on appropriation and the need for self-definition, and which allows individual differences to exist, that may provide a model for a relation to otherness beyond the one imposed by patriarchal law, and hence for a new form of subjectivity” (Sellers, 1991:74).

8.4 Conclusion

If the ‘empowered’ woman who fights for equality bases her identity on the splitting off of her feminine capabilities, and refuses to recognize the feminine characteristics of her ‘self’, then any claim to stand for equality, freedom and empowerment is invalidated. The assertion of ‘empowerment’ along the lines of ‘male logic’, or rationality results in the loss of recognition of an inner diversity, since it eliminates the feminine aspects and so vitiates subjectivity itself. Conceptualizing the ‘self’ as a seamless whole has invidious social consequences, for it then becomes necessary for the woman to repress her inner diversity. Claims about female ‘empowerment’/equality which aim to make women ‘more like men’ are inherently reactive and not creative. ‘Empowerment’ then merely becomes the search for one ‘Truth’ built on the opposition of polarities.

It is only through the radical deconstruction of traditionally phallogocentric discursive categories such as ‘empowerment’, which lead to the new emancipatory constructions, that cannot be collapsed back into the economy of the Same, that the empowerment of feminine subjectivity will be achieved. For, it is not simply a question of identifying hierarchies and overturning them, instead, the ‘empowered’ woman, as speaking subject, is faced with the challenge of refusing to be the Other of male discourse as well as refusing to be integrated as the Same. This task entails “entering culture and society in ways that defy identification and subjection, of entering into dialogue with the symbolic and social order without being integrated into it, without becoming fixed and forced or lulled into speaking from a singular point” (Butler, 1995:272).
What is at stake is more than finding a place within the existing discourses or values, the latter must be replaced by new, alternative norms and discourses which “should help… to open up the system to the prospect of a plurality of possibilities whose recognition… has been forbidden” (Stanton, 1980:92). Woman’s quest for equality cannot be achieved within the norm of masculinity and simply centring the marginal and marginalizing the central remains an oppositional strategy, which merely creates another hierarchy that will require overturning. ‘Equality’ merely serves to obscure differences and brings them back to the Same, to the monolithic or phallic principles, which is in stark contrast to the ‘polylogic’ which is designated as the feminine.

The identity principle, with its logic of unity and Sameness must be replaced by an accentuation of differences, and an inner diversity. Marginality must be acknowledged in order to designate a difference that is no longer conceived as an inverted image or as a double but as heterogeneity and multiplicity. For, it is in the awareness of the potential for expression, which are contained in the spaces in-between conflicting discourses, (rather than being lodged in the illusory ‘unitary’ identity), that there lie the opportunities for empowerment and radical transformation.
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APPENDIX A
EXAMPLE OF THE LETTER / ELECTRONIC MAIL SENT TO THE SUBJECTS REQUESTING PARTICIPATION IN THE STUDY

PO Box 824
Petervale
2151
caritao@iafrica.com
12 August 2002

Advocate L T

Dear Advocate

I am currently involved in research regarding the subjective experience of empowerment amongst black, professional South African women, towards a doctoral degree in Psychology through UNISA.

As part of the research, I need to conduct short interviews with black, professional South African women. Each interview will last approximately one hour and entails questions regarding personal experiences of empowerment.

The interview will be recorded on audiotape and transcribed afterwards. Your anonymity in this study is further guaranteed.

In view of your professional status, I feel that you could make a significant contribution to the research and I would be very pleased if you would consider participating in this study. Please complete the attached form and return it to me per self-addressed envelope at your earliest convenience. Alternatively, please e-mail me your response at the above address.

I am planning to conduct several interviews, starting in mid-December 2002 in Johannesburg, Gauteng. Should you wish to participate, I shall arrange a time and date for the interview in conjunction with your schedule either telephonically or via e-mail to minimalize any disruptions.

Yours sincerely

C.Ormerod (ms)
APPENDIX B
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Each interview commenced by asking the subjects to elaborate on their personal lives starting with their early childhood experiences. This was followed by probing questions about their relationships with a mother figure, the roles of their mothers in the household as well as any power-struggles (decision-making and family conflict). The differences and similarities between the daughters’ lives and their mothers’ lives were specifically focused upon. Attention was also given to the role that the father figure played in their lives.

The subjects were also questioned about their work environment with a similar focus on decision-making and conflict as well as the role of dominant figures. Once again the differences and similarities between their lives and that of the older generation were attended to. If a subject commented on a specific event that affected her, either privately or publicly, she was encouraged to elaborate upon this. Her opinions about the socio-political changes since 1994 were also considered within the South African context.

Due to the individual and unique nature of each subject’s answers, there was no specific order of questioning or a specific set of questions and each subject determined the line of questioning that followed.
TRANSCRIPT NOTATION

The notational convention employed in this thesis is loosely based on the system developed by Gail Jefferson as explained in Wood and Kroger (2000:193,194). The following notations have been applied:

[ ] Extract heading

( . ) Untimed pause (just hearable; <.2sec)
( 1.2 ) Pause timed to the nearest tenth of a second
Bu - Dash shows sharp cutoff of speech
under;pie Underlining indicates emphasis
CAPITALS Capital letters indicate talk that is noticeably louder surrounding talk
°soft° Degree signs indicate talk that is noticeably louder than surrounding talk
>fast< “Less than” and “greater than” signs indicate that talk is noticeably faster
<slow> or slower than the surrounding talk
ho:me A colon indicates an extension of the sound or syllable that it follows
heh or hah Indicate laughter
.hh Audible inbreath
hh Audible outbreath
wo(h)rd An “h” in parenthesis denotes laughter within words
rilly Modified spelling is used to suggest pronunciation
(word) Unclear speech or noise
( ) Unclear speech or noise
((coughs)) Double parenthesis enclose transcriber’s descriptions of nonspeech sounds or other features of the talk ((whispered)) or scene ((phone rings))
APPENDIX D: TRANSCRIPTS OF INTERVIEWS
INTERVIEW 1.
C: Uhm, M, thank you for speaking to me today.
M: “Sure”
C: I would like to ask you a bit, to tell me a bit about yourself, uhm in as much
detail as you would like to, of course, and really starting from when you were
quite small.
M: Okay, uhm, I’m the eldest of four children. Uhm, I grew up in a family, uhh,
that moved around a lot. My dad was a steel fixer, my mom had up to standard
four education and my dad up to standard six. Uhm, I’ve lived all over the old
Transvaal, and that means I went to seven different schools in my schooling
history.
C: Amazing.
M: Uhm, the good thing that came out of that is, is that it taught me a lot of
independence. Uhm, I have two sib…two sisters and a brother…who I love with
all my heart. Uhm, I…just tell me, you need to steer me where…
C: No, you just, these are your experiences.
M: Okay.
C: Feel free to say as much as you would like.
M: Okay. Uhm, in my high school years we ended up in Pietersburg, which
wasn’t the best of, of places for me. I started to-
C: Tell me a bit more about that.
M: Uhm, I, I experienced prejudice amongst my own people for want of a better way
of putting it.
C: Ja?
M: I went to a school that was predominantly Muslim, I was Hindu at the time and
ah, didn’t fit in. So, I ended up with the coloured kids, and the, the classes were quite
clear, your Indian kids were on one side and your coloured kids were on the other.
And, I learnt to speak the language very well and that was where I felt comfortable
and accepted. I’ve hh, I have always had a problem with authority, hahahah.
M: Uhm, in my standard nine year, I dropped out of school. I, I couldn’t handle the
prejudice, I couldn’t handle the “you are not good enough “ attitude and, uh it got to a
point where I just decided, no more. So, I think it was towards, just after June exams
that I dropped out of school, and (hh) a month later I realized that, hey, I could give
them my res…, my dignity, and they could take it away with them, or, I could damn
will stay and fight. So, I went back to school, uhm, I was the first non-Muslim student
to be appointed headgirl because the coloured students’ parents kicked up quite a
fuss. And within a week of being badged headgirl, I was debadged, hahaha.
C: That is amazing.
M: I know, and that is purely because, that is my first experience of something called
tokenism, which I’m passionately against.
C: How did that make you feel when they-
M: when they badged me?
C: Yes!
M: At the time I didn’t know any better-
C: Ja
M: until, uh, I think it was the fourth day that I was on duty, and a teacher smacked a little black kid and I lost it, because, everyone tells me that I fight for the underdog, but I believe in, I believe in equality for everyone. I don’t care who you are, I’m not, which is why working at B*** is strange because I don’t care what grade you are, C: yes
M: or where you come from. As long as there’s respect and dignity’s intact, that to me is so core to why I, I will never ever compromise on them. And I find it difficult to, uh, interact with people who don’t respect those sorts of values. I would admit that’s my own prejudice.
C: Mmm
M: Uh, so, within a WEEK I was debadged in front of the entire assembly as proof of what would happen if you challenged the authority of the school. We wrote standard nine and then I was told to drop all ( ) my subjects to standard grade ‘cause they wanted a good pass rate and I wouldn’t pass on higher grade. And I said, “No ways” . I dropped Maths and I dropped Physics. I wrote my Matric and I came up with a C-aggregate which, which wasn’t excellent, but, hey, considering all the other shit C: and all the other pressures.
M: Ja.
C: Now, where were you at that stage, you were no, no longer head girl, or prefect, nothing? How did you cope with that, emotionally?
M: Emotionally, I’ve always been a loner.
C: Ja
M: I always have uh, whether it be life experiences or just the way I view the world. I’m the sort of person, you can leave me in the corner with my cigarettes and some wine and I’m more than comfortable watching everybody else. I’ve always been like that and, uh, after Matric, well in Matric I got voted as the most least likely to succeed. Hahaha.
C: hahaha
M: Haha. That was my claim to fame in high school, the most leak, least likely to succeed, and I would deliberately do things to antagonize people. I pierced my nose, I listened to loud music, I wore dark coal around my eyes. I, I would deliberately do things because I thought….My mom always taught me to be different is to be unique, and that’s something I’m very proud of. And, up until today, it’s something I use in my training that I do. It’s something that I use in my interactions with other people and, I always watch people who have twins.

Interruption
Interruption: Uhm, can we stop the cassette for a minute?
Uh, I think, I’ve always. There’s part of me that always drives me to be different, and I dunno what that’s about, I’ll be honest with you. Part of it is, because maybe I’ve always had to go to a new school and have to make new friends and another part was, I’ve never wanted to be like everybody else and, I don’t mean to sound arrogant when I say that, but when I think myself, I want to think my self and not, a stereotype of who I should be whether it be on the basis of race, religion, whatever the case may be. Hh So, I finished Matric and, I went to University to study Psychology. There was I gonna be this amazing clinical psychologist, until second year. And, in second year I had to do, uhm, voluntary work at a children’s home. I couldn’t do it. I’m not
the type of person who can leave things as soon as the person leaves the room. I’m
the type of person who suffers from insomnia,

C: haha

M: beca(h)use I’m trying to solve the world’s problems. Haha. Things worry me,
ings and others, other times I wish, God, I wish I could just sleep for eight hours.
And it could be the strangest of things, something that I’ve seen on my way home or,

uh, something that someone says to me. It always makes me wonder what is it behind
that that makes that person say what they did ( . )?. Uhmm, so I went to university,

second year, got an amazing reality call and changed from Clinical Psych to

Industrial Psychology. ° While I was on campus I met some amazing people that
changed my life forever. One of them is a close friend of mine, who is half Irish, half
Indian, uhm, ano(h)ther friend of mine is a traditional Indian girl in all senses of the
word, to the point that she will actually have an arranged marriage.

C: Goodness.

M: And, ah, I met J on campus as well, and J and I, he’s had such, such an integral
role in my life, because when we met, I was your quiet, I was quiet, I mean I was
your tomboy. Hahha , I never ( . ) I never matched socks, NOTHING MATTERED,
and he just saw me in a different way and I think I’ve ended up seeing myself in that
way as well. I ended up doing my Honours , I wasn’t going to do my Honours, purely

from a cash point of view. I worked my way through university during vacs, I used to
go and work at Edgars, and, at the sunglasses counter and hahahahaha. A(h)LL sorts
of horrific things, so I never really had a holiday, but I knew it was something that I
needed to do and then, when third year finished; I got a scholarship to finish my
Honours, and I went back and I did my Honours  in °Industrial Psychology ° .hh I
came out of there , was unemployed for four months ‘cause I was overqualified with
no relevant work experience a:nd I got interviewed by a lady called S  B within this
organization.

C: whom I know, yes

M: Yes, and uhm, she interviewed me, and I thought, my God, why am I wasting this
woman’s time? And twenty minutes later she offered me the job, and I started off,

started off as an assistant HR Officer. Within 5 months I couldn’t, I didn’t like what I
did, I was pushing paper…

C: Could I just interrupt and ask you how old were you then?

M: 21

C: 21?

M: Ja, hahah. No previous work experience. For the record, I am now twenty-seven.
hahaha. Ja, I turned 21, I was 20 when I graduated with Honours and  I  was 21 when
I started at B****, and aaah, S  has been my strongest champion, she has ( . )

constantly thrown me in the deep end, hahaha and, it’s, it’s worked, because I used to
fail orals in school, I could never say a speech. Now I can do ten, training to three
hundred people and be quite comfortable doing it .

C: Ja

M: uhhhm I’ve, over the past three years I think it’s been, I’ve specialized in
performance management and employment equity specifically. I have sixty seven
children.
C: Quite a big responsibility, then
M: It is, but they constitute about 5% of the work I do.
C: Yes
M: Haha. But they allow me to see life through their eyes, which I am ever grateful for.
C: When you say that, what do you mean by that?
M: Hh. They make me realize that for a twenty seven year old, I am damned serious, one, haha and number two, that life for them is hard. I’ve, I’ve always wanted to see it, from the point of view, when I was younger, I never knew about apartheid, I never knew much about it and when I did come to know apartheid, I was incredibly resentful because I looked at my parents and I wished, my God, if they’d finished school,
C: That’s right
M: Or they’d been given the opportunity to go to university, what could they have been? I mean, my dad is a business development, business development manager for Mondi and my mom is a caterer, >she is quite an entrepreneurial woman< but I just wonder with those formal qualifications behind them, they could have been so much more.
C: Ja
M: Uh, in my own personal experience, I think I went to as many schools, so it didn’t make a difference to me. I went to a good tertiary institution.
C: Mmm. So you feel you’ve had quite a lot of, had quite a lot of exposure to different cultures?
M: You’ll FIND that, to me, I don’t make friends with people because of race,
C: Mmmm
M: it’s because we have so (many values)
C: Mmmm? It’s because you’re interested
M: Yes, and if I look at my friendship base (.) I’ve, I have (.) I think, one Indian friend and that, I think, speaks volumes, because a lot of, I mean in my extended family, I mean, ( ) one of 74 first cousins from my Dad’s side alone.(smiling)
C: Amazing, hahaha
M: Yes, and ah, I’m the only one who’s been to university. I own my own home, I own my own car and I love that independence, ‘cause > I left home when I was seventeen and ten years on, you know what, I’m still by myself and I’m, it’s, it’s something I thrive on and the one thing I passionately believe in, and, it’s something I’ve experienced with my students as well, ‘cause the first year that they join me, I say to them: “No one owes you anything, you will work for what you want”, and I think that’s part of my upbringing when my parents taught me, you have to work for anything that you got out of life .<
C: So you’re teaching them a sense of independence…
M: Yes
C: Which your parents really passed on to you?
M: Ja
C: Can I ask you, uhm, your family life, can you tell me a bit about your family life?
M: °Okay°( )
C: What was it like when you were a child and what is it like now?
M: I’ve always been the parent. I’m, I’m not (.) very comfortable speaking about it,
purely from the point of view that my dad (.) was very abusive (.) towards my mom
and I always found myself having to play mediator between the two ((clears throat))
and there’s a lot of history behind that. Uhm, my parents are different, different
religions (.) and they weren’t allowed to get married, so my gran brought my dad to
Johannesburg and married him to someone else. °He had two children with this
woman, divorced her and went back to my mom and they eloped (.) and there’s been
a lot of baggage from that point of view°
C: I’m sure.
M: I never got to know my stepsiblings hh, I mean my stepsister died (.) six years
ago, She died of diabetic shock. Uhm, she didn’t know she was a diabetic,
C: Yes
M: but she had left, < stranded, deserted a family of four >.
C: Good grief
M: She was a mother of four children and ahh, she left them °including a husband,
and we didn’t know where she was °(.) and at that time, I was at campus, I didn’t
know much °. The first time I was introduced to her, I was what, standard four or
standard five. I just knew her as this other person.
C: So, she was, wh, would you say that you feel that she was maybe a stranger to
you?
M: To a large extent, yes, but she was still my father’s child.
C: So, you know, how did that make you feel when you heard that she died and she
never got the chance to-
M: They didn’t tell me
C: to meet?
M: they didn’t tell me
C: why is that?
M: they didn’t tell me because, it was my final year
C: Oh, I see
M: So, they didn’t wanna upset me and °told me when I got ho:me and (.) the sad
thing was, a couple of months my brother-in-law was killed, so I have four nieces
without parents °, but his family has taken custody of the children°
C: Are you in contact with these nieces at all?
M: I’ve (.) been told that I’m not welcome there. So I, I don’t. I initially did try,
because, I (.) they’re still my blood °.
C: Ja, so you’ve got quite a strong sense of family then?
M: °Ja, but its just, its not allowed, so we don’t go there. I know it kills my dad°.
C: Ja
M: cause my dad (1) °. My dad’s got four kids but none of us plan on getting married
anytime soon, hahaha.
C: hahaha
M: and they’re not getting any younger, because, my parents are quite old. My parents are 57, so my mom had me when she was, what, 30, ° and my youngest sister when she was 40°.

C: That’s very untraditional?

M: Yes

C: Can I ask you, if, would you say that your mother has been like a role model to you, or who would you like to identify in your life? Specifically? Maybe more than one, a specific female figure. I mean, apart from S that you’ve mentioned which is obviously professional.

M: Mmm. Uhhm. ° If I had to be honest, no one°.

C: Not a specific person?

M: If I had to be honest, no one. °

C: Because, it’s not really…working out?

M: for the sake of their children. Because I think, I don’t think parents sometimes realize the impact that they have on a child’s life. And on the one hand, yes,> it’s good because I turned out to be as independent as I am, but my siblings aren’t.< My sister who’s a year younger than me, is so dependent. And that’s why, I mean, >the one thing that’s always interested me, is that, even though we’ve been brought up in the same environment, we’ve turned out such different personalities<.

C: why would you say she’s dependent? Give me an example maybe?

M: ° An example°. My sister is not the type of person who can, one, be alone by herself. Two, she recently moved in with her boyfriend and when they moved out, for her to not see him for more than one day is devastating. To the point where she will sob her heart out. And, J and I dated on campus and, for four years of the six years that we were together, we lived on opposite ends of the world. We saw one another every six months and I think it’s those sorts of experiences that have made me as independent as I am, which is not always good because people perceive me to be aloof, haha.

C: Aloof? haha, that’s a good word. Yes.

M: THAT’S A POLITE WORD, hahaha

C: that’s a very polite word

M: ICE QUEEN IS ANOTHER WORD THAT’S, CO(h) ME THAT’S COME ACROSS MY DESK.

C: And why do they say that? Do they say that to your face? Do you hear it via other people?

M: No. ° I’ve, hh I’ve been told on more than one occasion, that people don’t know what it is I’m thinking, that I’m very good at hiding my emotions , whereas I feel that I am OVERLY emotional° hahaha. So ( )

C: So, what is it, why?

M: It is incongruent, hahaha

C: yeah, a discrepancy almost?
M: °I don’t know, its because I feel when I am at work I have to be professional°
uh(.) when I started here < I’ll never forget, one of the first things I had to do , was sit
on this panel, and like all the dudes were like fifty plus. It was the company
secretarial panel. I DON’T KNOW WHAT THEY WERE THINKING.THEY WERE
FIFTY PLUS WHITE MALES, AND HERE WAS THIS TWENTY O(h)NE YEAR
OLD, HAHA, hh INDIAN FEMALE AND I, I didn’t know how to react in that
situation.
C: Ja, so you felt, did you feel insecure at all?
M: Not insecure. The only time I feel insecurity is if I, if I think I’m out of my depth.
And what I always do, is make sure I do my research before I go into a meeting. I
will, if I don’t understand something, I will ask someone to, to rephrase it and, if I
don’t know the answer, I will tell someone I’ll get back to them.
C: So, in that specific situation you were twenty one then, am I correct, being
surrounded by all these senior white males, at the very young, relatively, or quite
inexperienced, Indian, employee.
M: Ja. Hahaha
C: Female. Female, to top it all,
M: Ja.
C: How did they, how do you think they perceived you?
M: I don’t think (.). Until today, I don’t think people know how to take me. Uhm, I
look at my kids who’ve been on vac work for the past four weeks. I took them white
water rafting yesterday and we had so much of fun and one of them came to me
afterwards and said ”you know I really didn’t think you could be so much of fun” and
it’s just about.... I need to be very comfortable with someone before I ... I can-
C: open up?
M: laugh and joke, that sort of thing. >I’ll be the first to acknowledge that< I’m , I’m
usually very quiet in the first meeting, uhm. This I can tell you because I know that
it’s for some, some, some different purpose, but uhm, yeah, I tend to be quite
reserved, I’ll laugh and I’ll joke, but there will a:lwats be that barrier (.) with people.
C: Can I ask you, just to, ummm, get back to, for example, your independence. It
seems to be quite a strong point, you know, that’s that’s been passed on to you from
your parents and that you like to pass on to people. Uhmm, is it something that, you
would say, your, is your mother an independent person? I mean, if you had to
describe how she lived life and then compare it to yours, maybe contrasts and
similarities.
M: Okay. My mom was your traditional Indian woman, sari and dot everyday, you
know, she, she never wo:rked before or anything like that . My mom and my sisters,
are very dependent, and (.) it angers me ,hahaha . It really does, because I always
think. It goes down to locus of control, which is, is another core thing with me I
BELIEVE (.) that you have it within your power to be whatever you want to be .You
create your own limitations, you allow people to impose barriers onto you. I, I cannot
handle, uh “I’m a function, of the system”. I hate that attitude and I tend to argue and
fight with people a lot, based on that. I’m not saying the world is ideal, I’m quite a
realist, >but I’m saying< if I want something, only I can go out and get it. No-one’s
gonna come and say “Oh, poor you, can I come and help you out?” Reality is, people
don’t care anymore, which HURTS me, I mean, because I think, you do have that
five percent who are good and kind, but I think at the end of the day, it's within your power and people depower, for want of a, I can't think of another word, but they take their power away from themselves.

C: They disempower themselves almost
M: Yes, they do
C: Do you feel your mother, or your siblings, are they all girls?
M: No, I ( )
C: Four girls?
M: I've got 2 sisters and a brother
C: Do you, well, let's maybe focus on the females in your household. Do you feel that, they do that to themselves, and, and why?
M: I do, I mean, I look at my sister. She's a bright woman, she's damn intelligent, yet she's so de, eh, dependent on this, on this other individual. I cannot comprehend it, for a minute. And that's why, they say to me, that I'm too cold, I mean, my own siblings have said this to me and I say to them " It's not about, it's not that I don't wanna understand, I do want to understand, but how can you sob your heart out if you haven't seen this person for one day?
C: And is your mother's relationship with your Dad like that, I mean WAS it initially when you were younger? I know that you said it has disintegrated.
M: ( ) very, very dependent
C: In which ways, financially, emotionally?
M: Financially, emotionally. My mother was what he wanted her to be (.) at the end of the day.
C: With very little education.
M: °Yes
C: Does she, is she able to drive, I mean, does she have her own ... 
M: ° My mom (.) can't drive till today
C: Does she want to, do you think, have you discussed it with her?
M: I've constantly asked her, I mean I'll give you an example. My youngest sister has just finished Matric, and it's (. ) ironic, 'cause I give career advice to sixty seven kids and I do volunteer work to places like Cedar ; telling kids about going and getting an education and stuff like that. My sister, one, refuses to leave home, because she doesn't want to leave my mom alone with my dad (.) and secondly, I told her this holiday, find it a ( ) driving school, go for driving classes and I'll pay for it for you, but still.
C: How old is your sister, if I may ask?
M: She's, she's seventeen.
C: Seventeen. Is she the second eldest?
M: No, she's the baby.
C: Oh, so she's the baby, so she wants to stay at home
M: Yeah, and the one who is a year younger than me, has always wanted to leave home but could never live by herself, and -
C: Why is that?
M: I don't know what it hh I'm gonna, I know I sound like an absolute bitch, but I just, maybe I have learnt too well how to be by myself. I'll be the first to
acknowledge it. And, with my sister needs the constant attention, ‘cause as we were
growing up, she was always, the apple of everyone’s eye. ( )
C: You’re the eldest.
M: I’m the eldest, she’s a year younger than me, very, very attractive, and she’s
sweet. I like her, I love her, you know, she’s my sister, I’d do anything for her, and it
upsets me that she constantly compromises on things, to be with someone who loves
her and I think love is more than that. Love is about respect.
C: Mmm
M: Love is about not having to accuse people of doing things. I went home last week
after about six weeks, and my sister was asleep at half past five, and I asked my mom
what was wrong, and apparently her boyfriend had accused her of, of, of having an
affair, or whatever you wanna call it and I thought HELL NO, stand up for your
rights, don’t go and lay in bed and sob you heart out. I cannot handle people who do
that. And maybe it’s because I’ve seen my mother do that so many times, it angers me
so much. One of my students came to me today (at school)) and told me she’s six
months pregnant, at twenty. And I cannot explain the rage that I feel, cause I feel,
(incredulous, short laugh) as a wo(h) man, you have to take control of your life,
‘cause reality is well, my reality is, that I want, if one day I have children, that I can
take care of those children, number one and if anything happens, I can provide them
with whatever support, financial or emotional, it is, that they need. I would never
wanna place my children in the role that I was in as a child, to be a parent. ‘Cause
now, I crave to be a child, hahaha
C: I see, so you feel that you’re a parent to both your parents, or to your mother only?
M: ° To both my parents°
C: Would you like to give me a bit more detail about that?
M: hh
C: Why you say that specifically?
M: Because they never allowed me to be a child. I was never allowed to mess
around, I always had to take care of my siblings. I always had to ensure that the house
was clean, that chores were done, and with my Dad, I think he always wished he had
a son because if view of tuning the
VCR, I know it’s a stupid example-
C: Hahah. It’s a good example
M: but you know, they never did those sorts of things, they relied on me to do it.
C: Now, can I ask you, if you view yourself as the parent, from being a very
independent uhm, young woman, even an independent child, uhm, who used to make
the decisions in your household?
M: ° My dad, without any doubt°. They weren’t, you SEE, they weren’t. It was never
consultation in my house, it was dictation, which, there’s a very clear difference and I
would challenge and continuously get swatted down, ‘cause how dare you challenge
the authority. Until today I do it, and the last time I did it, was two mo(h)nths ago
where I got told, “don’t tell me what to do in my home”.
C: And how does your mother react to that?
M: That’s the thing, my mother doesn’t. And that’s what what’s fucks me up, sorry, I
swear a lot.
C: You may, hahaha.
M: Haha, uhm, that’s what pisses me off,
C: Ja
M: because I think, you never shouted us when we were young. You never allowed
me to be a child, because I had to experience adult problems (.) when I was as
yo(h)ung as standard two, standard one, and I think >that’s where some of the
resentful, the resentment comes in, because now, when they tell me things, I’m
actually not interested. I tell them, sort it out. If you can’t sort it out, get divorced< .
That’s how I see it. <It’s harsh and it’s cruel, but that’s where I am right now>
C: And do you think, that uhm, this has affected the way you view the world, the way
your career is going uhm?
M: I think it’s impacted only so far as (. ) my independence. I know that I keep
harping on it but it’s the one thing that I go back to, is that I’m not easily swayed by
other, by the way others think. I, I can walk into a room and feel comfortable enough
to talk about certain things if it’s within in my area of expertise, a:nd , I think I can be
very independent when it comes to negotiation process, because I can see both sides
of the story, having had done that at a(h)ge what ten? Hahaha. It’s something that’s
just stayed with me, seventeen years later.
C: So, I mean, you, you are clearly, completely different to your mother.
M: °Yeah°
C: How old was she when she got married?
M: °They were twenty nine°.
C: Okay, which is not that traditional, I’m sure.
M: °Because, remember, he (with someone else)°
C: That’s correct, because of the whole problem there.
M: ((Clears throat))
C: and, do you think that you’ll ever get married? Be a traditional wife
M: I, hahahaha
C: so to speak?
M: I was gonna get married three years ago, uhh, J and I were gonna get married and
°what had happened was, it’s difficult when you live across the world from one
another, ‘cause your life experiences are so different and you change. And, what had
happened was, I became the confident (. ) sociable one and he became incredibly
introverted, a:nd at the time, he , he’d been for a lot of doctors’ tests and he thought
that he had cancer °. And when he came down so that we could tell my family, it just
ended really badly. But I mean, he’s still my best friend. I went on holiday with him
in June, haha. You know, he’s one of those very few people in the wo:rd that I trust
( . ) with all my heart. (   )
C: And, where does J come from, is he from Ireland?
M: No, J is Greek .Uh, his pa: uh, his dad is a shipping dude, s(h)o that’s how he
ended up in Natal. I studied at Natal University a:nd I met him there in my second
year, and we were initially best of friends. We did everything, we went to movies, the
clubbing, whatever the case may be a:nd °over a period of time, we ended up falling
in love with one another ° and , initially it was, I mean (. ) >I’m not gonna say my
parents’ relationship has, hasn’t scarred me in some ways, but I mean he would ask
me to iron his shirt and to me it was a power struggle, immediately. Hahaha
C: And you think that, does that refer back to your parents’ marriage?
M: ( ) ° Without doubt, ja°
C: and your childhood experiences?
M: ° Yes°. I’m rational enough to, to acknowledge that, as IS HE . Uhm, but the
good thing is, that we’re at a place now where we’re still ( ) constantly in contact with
one another and we can go on holiday and I know that he’ll take care of me.
C: And would you expect to make major decisions, I mean in your relationship with
him before and even now, although it’s different. Do you feel that you’ve got equal
say? I mean, is it different to your parents’ relationship?
M: Definitely. I wouldn’t be with someone, if they treated me. I’ll be honest with
you, Carita, if someone has to talk down to me, oooh, that gets my blood boiling,
because then I would do everything in my power to show you differently.
C: Now, when you say, if someone, would you like to be specific, I mean -
M: If anyone, uhh hh 1 ( )
C: Is it, has it got to do with a, a work situation or a personal situation?
M: Work or personal, I mean, I’ll give you an example of both°. Uhh, work°. I was,
°I, I°, I was answering M -A’s phone call, M -A is a friend of mine°, who works in
the office next to me and uh, everyone °thought that I was actually her, her secretary,
which I actually don’t mind, I laugh it off. And I even got flowers on Secretary’s
Day.
C: That is delightful, haha
M: Hahaha
C: Thank goodness for a sense of humour.
M: Ja
C: Hahaha
M: It, see, those sorts of things don’t bother me, but it’s as soon as someone,
someone condescendingly, addresses me in a condescending manner or treats me as if
I’m an imbecile. It, just, it pisses me off°°. It’s one of my hot buttons, I know it <.
C: For example, what did they say to you that irritated you do much?
M: When hh it was. I tend to be quite busy° during the year, and there was a
message for M -A and I forgot to relay it to her and this woman phoned me and called
me incompetent°°. And I just thought, oh no, you didn’t°. Hahaha
M: Okay, so another woman called you incompetent?
C: Yes, and it’s not, I mean, I look at all my managers are male, most of them
anyway, and I can laugh and joke with them but then also know that I will deliver the
goods as and when they require.
C: So do you, they don’t see you any different. They treat you as an equal.
M: I think they do, I think they don’t know how to place me, hahaha.
C: Which is an advantage or a disadvantage?
M: I think ( ) i. it’s a good thing, I’ve had one of the women tell me, she works down
the passage, she doesn’t know what to make of me, ‘cause one day I’ll wear a sari and
the next day a long pants and the next time with a short skirt. So, ho, she can’t box
me and that’s what I love,
C: Mmm
M: the fact that someone can’t box me. That’s my aim in life > I don’t wanna be
boxed< < I want to be ME:> I don’t wanna be -
C: So, you, you, you’re different people, would you say that? And if you had to say, the different roles that you fulfill, maybe as best friend or sibling or worker, or girlfriend eventually.

M: Mmmm

[Tape runs out/interruption in interview]

C: Have you managed to combine all those roles?

M: ° I think I stay true to myself °. I think when I give, I give with all my he:art. ° If I disagree with someone, I’ll tell them ° why °.

C: Uhm, is it easy to do all these jobs at once especially when you have quite a demanding job. Do you sometimes-

M: Well, I started studying this year, haha. So, this year has been a true test. I started my MBA this year, and, hahaha. It started off as a bet, hahaha.

C: Oh, my.

M: And, M- A >. I was planning on doing my Master’s in Psychology and I wasn’t sure whether I wanted to do it or not. So, she said: “Why don’t you try the MBA? Go and write the entrance exam” <. I thought, ye:a:h, I can score a bottle of wine ‘cause I AIN’T GONNA GET IN, hahaha. I went and I wrote the entrance exam, I went for an interview in January and I got in. And I was shocked ‘cause I knew I was too young a:nd >one of the reasons why they gave me, why they let me go in was because they said I was very mature.< Now that pisses me off as well ((smilingly retorted)) because I think people think that I’m much older than WHAT I rea(h)lly am, hahaha. And ah, balancing work and studies this year, has been incredibly difficult, but I would NOT change it for anything in the wo:rd. I’ve made new friends, for one. I have, I’m seeing the wo:rd in a different view, from a different viewpoint altogether and I’ve been challenged like I’ve never been challenged before. And one thing to me, if there’s an intellectual challenge inVOLved, I’m THERE, hahaha. I LOVE arguing, I LOVE someone arguing BACK at me. To me the most key thing is as long as you can walk out of a room with a person’s dignity intact, that’s all that matters.

C: Ja, you’ve mentioned the word dignity and prejudice, and equality, uhmmm, when you, would you say that has affected your worldview as well? I mean, your childhood experiences, having been at so many schools and specifically, your, your last final year?

M: Mmm

C: you know how has that shaped your view of the world, and you as a person, really?

M: You know, what, Carita, I mean being told you’re gonna be the least likely to succeed, hahaha, to me that was a challenge. But a lot of people, it’d destroy them. That is WHY I will NOT ° tolerate anyone being talked down to °and it’s, it’s a simple thing of, if you go to a restaurant, I think the true test of character is the way the person treats a waiter, I know it sounds stupid -

C: I have to agree with you.

M: but the way a person treats a waiter is, ha: gives a lot of insight into character and it’s bossing, things like please and thank you. I, I know these are silly examples and
I don’t mean to sound like an idealist, but they’re so important to me. I want people who respect other people, I wanna be with people who I can fight and argue with (part or whatever), but we can still be the best of friends. And that’s what’s important.

C: Ja, you often talk about that you will argue about something especially if you know that you were right. Now, coming back to that experience of your father being the all, you know, the person who has the say, uhm I can’t recall the word that you’ve used, it’s-

M: „Uhm, dictatorship“. HAHAHA.

C: Ja, dictatorship, and you said that you had a lot of arguments with your dad. How did you resolve those kind of conflicts?

M: „With my father?“

C: Yes

M: „They were never resolved“

C: And, and -

M: „Because“

C: now that you’re older and totally independent?

M: „Still not resolved, because he’s still the dad. But now I can get into my own car and go to my own home“. HAHAHA°. I don’t have to stay under his roof.

C: And what does your mother do -

M: „Nothing“.

C: when you have an argument with him and your other siblings, what do they say?

M: „The funny thing is, till today, if my siblings have something important to tell my parents, I get called. An emergency 911. Please come and mediate. HAHAHA“.

C: That is amazing

M: „I’m still used to that role because I think what happens if it’s time for me to tell them something important and I don’t tell them of things that happen in my life. I’ll be honest with you. Uhmm, firstly, one, I don’t wanna worry them and secondly, I just figure what is there they can possibly do for me, and I got really ill about two years ago. I went on a course (a)nd it was a diversity course on R**** I**** for seven days (a)nd using the Travistock model, which (a)nd till today, I will never attend or send anyone to attend a course, based on the Travistock model. My third day there I was physically beaten up."

C: Good grief

M: „and -"

C: By whom?

M: By: another member of the, of the course a:nd hh three weeks after that I suffered from post traumatic stress disorder (a)nd ( ) -

C: Can I ask you, why were you beaten up, do you know?

M: „Cause I dared challenged a man“.

C: very interesting

[Interrupt]

C: Would you like to be a bit specific about that incident?

M: „Uhmm, sure, uhhm, using I, do you know the Travistock model?"

C: I have a vague idea, I must be honest
M: They put us into big groups; small groups and then specific groups that we’ll want to align ourselves to. We were in the big group, and there’s one thing that I can say about, I like to stir, uhhhhaha. Especially if I think, you know, WHAT ARE YOU ACTUALLY SAYING? I will always try to put a spin on what people are saying.

A:nd we were sitting in in the large group a:nd they were fighting on the difference between Black Christians and white Christians. Now, maybe I sound idealistic when I say >white Christian, black Christian<. SAME THING end of story. >So I turned around and said, but it makes me wonder what you will, guys would say if I told you< I was agnostic? Now, no-one bothered to hear what I said, they thought I said atheist, no-one even asked me what agnostic meant. And then they said, “Oh, we all know you’re going to hell, ha ha ha”. ((said in sarcastic tone))

Black Christians and white Christians laugh, hahaha. You know, it was (.) I think I’m rational enough to be able to see those sorts of things a:nd, uhm .hh so , as we were walking out, one of the guys in my smaller group said that people think I’m here to, to make friends, well they’ve got another thing coming if they think that they can be my buddy. He was directing it to me, so when hh -

C: So, he thought

M: I wanted to be everyone’s friend -

C: wanting to be popular

M: Yeah. So, we go into the small group and I said to him. Before we start , I told the facilitator, I ‘d like to, to say something to this GUY. So I said “If you have something to say to me look me in the eye and say it to me“, ’cause that’s the way I am, I hate gossip. Nothing FUCKS me off MORE than people sitting and (.) >you know talk< to me, I obviously opened up Pandora’s box that day and he completely snapped. And, it, it started off with screaming and he smacked me off the chair and when I was down, he kicked me .hh  .I got up and I walked out .hh and I’ll never forget, I went to the edge of the ocean and I did not know what to do because I hadn’t experienced that sort of violence, up front, from a stranger.

C: Did anybody intervene?

M: No-one did anything and I’ve written a letter “to the Psychological Association and I’m still waiting for a response”. And ((tremor in voice)) uh ((sigh)) I went back to my room and I sobbed my heart out because I was devastated. I phoned M-A to tell her what had happened and she said “Get on the boat, get back to Cape Town and come back home”. And I thought, now if I do that he would have won. And I thought FUCK no, he(h)’s not gonna wi(h)n ,no way, no, I’m not gonna let that happen, so I went back into the group(.) and I carried on that entire week and , at the end of the week, what upsET me more than every, than anything was >everyone was hugging and kissing, oh we’re the best of friends< yet I called you a this yesterday, or I , I mistreated-

C: yes

M: you that way, or I disrespected you. I cannot handle that sort of hypocrisy because I feel, if this is the way that I feel towards you , if I don’t like you for whatever reason, I will withdraw from you <I won’t engage in any conversations with you>. I
will be polite in terms of saying “Hi, how are you doing”, but that’s as far as it will
go-
C: Yes
M: if that, but don’t let’s pretend to be friends when I obviously cannot stand the
sight of your skin colour, OR YOUR RELIGION, or whatever the case may be.
C: Do you have any contact with this individual at all?
M: ºNoº, what had happened was post the courseº. They uh, they started this e-
groups thing, electronic groups and I used to, because I was on the mailing list; I used
to get all of their correspondence and ºon the oneº he’s, he wrote and he asked me
where was I, why was I hiding from him º?
C: What? How did that make you feel considering what had happened?
M: It made me wanna take a baseball and bash his head in. HAHA, SORRY, I got a
violent thought, but that’s what it wanted me to do ‘cause I thought, HOW THE
FUCK DARE YOU, HOW DARE YOU WHEN YOU DID THAT TO ME IN
FRONT OF EVERYBODY ELSE?! I do not believe that things .hh I know that
people have been (. ) through (. ) violent (. ) periods in their lives (. ) or emotional
trauma.
C: Correct
M: I do not believe you can take away that pain within yourself by inflicting it on
someone else. It does not work ( ) in any system
C: Was that a perceived excuse of, on his side? Were you told certain things about
this incident?
M: Afterwardsº uhm, one of the things the facilitator said was, and >you have
forgive me, my memory of that thing is not very good purely because (. ) I’ve just put
it in the back of my mind< ;was that he’d experienced his best friend being shot next
to him º. So, I think, this is how I figure it (. ) I’m someone who’s experienced hurt,
my role, is to, to TAKE CARE OF EVERYONE. I don’t want anyone to experience
that hurt, ‘cause I know what it feels like. I cannot make my hurt better, by making
someone else feel it.
C: Correct
M: It’s not fair, it’s not right and it’s not my work to do something like that. So, those
are the sort, you know. How the hell did we get to talk about this?
C: Hahah
M: Anyway, I got really sick ,I was hospitalised º. I didn’t tell my family, I got into a
car and I drove to my best friend in Pietersburg and I stayed there for a week and till
today my parents have no idea what’s happened. And that’s not something that I’m
(willing to talk about)º.
C: And that’s not something that you’re going to tell them because?
M: ºWhy? Why ?Why? you know. They’ll get upset and that’s it. They’ll worry
about me and I don’t want thatº.
C: And I mean its interesting that you’ve experienced so many incidents, and, and
that you, your opinion is still you won’t inflict hurt on other people. Although you’ve
experienced so many...
M: You know why, Carita, I just figure (. ) and maybe that’s where the having to take
care of my parents is good, is that I think I’m a nurturer in all my relationships. I
want, I want people to feel safe when they’re with me and I’m the type of friend if you phone me in the middle of the night and tell me something’s wrong, I will be there, no no matter what it is I’m doing, if I’m writing exams or whatever, I will do that, because I know how important it is to stay true to your word and I know how important it is to not let people down in their time of need.

C: So, do you, do you see that as something that perhaps set you apart from other people?

M: >I don’t think so; I think a lot of people have it, we just have different ways of showing it. If anything I< the one thing that brings a smile to my face is kindness. And when (. ) I see other people being kind, it gives me faith (. ) and those are the sorts of things that I build my strength on, knowing that there are kind people out there.

C: Can I ask you,

M: Mmm

C: you know this, this, this study is also about, and that’s another word you’ve mentioned, equality, uhm, you’re probably quite familiar with the South African constitution and the Bill of Rights?

M: Yes ((smiles))

C: do you mind if I just read it to you, just to refresh your memory?

M: Not at all.

C: Equality. The state may not unfairly discriminate directly or indirectly against anyone on one or more grounds including, race, gender, sex, pregnancy, marital status, ethnic or social origin, colour, sexual orientation, age, disability, religion, conscience, belief, culture, language and birth. What are your feelings about that?

M: Hahaha. Okay, can you rephrase your question are you talking specifically in terms of how I perceive that or the way in which it is practised in our country or the way?

C: No, I’d like to know your personal feelings,

M: ((clears throat))

C: your thoughts, maybe your experiences. Whatever you are willing to, to share with me.

M: I feel you have no right to judge anyone, on any basis whatsoever. I (.4) as I said I talk to people because I find them interesting, I want to know more. It doesn’t bother me what people’s sexual orientation is, whether they’re pregnant or not. >But if they’re pregnant I get really excited ’cause I do things vicariously<

C: Hahah

M: Uhm, but I, I believe in equal rights for all, I do. I don’t believe people should be treated unfairly because of arbitrary things. And, at the end of the day, all our blood is red hh.

C: Yet, you’ve experienced pretty much, a lot of, you know, things of inequality perhaps

M: °Maybe that’s why I believe in equality more, because I °FEEL, and this is what angers me about internal locus of control, external locus of control, where people blame bigger things, where they be apartheid, or whatever, for their situation, but I just °I have this passion for life a:nd, I want people to see: and maybe it’s °God, I probably sound like a dictator myself< Hahahah.
C: Hahaha
M: But I want people to realise as how much power they have within themselves to rise above situations and experiences. You know it’s hh yes, bad things happen. I’ve had three of my first cousins die this year and it’s been extremely traumatic but if anything it’s driven me even more, because NOW I WANT THINGS even more, because they were round about my age and I always try and ( ) something that negative and try and make it positive. It’s not saying that I’m Mary Poppins all the ti (h)me
C: Yes
M: I swear like a trooper, I do have bad days and I do loose faith in humanity sometimes, but I hh and someone said to me I look at life through rose-tinted glasses. But it’s not about that.
C: Mmm
M: It’s about showing people respect, making people feel comfortable enough with you, that they know that your door is always open.
C: Do you think that your mother gets respect?
M: °From who?°
C: From your father, from other women?
M: °Not from my father, but from other people, yes°.
C: Because she’s now got a business, which is quite remarkable.
M: hh that’s part of it and another part is my mom’s a great listener. My mother is everybody’s mother uuuh haha.Everyone just feels °comfortable enough to chat to her and I think that’s one of her traits that I, that I got was that, I will give people, if someone needs to see me, I will sit down and listen to you. I may not always have an answer or I may not always have a solution, but I will hear you°.
C: So, and from that point of view, do you feel that you are quite similar then,
M: ( ) Ja: I think so.
C: Although there’s, there’s a lot of differences,
M: There is.
C: between the generations really, I mean she cannot drive her own car, yet you can. But she is now self-employed, but she did, she never used to be before. You’ve always been,
M: Ja
C: completely independent.
M: She’s very hh you know I ( .) I sometimes feel unfair that I judge her so harshly >and I know I shouldn’t judge her <.
C: Why is that?
M: What, that I shouldn’t judge her or that I judge her so harshly?
C: Well, both, actually. Hahaha.
M: Hahaha. It ANGERS me that, that she put up with the whole crap that she did .It angers me that she never stood up for me, as a child .It angers me that, that she’s not done it with my siblings either °. That till today I fight their battles for them, when it comes to my parents°. A:nd, it angers me that they’re so involved in this love-hate relationship between the two of them that it’s to the exclusion of everything else, including their children°.
C: Yes

M: I, my biggest fear is that if I have children, I will be like that ((inaudible laugh))
and, and it’s almost a self-awareness. I love children, I can spend hours with them, I
find it an amazing experience, but I will always watch what I say to them. I will
NEVER let someone else say to a child “you’re fat or you’re ugly or you’re stupid”.
C: Yes
M: I SWEAR TO GOD, I WILL GET INTO A PHYSICAL FIST FIght IF
ANYONE EVER SAID THAT TO MY KIDS, EVEN IF THEY WERE UGLY.
C: Ja ( )
M: OR STUPID, OR FAT. I don’t think adults understand their impact on children
(.2) ‘cause if I listened to my teachers I would not be where I am today.
C: Ja, that’s very, very true
M: You know, and I think as adults, they have a responsibility towards children
which a lot of them disregard and when I go to them, this volunteer work that I do, I
look at these kids, and I think of their backgrounds and where they’ve come from and
my heart swells with pride because I think, you know what, my hat is off to you
because you’ve done so damn well. ° I will always tell people how I feel, if I’m
proud of you, I’ll tell you I’m proud of you. I will never withhold those, those words
of appreciation ‘cause I think it’s sometimes so easy to judge and say bad things
that it is to say, you know what, job’s well done and I’m so proud of you.
C: I agree with you
M: ‘Cause you know what, those words mean a lot, and especially trashing children. I
will not have anyone say anything bad about kids, especially kids I know. If it’s kids I
don’t know then I’ll still withhold ((smiling)),
C: Hahah
M: from the conversation. But if it’s kids I know, °I get very angry, because I think
children internalize those statements, and°-
C: And do you think that it perhaps refers back to your own experiences at that
school, your last school where you were sort of marginalised, they tried to margina,
tried to marginalise you?
M: Yeah. > I enjoyed it, I have to admit. It, it worked within my loner schedule <
HAHAHA. I found that (.2) from the time I was a little girl because I had so many
extended cousins ((clears throat)) and that they were quite traditional at that time.
You had to be thin, and you had to be pretty — otherwise you couldn’t get married,
that sort of thing. And, from the time I was being a little child, I was to:ld I was fat
and I was ugly and why couldn’t I be like my youngest sister?° And it’s those sorts
of statements, that together with the school that I went to and what my parents did
that makes me so passionate about protecting children. Because <it could be one
small statement > that could strip a child of their entire life and > I cannot, I cannot
stand
° for it<-
C: So, you would, so you would fight for, you’ll fight against prejudice, for equality?
M: Because I think, uh, you know hh and I cannot understand how people can be so
callous, it, it frustrates me in a way when I think (.2) < in one, in one word, you can
take a child’s confidence and crush it completely >,
C: Very true
M: And in that mo:ment you have taken away a lifetime.
C: Can I ask you, it’s very true. I, I agree with you, uhm , as an older woman now, 
apart from that incidence that you experienced, is there anything that’s similar to that 
, an experience that you feel, made you feel, once again, marginalised, or you must 
keep quiet.” We do not want to hear your opinion”.
M: >I don’t allow it to happen< HAHA.
C: Haha, that’s wonderful, haha
M: I’ll be honest with you, uh, I worked with S up until last year and working with 
her is just amazing. A:nd, last year this time I was told that I would have a new boss, 
G  H  a:nd uh, my first meeting with G  wa:s, this is how you’re perceived by the (.) 
organization , you’re ruthlessly ambitious, ah, you ‘re argumen, challenging to the 
point of argumentative and he (( )) this whole list to me and I wa:lked out of that 
meeting, devastated. And then I thought, I’ ll show you, hahaha. And today, we’re the 
best of buddies. And, if I wanna scare him I’ll go into his office and I’ll tell him “I’ve 
done something” and he just <turns white> hahaha.
C: So, how did you turn out to best of buddies when you, when you, when you said 
were devastated? I mean, was it the truth or was it not the truth, according to you?
M: It was perceptions of people.
C: Perceptions of people.
M: Perceptions that people had of me in the organization.
C : Ja, and you say you and S,
M: Yes?
C: you’ve said it now twice, that your work experience has been fantastic, what, 
what is it about your work experience, or her, maybe , that that you enjoy?
M: Trust.
C: Mmmm
M: She never, I mean, I was lucky if I got to saw her in a week, we were a team of 
two, HAHAHA. She worked on a different floor from me. We met every month to 
work out our deadlines and details . > She would let me get on with things<. She 
never watched over my shoulder all the time. We fought about everything, we still 
fight about things, especially Islam. That’s one, S and my hot button. hahaha.°We 
still fight about it, but you know what, at the end of the day, we still respect one 
another and those sorts of relationships are very difficult to find. She had faith in me, 
she boosted my confidence and she showed me things I never saw in myself °hahaha.
C: Yes, because after all, she employed you after 20 minutes! At the age of 21!
M: Haha. At twenty one, and I think the change that I’ve been through over the past 
five years has been phenomenal. May next year will be six years that I am at B**** 
and I have my photograph of the first day I started here and I look at it and I look at 
myself now, (I was a moss) HAHAHA.
C: How are you different?
M: Haha. I’m more outspoken.
C: Mmmm
M: I’m much more confident. I, I laugh more, HAHA I’ve learnt to laugh a lot more 
°these days, because I realised I was way too serious for my age. Uhh, hh I’ve just 
(.4) <I know that I am competent and,without having to sound vain, I am, if I feel I’m 
out of my depth, I have no shame in going and asking for help °.
C: And how were you, well, okay, before you started working here?
M: before, I never knew what my capabilities were. The first week of working here they asked me to send faxes, I couldn’t WORK THE DAMN MACHINE, I WAS DEVASTATED, hahah. And, you know, now >everything I have learnt on the PC and stuff, I’ve taught myself, I haven’t been on courses<.
C: Self –starter.
M: Ja. I, I, I can if you tell me, we’re interested in looking at this, I will go and research and research until I know what it is that I’m talking about and come and give you feedback.
C: So, that’s basically your strength?
M: °And that’s what we’re doing with S. I will tell her I think we need to do this; she’ll say “Why do you think we need to do this?” I would give her an answer, what are the pros and cons, and, ja°
C: And, now you say there aren’t many people like that around?
M: °Ja°
C: What do you mean by that specifically, I mean what specific experience have you had that you can recall?
M: With?
C: When you say look, S is one of a kind, you’ve got a very good relationship, you’ve got conflict situations but you’ve actually got the trust and the confidence and -
M: °Okay°. The one thing I’ve learnt, I’m now a D-upper, I’m a divisional manager, the higher up you go, there’s more politics, and the one thing I’ve learnt, is, you watch the politics°, you understand how it impacts on you, but you never play it. °I will never play politics with anyone. I have champions >°because I have earned respect from certain people and I’ve established my credibility <and the one thing that I’m finding frustrating now, is that there’s, you get more exposed to the politics and its not something I’m willing to engage in°.
C: Yes
M: I’m not gonna cc a thousand people on an e-mail so they can see what I’m saying to you.
C: Haha
M: It doesn’t fuckin’ interest me!
C: Ja, haha.
M: not in the least, I’ve got nothing to prove to anyone, I’m here to do a job, I will get it done. If you prove to be a barrier, I will get back-up. And you need to tell me why you don’t want it done. Don’t just tell me you don’t have time, I’m sorry, that’s not the end of the conversation.
C: When you talk about politics, would you say it’s men and women, men or women.
M: I don’t think it’s easier for women,
C: Mmmm
M: but I also think sometimes .hh both the parties, I mean> B*** is a very male organization and, once again you’re gonna think I’m an idealist but when I walk into a meeting, I don’t think of myself as a female. I’m a competent individual and that’s all that matters<.
C: How do you think they see you?
M: >They see me as an Indian female and as soon as I open my mouth, they don’t
know WHAT TO THINK, HAHAA<.
C: Why do you say that, that they see you as an Indian female?
M: ‘Cause I do diversity training, well, I did diversity training and when I started
training I would play a song called “Free your mind”. Once I played the song, I
would ask them six questions, the participants, and that would be how old am I, what
have I studied, what do I drink, what car do I drive, what do I read hh and what is the
sixth question? No one has been able to get the six questions right, haha, because as
an Indian female they don’t expect you to drink and smoke. As an Indian female they
don’t expect you be able to drive your own car or own your own home.
C: Even now?
C: In the year 2002?
M: It’s, it’s hh I don’t know, I just .
C: So you don’t fit the mould of what other people perceive
M: people perceive.
C: ‘Cause you’ve said that a few times, other people’s perceptions.
M: Mmmm. But I love it, and if someone thinks-
C: Why is that?
M: Oh, I just thrive on it.
C: Hahaha
M: Maybe I’m sadistic in some way, I don’t know, but I love proving people wrong
and it’s not a malicious intent but it’s, as soon as someone thinks, oh, that’s how
she’s gonna react, I’ll do the exact opposite just to get a reaction.
C: Just to stir a bit
M: Hahaha, I love stirring, aah, not in a political way but in a fun way.
C: What if you could change one thing?
M: Where, at B***?
C: Well, in your work life, for example, let’s start there.
M: °If I could change one thing at work, it would be the politics, without doubt, I
would “I would never, ((clears throat)). >I look at my relationships with my managers
and I think some of them are really good, others do need work, I’ll be the< you know
I’d be lying if I said that it was all perfect;
C: Yes
M: and I wish that, or I know that I would never compromise any of them °if a more
senior person were involved°;
C: Yes
M: °and I wish that it were reciprocated°;
C: Mmm
M: because you find in a lot of situations what people do is, instead of dealing with
the matter as it happens, like if you have problem with me, come and speak to me
about it. If I was wrong I’ll, I’ll definitely apologize, but if, if you were wrong then
we’ll talk about it. Maybe talking is not what people do, I don’t know>, but I’m the
type of person, if I have a problem, I will confront it, deal with it, move on, ‘cause
work needs to be done< . You’ll find here that a lot of people will compromise
others to get what they want . That’s not who I am, which makes me wonder how long
I, I will stay here.
C: Yes. And then, socially speaking?
M: (.3) ° Repeat the question?° Haha.
C: What would you like to, to change?
M: Socially? That I weren’t so shy °, that I weren’t so much as a, so much a loner°. I
can go weeks without seeing people (.1) easily.
C: Do you see that as strength or as a weakness?
M: Part of it is strength, part of it is a weakness. Uhhh, purely from the point of
view that, it’s a strength that when I go home, I want quiet °. I wanna listen to the
music I want, I wanna do what I want° (. ). The weakness is, as soon as I’m put into a
social situation, I, as I said, I’m the corner, in the corner table sort of person. ° Leave
me alone by myself and I’m fine°.
C: Ja
M: ° Because more often than not I tend to argue with people ° HAHAHA.
C: Now this arguing with people and, and talking about the politics, it has a lot to do
with almost, and you can correct me if, if I’m wrong, maybe is it a power thing?
M: hh
C: Maybe is it related to how your father had the final say, even now?
M: I don’t (.3)° I don’t think that everything is power based. I think it’s, it’s
individual power, it’s individual greed. That’s what politics is all about, I wanna be
right because I wanna be the blue-eyed boy, or brown-eyed girl, whatever the case
may be ((smiles))°,
C: Hahah
M: ° you know. It, it doesn’t interest me °, in the least whether it be in a social
situation or otherwise, I can get along with people of all backgrounds°. I mean I’ll
give you an example; you wanted an example of how I was treated differently. I have
a friend whose dad happens to be a director > a non-executive director of A**** and I
never knew < ° and he asked me to dinner to his parents, and his mom thought I
was, I was a waitress° HAHAHA.
C: How did you handle that?
M: HAHAHA THANK GOD, I’ve had half a bottle of wine BEFORE I WENT
THERE, hahaha, so I handled it, very graciously.
C: But, good grief!
M: It’s, you know what it is, Carita, those sorts of things, at the end of the day, says
more about the individual than it does about you.
C: Mmm
M: ° And, you know, I’ve had kids in here, sobbing their hearts out because they’ve
had one or the other problem and ° I say to them, “Leave it where it’s coming from”. °
C: Yes
M: ° Don’t make other people’s problem, your problem. °
C: Rise above it so to speak.
M: Ja, something like that, because if I had to listen to everything anyone had ever said to me I would have amounted to nothing (.) but it’s about realising that, and my thing is, I can only depend on myself.

C: Ja

M: at the end of the day and I know that sounds selfish but I don’t ever want to be so dependent on someone else that they take away that core of who I am.

C: Thank you very much.

M: No, that’s co(h)ol, it’s not it’s not compromise,

C: Ja,

M: at all, never do that.

C: be true to yourself

M: Ja, and I’m not gonna say things to make someone else happy. If I disagree with you I’ll tell you and I’ll tell you why. And I won’t do it in a malicious manner ‘cause I I want to hear what the other person says.

C: mmm

M: Uh, I met, I have this cousin whose been trying to hook me up with someone for ages, so EVENTUALLY, just to shut her up, I agreed and, it went SO BADLY that I,

C: Haha

M: I burst out LAUGHING ON MY WAY HOME, cause I was called pro-Black.

C: Okay

M: I’m not, it’s not about equality, I’m pro-Black and I thought °you fucking fool, you know, if you can’t° >because you know he treated the waiter badly < THAT’S WHAT PISSED ME OFF, HAHAHA.

C: Mmm

M: hahah, if I’m being honest with myself and I jus, I carried on thinking I believe religion-

[**Interruption: tape has to be changed**]

M: Where was I hh? Sorry hh Memory of a goldfish, haha. Uh, religion-

C: Yes

M: uhmm, I believe that religion is in your heart, it’s in your actions towards other people° .I don’t need to tell someone I’m a Hindu to be a Hindu .It’s whether you do things with kindness, whether you do things with honesty (.) and whether you can go to sleep at night (.) with a clear conscience (2) and,° hh I cannot remember why I was telling you this hh ja, that’s that’s core to who, to who I am in terms of religion or culture or ( ).

C: Ja, we were actually, just to refresh your memory, we were talking about the incident where this person was calling you pro-Black

M: oh ja, so (.) that’s part of it,

C: Ja

M: °the way you treat other people, ‘cause you treat other people the way you want to be treated and if I was the waiter I would have dropped his coffee in his lap ° hahaha.

C: Hahaha. M, thank you very much.

M: Not to worry. IS THAT IT? Quick and painless, hahaha.

C: Thank you it was very interesting.
M: "Okay °
((M has tears in her eyes at end of interview))
INTERVIEW 2.
C: B, thank you for speaking to me today about your experiences. I would like to ask you to tell me a bit more about your background, starting from as far back as you can remember and, as as as you’d like to tell me.

B: Alright Haha. Are you sure you have enough time for that?
C: Absolutely!

B: Okay, uhm, I was born in KwaZulu Natal, uhm in P**** S******, you know, uhm. But, uhm, my parents lived in Pietermaritzburg, you know. Those days, I don’t know if you, I, I should also tell you those days, my mom was a nurse and, black nurses were not allowed to have kids while uhm, while they were working, uhm, they didn’t have maternity leave, you know
C: Right
B: So: my mom only left the hospital when she was, like, what, eight and a half months pregnant you know, hh and, had to go far away, to have the child so that nobody will know, even though she was married you know, and been married for eight years, you know, so that nobody would know and then come back to work. So: hmmm, I don’t think she ever spent months, she had maybe like uh, one month leave after I was born and had to go straight back to work, otherwise she would have been queried or struck off the role, I don’t know what, what, what-
C: That’s incredible.
B: hh you know, those days.
C: Are you the only child?
B: No, and then my brother was born the following year as well. The same thing as well. He was born far away in P***** S****** ‘cause my mom’s sister used to live in P***** S******. So: (.) She would go there, have us and then we’ll stay with my mom’s sister and while she rushes back to work you know. hh. Alright, uhm, then I started school. ‘Cause then, because also of poverty and all those things, you know, I started school very, at a very young age. I was three years when I went to school to do uh, grade one. I went to -

B: Yes.
C: a crèche for you
B: Ja, I went to a nursery at about two and a half years old and then (.) at about three years, ten months, I started school, formal school education. Okay, then I, which was, which was to my advantage, because I was able to complete my Matric at fifteen, you know.
C: That’s amazing.
B: Ja. I just turned fifteen when I ( ) a Matric and, I finished my degree; I was eighteen when I completed my degree< which helped, you know. Ja.; it was, it was a disadvantage, but it helped, you know.
C: Yes
B: I mean, even now, my mom always says now, she won’t do that to any child. ‘cause it robs the child of their childhood. You are (responsible)-
C: That’s correct.
B: at an earlier age, you know, uh, ‘cause while other kids were (.) sitting (.) in their mom’s laps and not worrying about anything, I was already at school and sitting in a classroom with older kids, you know.
C: Yes.

B: Like three years older than me ’cause they were formal age to start school is seven, you know and there I was, four, you know, a:nd. So: -

C: So, she didn’t have much of a choice then?

B: But, she didn’t have much of a choice, cause, eh-

C: She couldn’t tell anybody about the fact that she was pregnant. I mean-

B: No.

C: Did they know she was pregnant?

B: The other black nurses, that they knew but even a black chief matron , you know the person in charge of ( ) they didn’t, they didn’t know, ’cause they, they would tell, you know. People, usually black people, uh , those days, in senior positions, you know, because of apartheid and that they wou, wou would like tell to the (. ) like informers, you know, they would inform and I don’t blame them, you know, it’s how it was presented to them , you know. °That maybe, uh, and also to get benefit, I’m sure there was financial benefit°,

C: Correct.

B: °for that as well, ja.° So, that’s why she, she was quite lucky, you know, she never got too big a tummy, you know. So the common thing, you know, and if you are married, my mom put it off, uhm, waited for seven years before she would have her first child in her marriage thinking that things were going to change, you know,

C: That is incredible.

B: (that usually they would get maternity leave, whatever)

C: She waited for seven years because of political reasons?

B: Yes, because of political reasons that black nurses were not allowed, even though married, were not allowed as they didn’t qualify for maternity leave, you know.

C: right

B: hh. Okay and then, hh I went to: hh (2) a school and then after that I went to a, a, a, black boarding school . It was S***** H***** in Durban, uh, uhm it was run by, uh nuns in the convent . Uhm, I spent five years there. It was lo: vely, I, mostly have good memories of the place but uhh, it was very strict, you know, no boys and, and you know how the nuns are as well, they’re not open to tell you about the real facts of-

C: of

B: of the real world, you know.

C: yes

B: Everything was like hidden, you know, hidden, hidden, hidden.

C: Yes, I used to teach at a convent. Hahaha.

B: Hahahaha.

C: Yes, I agree.

B: You know like not even sex education ( )

C: That’s correct.

B: But, I was very lucky to have very open-minded parents, and uhm, plain -talking you know, my mom would just drew this hh picture of an ovary and she says > “if you don’t use contraception you will fall pregnant”, you know<. Whereas at school, we were, we
were never told things like those, you know. So, during school vacation, my friends would teach me sex education, teach me about boys you know, try and, so that you could mix with boys. When I got to university, it wasn’t a shock for me,

C: Correct.

B: to be in a class with men, you know. C: Yes.

B: I know, quite a lot of my friends, immediately, after Matric, being exposed to the outside world, fell pregnant. You know, have kids, you know. You’ll find a lot of hh black professionals, female, most of them, have kids, you know.

C: Ja.

B: Because of uh all these hidden, uhm, sort of like, ru:les and, and, and-

C: when you say the black professional women, that you’re specifically referring to?

B: Yes, women. Yes, women. Ja, I’ve got, uh, it’s, it’s not uncommon fo., to have, to know a black professional, who’s got a chi:ld, you know.

C: Yes.

B: Ja. Normally they’ll get those child when they’re like eighteen when they know nothing as well.

C: Correct

B: Ja: But, uhm,

C: And you wouldn’t say, is it, is it tradition?

B: No.

C: It’s being ignorant?

B: It’s being ignorant, because of the expo:sure, you know

C: It’s not being told.

B: It’s not being taught, yes

C: Ja.

B: Ja, at ho:me, you know. One: with o:ur culture, parents cannot speak to you about sex, you know. I mean I cannot sit in the same room with my fa:ther, you know, and have general chats about this and that and-

C: even today

B: No, today. Okay, it, in my family, it’s different, because my parents are very open-minded, <

C: Okay.

B: I sit in my dad’s lap and I tell him whatever I think of, you know. Uhh, but I know in most families, that doesn’t happen, you know.

C: It’s a taboo

B: It’s a taboo, you know. That’s how ( ) men are sitting. You sit, I mean, you can’t even look at your father straight in the eye, you know.

C: because of respect

B: Because of respect, a sign of respect, you know, So, you can imagine, somebody growing up in a home like that and then suddenly being exposed to (. ) university, with all types of (. ) races, and tri:bes and ah, cultures, you know. It’s easy to be swayed, you know and uhm, if you ha., don’t have a, a, a firm background and knowledgeable, then it’s easy to fall pregnant, you know.

C: Correct

B: ‘Cause, ‘cause, li. naïve, ‘cause we’re naïve, ja, ja
C: Ja
B: So: okay, I did my. I was lucky ‘cause I got a b********* bursary when I was doing
Matric° ‘cause they went around, uh, black schools and, and sponsored like the , uhm (.)
good students. So: they paid for all my tuition, you know, uhm. So, I star., I did my
degree for, over four years at Natal and then, uhm, did my postgraduate diploma after that
. And I did my articles with E******** a:nd uhm, for three years a:nd so: because they
sponsored me I had to come back and work for them,
C: Right
B: That’s why I’m still working for them today, ja, for a two year service obligation with
them°. But I mean, which to me is not actually, hmmm (2) a big thing. I love what I’m
doing here, I think I was placed in the right place, you know.
C: Hmm
B: Uhh, traditionally, I know, many people were sponsored by this big uhm corporations
that when they ‘cause now, when they started working they would just be placed
anywhere you know, which affected. That’s why people didn’t stay long in their jobs
you know, they were unha:ppy.
C: Right
B: °You know, ja: No, I’m quite happy where I am, ja°.
C: Okay, can I ask you-
B: hmm?
C: A bit about your family life?
B: Okay
C: You say that it’s very open.
B: Ye:s
C: That you have a very good and open relationship with both your parents.
B: Parents. Ye:s.
C: Tell me a bit about your father.
B: Okay. My father is, uhm, a very religious man. He had, is ver, when I (.) was
growing up (.) I thought he was very stern, you know, and ah, strict, you know.
B: Hmm.
B: Uh, the older I became the more, I realized that he is so loving, he’s a loving father.
°He just wants the best for us and .hh and° so and these good, taught me very good
principles in life, like a good solid foundation, a Christian foundation, you know. Uuh,
my father is sixty now. He’s retired, you know, u:hm °We still talk every now and then,
you know°.
C: Okay
B: °At E****** Hospital, in, as far as back, you know, at the black government
hospital, hm°.
C: and, can I ask you, when people in your family life, as far back as you can remember,
when decisions have to be made, who made the major decisions in your family?
B: °My mo(h)ther°.
C: Your mother!
B: Hahah, ja. °My mother°.
C: Why is that?
B: Uhhhhm, I think, one, because of her personality.
C: Tell me a bit more.
B: She’s got a very strong personality, you know. My Mo:m, uhh, I can tell you so much about my . My mo:m was a nurse but part-time, she used to sell >uhhh, was in private selling, you know, selling for this companies. Today you have the Glo-Mails and stuff. But then she used to work for P********<
C: that’s right
B: a company that does, ja , bedding , you know.
C: Yes
B: And she excelled in that, you know. My mo:m, uuhm, did her, uhm, studied uhhm, at M***** College in Durban, in a in a convent school as well . hh Completed her nursing training and then worked but I think in the Eighties she reali:sed that it wasn’t enough. She started to, studying part-time, she did, my Mo:m got her degree at 45 year’s old. Her first degree.
C: Wonderful
B: Ja. Studying part-time and she still excelled, you know, she always-
C: what did she study for, B?
B: BSc in nursing.
C: Right
B: Or BA Nursing, I dunno.
C: I think it is BSc.
B: Ja, BSc, ja and she uhm (.) did that, excelled, you know, she was even also offered a, a, a bursary at Unisa to do her Honours,
C: Right
B: for, for free.
C: wonderful
B: Ja. While working and raising us up and still selling, you know. So: as much as uhm, nurses earned very little then, like R500 a mon:th black nurses, but, she ha, could augment income by doing this private selling you know, and which she excelled and did very well. Got to tour the wo:rd through that, you know, ‘cause, no, no, normally, the best seller for the year , they would sponsor them a ticket to overseas ticket ,or a ticket to Cape Town, or a ticket . hh around on the boat, you know°- C: When was this that she started her selling, how old was she more or less ? B: Okay, she told me she’s been, she’s been selling all her life, actually. When she w. , in ,in the Seventies, as early as the Seventies.
C: Yes
B: She was sewing night caps, you know, for, for bed-time caps. She was selling, I rem. even when I was a little child, we would go down to Durban on a week-end and she would go to these Indian shops and buy shoes and shi:rts and stuff, you know . And then, sell that and then my father, after work, would go and collect the money from the people , you know and then they’ll save, ‘cause we used to live in a tiny four-roomed house then.
C: right
B: And my parents wanted a bigger (. ) house, you know, so they (. ) did their private selling , I think for three or four years (. ) and saved a lot of money and then build our house where they’re currently living even now. Cash (. ) you know. So, they always. They
were visionaries, they always knew, ( ) rose against all odds to ( ) ensure that we had a
very comfortable life you know A:nd, uh, I mean , then , black females didn’t own ca:rs,
but Mom had a ca:r ’cause she was into this private selling , making a lot of money and
that, you know.
C: So she had her own car
B: ’She had her own car, then and even now. I mean , she still has her own car”. 
C: She’s actually a very independent woman.
B: She’s VERY, oh, she’s very independent. That’s why I say, she makes (. ) all
decisions , at home, you know.
C: Yes
B: ‘Cause, uuhh, my FA:THER, I think also because of different backgrounds, you know.
My mo:m, my mo:m’s elder sister as well is, is a very intelligent lady whereas my
father’s side, none of them, they’re not that educated, you know.
C: Correct
B: So, as a result, they <don’t thi:nk of things> they just think of things differently . But
my father, I respect her in the sense that , he knows where (.) how far to go , he knows
where to give my mo:m space, to explo:re and uh, uhm, and, and, and take her ideas you
know and follow them, you know, ’cause uh, look I remember, my mo:m said (. ) there
was no way we were going to study in local schools then , you know .It’s better that we
must go to boarding school .> I think my father was opposed to us being<, so away from
home.
C: Correct
B: But because of the township violence then, you know because of (. ) all this and .hh
ri:ots against apartheid,
C: Correct
B: you know. We were going to have to, it was going to dis, disrupt our education, you
know. My pare, parents had to send us AWAY, into boarding school, (. ) SEE US O:NCE
IN THREE MONTHS > but at least we got the best education< and no: dis, disruptions,
you know.
C: Yes
B: Ja, I mean even when I had to choose what to do, my father, wanted ( ) to do, to
pursue medicine, you know, but my mo:m said there’s no money in medicine, you know.
She’d lived with do:ctors and she (.) sees do:ctors everyday and they work hard and
there’s no money in medicine. I must just do this thing called chartered accountancy, you
know. THEN, that was 1992. There was one black female South, CA in South Africa,
you know. >And I don’t know where my mo:m had heard of this career< .
C: Hm
B: She brought books, she made sure I met somebody, a guidance teacher who told me
about it, you know. She got this, uh, I don’t know, she got this booklet >from the
University of Natal, all the companies who are sponsoring people who want to be CA’s
and I applied to each and every one of them.
C: Yes
B: for sponsorship, you know, ’cause there was no way they could afford varsity tuition.
C ( )
B: Maybe they were going to< but I was going to be a day scho:lar, may:be not stay in
res.,
C: Correct
B: or have to work, part-time, you know. So:
C: Ja
B: .hh I mean, she’s always been open-minded, you know, about everything.
C: Very liberal
B: Ja, and very visio-, very liberal and visionary. LI(h)KE, even no(h)w, my mo:ther when she, she just goes on holiday when she wants to go whether my father wants to go or not. She’ll go-
C: Hahaha
B: haha . with her friends or her sister, you know-
C: Yes, so very untraditional
B: Ja, very untraditional.
C: from a background point of view
B: But then, my father >that’s why I say I respect him< because he understands my mother’s personality and he doesn’t stifl:le her growth you know, instead (. ) supports her, you know. So like, now, over the holidays, my mom, went down to the Eastern Cape with me, and my father remained at home, you know and he didn’t phone, to say that we must come back now, or this and that and that, gave uh, us his blessing, gave us pocket money, and you know.
C: that is wonderful
B: So, he’s VERY SUPPORTIVE
C: yes
B: he’s not threatened by my mo:ther’s personality, you know.
C: would you say that is what the general, uhm
B: NO:
C: father figure would be like
B: NO, no.
C: to be very threatened
B: No, in most homes the father makes all decisions. I’ll tell you an example, my, my cousin, you know, my cousin is, comes, exactly, her fa:ther is my father’s brother and uhm, her mo:m is a nurse too, her father is a businessman. But her father is very domineering, you know.
C: Right
B: As a result, my cousin had no say, you know and their mother has no say, the father just made, whatever the father says goes, and uh (. ) the father has been very wrong at times you know and uh; which has led to the family also following that lead, that wrong lead, you know.
C: Correct
B: So: and also (. ) Ja, I, I, many, many bla:ck families you .I mean , I know ,people have told my father oh, you’re stupid how could you let your wi:fe, uhm walk all over you, you know-
C: but that’s how they see it
B: Ja, it’s how they see it; it’s how it’s seen.
C: Give me an example of what they mean?
B: Okay.
C: when they say that-
B: Okay, like my mom, with her selling, you know,
C: Right
B: to sell at night> you know I told you she is, she was a nurse.
C: Yes
B: So, she ‘d start work at seven to seven, you know, so come back from work, change, take her, with cat, with P*******, she had a catalogue, take her catalogue, her forms her little suitcase and go: walk out you know, that is like half past seven at night.
C: Dedicated.
B: Dedicated, you know. So, in most families, to let a wo:man go: at half past seven and people start thinking, oh, she’s had (. ) affairs, you know.
C: Right
B: ( ) She would come back home at twelve –
C: I think in any culture they would.
B: In any culture they would think that. She’ll complete her forms, complete the forms, and complete, you know her, to process her sales, then (go) to sleep at two in the morning. Uhm, you know, what I said, the majority of cultures wouldn’t have a wi:fe (.) leaving at night and going to do: .
C: and he accepted it
B: and he accepted it ( ) OH, and sometimes ( )
C: and people don’t like it
B: PEOPLE DON’T LIKE IT, <my fa:ther’s family >was very opposed to that you know . Like my grandmother will say, > “Oh, my mother loves money too much< you know, as a nurs:e, she should be fine”, you know. But she wants, she loves money too much, you know. They’ll say things like those in our presence, in the presence of my fa:ther, you know, to try and stir some uhhhh,
C: discontent
B: discontent, you know, but my father just ignored all of those things you know
C: what would they fight about, if they fight?
B: My parents, if they fl:ght, ja. I know they do fl:ght. They fl:ght usually, it’s about okay, like in my cultu:re women are not supposed to wear pants, you know.
C: Right
B: In chu:rch, our chu:rch women have to wear ha:ts , and uh, long skirts . hh and my mother doesn’t like that .
C: Haha
B: You see, my mother paints her, paints her nails and she has lo:vely, big hair, uh, lo:ng hair, you know.
C: Yes
B: so: my father always insists that when they go to church my mo:ther wears something over her hair. So, my mom, okay, will put something on her hair >but immediately after church she takes it out< you know and then (. ) <my father would like, sco:ld her for that< you know and rec(h)ently, their biggest fl:ght (ahah) recently was . See, my father doesn’t fl:ght, he just says one word that destroys you, haha.
C: Ja.
B: hahah
C: Hahaha
B: (He’s not) going to scream or whatever you know, just gives you that look and you feel SO guilty, you know that uh, you take.

C: Quiet discipline

B: QUIET, QUIET, discipline. Hahaha. So, like this day, my mo:ther at her work, now she’s a lecturer, you know. They had, uhm, Christmas lunch, you know. My mom wore her nice pants and a jacket and then my father saw her, you know in the kitchen,

C: This is not going to church

B: this is not going to ch-

C: this is for Christmas lunch

B: this is for Christmas lunch. Ja: but you see, WITH OUR CULTURE, if people in church, if they see her in the kitchen, you know.
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C: This is not going to church

B: this is not going to ch-

C: this is for Christmas lunch
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B: this is for Christmas lunch. Ja: but you see, WITH OUR CULTURE, if people in church, if they see her in the kitchen, you know.
C: Ja, I didn’t know that
B: Ja, ja, (no, I know). African ladies are not supposed to wear pants. You’ll find that my generation, our generation (.) wears pants.
C: Hmm
B: But people (. ) older like 50 and above, don’t wear pants, you know.
C: So what are you saying by wearing pants?
B: But THINGS CHANGED you know, WE WENT, I mean, I went to university, my parents never went to a university and there’s no way I was going to be wearing skirts at university,
C: right
B: when everybody was in jeans. So, it’s, it’s also because of our orientation and mixing with different cultures, you know.
C: Yes
B: But I mean, my father was born in the deep bundus of KwaZulu Natal, at I****** in a rural place, where they had to fetch water from 20 kilometres away.
C: Yes
B: You know, walk barefoot to school, so you can imagine if somebody grew up like that, you know. It’s kind of difficult for him. And then, all of a sudden when he’s like 30, 40, things changed you know, uh, was exposed to this modern world, you know.
C: Right
B: And so, it’s quite difficult for him to make that uhm, transition, you know. ( )
C: How does he cope with it, if seeing you wear suits ( ) What does he say?
B: Ja, Nothing. He says nothing to me . You see, it’s because of his supportiveness. I think he’s learned to understand, you know,
C: Hmm
B: and learnt to (understand) that I’m younger you know, but still hahaha I think he can still, hahah, uhh, exercise his dominance over my mother and
C: So, but it doesn’t count for you?
B: No, it doesn’t count for me or my sister.
C: But, but that’s-
B: ° It counts for my mother, ja:
C: How many siblings are you ?
B: Three. It’s me, my, my elder sister and then my brother.
C: So, it only counts, it only applies to your mother?
B: It only applies, ja
C: and to the other older women in your family?
B: Ehh-
C: Do they listen to their husbands when they, do they have those kinds ( )
B: You see OTHERS don’t even wear pants, ehh, like my, my, my aunts, you know and uncles, their wives just don’t wear pants, you know, they’re always in skirts, you know.
C: What do they think of your mother (do you think)?
B: OH, I know
C: Hahaha
They always think she’s talkative, she likes money, you know. But my mother, couldn’t be bothered you know. I think, my mother knows what she wants, what I like about her she knows what she wants in life.

In spite of other perceptions. You know when she was studying her degree, hh people told her, “Oh why are you studying at 40, I mean, that’s not gonna help you. It’s not going to take you anywhere, you know”.

In a modern world, one day there won’t be apartheid,

C: Yes. thung I, I stayed at, at, with my parents, I bought my own car.

B: How old was she when she got her car?

B: ° oh, my mother when she was 48°.

C: Yes, but she got the licence.

B: She got the licence, you know, hahaha

C: Right

B: So she always had it, ja.

C: Okay, so, it’s the car.

B: ‘cause I know she was the first car she bought was in 1989, this was (when she had her car for the first time) you know. hh So: , no, I’m okay, and even now, I live on my own now, I’ve got my own house, and, uhhm. even, even decisions that I make, it’s , I’m I’m so: like my mother. Ja, no, all of us actually, even my bro: ther , he’s so: much like my mother° uh my sister, as well, she’s so: much like my mother° Because she’s always been the stronger personality, you know, ja.

C: And what of your father’s qualities have you got?

B: <Okay, mmm(.) patience, I know I’ve got that and (. ) kindness, my father’s very kind, you know. < Eh> which doesn’t mean that my mother is not kind, my mother is a go–getter you know, ( ) People mistake go-getters for aggressive people whereas my mother’s very kind, I know . Actually, sometimes, I think my mother is not assertive.

She’s a loud mouth, but she’s not assertive, you know ((smiling)).

C: Yes, she’s not strong enough ( )

Ja, she’s not strong enough for, for her, to stand for her rights, you know< Ja: Eh, my father, I’ve got that and uhm, honesty. My father is a very honest man, you know.
C: Hmm
B: I think they’ve been married now for 40 years you know and they’ve been, throughout these years they’ve been, my father I’m sure has never cheated on my mother. He’s been very loyal you know. Ja: Even though he didn’t earn a lot of money, but every cent he brought home you know.
C: They were a team.
B: They were a team, sort of, yes. I remember, like month-end after pay-day they will have a meeting, the two of them, and I think maybe, probably decide how much money they have this month how much to spend, how much to save. That’s why they uhhm, I mean, by the time they were 50 they had no debt. My parents have never had debt. They, if they need to buy a car, they’d buy it for cash. They plan.
C: wonderful
B: Ja, they’d sit down and ( ). So, my mother is the hard worker, my father is not going to go and sell, my mother will go and sell but my father will go and collect the money.
C: Yes, so they’ll support one another
B: Support one another, save together, and then ( .) make a decision as to what to do with the money.
C: And how would you say, uhm, you are different from your mother
B: Okay, uh, I’m different from my mother in the sense that ( .) I know my rights, you know. My mom, if somebody. If you are in a restaurant and she gets bad service, she’ll accept that and it’s so unlike her. She’ll accept that and she’ll ( .) wouldn’t stir trouble, you know.
C: Right
B: Whereas, if I get bad service, I’ll ask immediately, what is ( .) going on, you know. I want, I demand, good service, you know.
C: Why, do you think, she’s like that
B: I think, you know what, your upbringing goes a long way, you know. So, even though she might have been educated at a later age in life, but that thirty years where she was not educated, where ( .) excuse me, she lived in an oppressed society, shows you know. Her upbringing just shows, clearly. She went also to a convent school -
C: Yes
B: you know in Mar, in ( ) seminary and that was in (like) the 50’s, you know, so: where things were even worse for women then, you know.
C: Hmm
B: So, that side of her always comes out, every now and then. I can, uh, always see it, you know.
C: And what do you say to her when you see that happens?
B: MA: you know, stick up, you know. And she’ll say, you like to… just leave it, you know. But also, you know, other things comes with maturity, you know. I’m YOUNG
C: That’s right
B: and uh, rebellious, whereas, at an ( .) older age, you get to understand things, look at things differently and, and, and. And, if it doesn’t bother you, you let it go, you know.
Only if it bothers you, whereas, I speak for the sake of, of speaking for my rights, you know. Hahaha.

C: Okay, I was going to say, what would you not let go?

B: Ja, haha

C: at this stage, you know?

B: What would I not let go?  No, at this age, uh actually nothing, uhh, that’s why my mom always says, I won’t get married if I go along this way ‘cause with guys, sometimes, even though, you know you’re right;

C: Yes

B: you have to pretend you are wrong and ah,(I always tell her that’s not on) Uhh, I can’t .

C: Would you do that, B?

B: I would never, maybe that’s why I don’t have a relationship, you know. My relationships don’t last because uhm, guys, one, feel threatened, you know.

C: Yes

B: by the fact that, not because. I just think they like that understanding (1) that uhm, (.3) in spite of (.) what I may have, what I may have achieved, I still need love, little things still make me happy, you know.

C: Hmm

B: Whereas, I find that men think, oh my gosh ( ) look at that, she’s an expensive maintenance, you know.

C: Haha

B: (laughing) Whereas, I don’t want their money, you know, and, you (.) people, I mean sometimes you want your own private spa. I, I had, was seeing this guy who was a doctor. And one of the things he used to complain about was that uhm, I like my own space. But I, I could never see how, what he meant by that. I mean, I come back from work, sometimes I’m just tired, I just need to be by myself, for like three hours maybe have a bath, my own time, then maybe see him after that. Or if I don’t see him in one day, it’s okay with me, you know, or, or for a whole week if I don’t see him, it’s okay with me.

C: Ja

B: But, uhm he just didn’t understand that, you know

C: What did he expect?

B: He expected to see me every day, you know and us to do stuff together, go to movies every day. You know stuff. Whereas, ( . ) okay, their, their work is very much a physical, eh, walk around the whole day, you know. Whereas ours is, my mind just needs to rest. I need peace and quiet around me,

C: Ja

B: whereas he needs to sit down and drink in a bar. Relax, you know. Whereas I just need (. ) quiet time, even if I’m standing u(h)p.

C: Ja(h)a

B: Quiet time to just cool off, you know. So, we always used to fight about that, you know. Ja eventually, the relationship never worked, you know. °

C: And any other relationship, what reasons

B: They, okay-

C: why did they not work?
B: not work? Okay .hh UHMM. Okay, my, I’ll (.) I can always remember, I know that
I’m like my mother, (.) >sometimes I look at my first relationship. .hh I met this guy at
university doing his final year in B. Com, I was doing my first year < .hh Very nice guy,
very handsome, but (.) he was so much like my father, he was very (.) °women rule,
amale rule you know. I couldn’t do this, I couldn’t do that . .hh and, okay, we went out for
like two years you know°.
C: Hmm
B: °But, one day I realized, you know, this is not what I want to do. I want to do bigger
things in life, you know°
C: Right
B: A:nd, sort of, you know other guys mistake respect (.) for (.) subservience, and
also, no ambition. If you’re ambitious then you’re not respectful.
C: Correct
B: I found that with guys, if you have, if you earn a good salary and drive a good car,
then you’re not respectful. You are (.) uh, you know, he was the type of guy.
C: Ja, aggressive almost?
B: Aggressive, almost.
C: Ja.
B: Okay (this is not) wife material, you know. <Wife material is somebody who’s not
ambitious, who’s a local teacher, who: has no dreams, who depends on them for, you
know. I don’t see what’s wrong eh, going to a restaurant and paying for your own meal,
you know, eh >
C: He couldn’t take it.
B: <And they couldn’t take things like those, you know>. But, I also find it to be abusive,
you know. Sometimes when I paid, he’d (allow me to pay,) you know. So, when it suited
him, you know.
C: Interesting
B: Ja, when it suited him. <he would forget (.) that (.) I’m female ,
C: Yes
B: you know. Men are very selfish ( ).
C: The roles are almost reversed
B: The roles are almost reversed, you know. When it suits him, when he’s going to
benefit, you know.
C: Ja
B: When it suits him, but where, normally, under normal conditions, on a normal day
C: and, uhm, these guys that you date, are most of them professionals?
B: Yes, yes. I’ve only dated professionals. Uhh, than I found when I saw a guy that was a
doctor, you know. Okay, we had a very good relationship with him, but uh, shame, it was
very sad because he grew up in Ghana (.) in -
C: as a foreigner
B: Yes, a foreigner, so he was a friend of South Africa. I met him actually through my
mo:m and uh, we were° friends, friends, friends, but then there was this lady, from
Ghana, you know, whom he had a child with.
C: Right
B: And it was expected in his community that they would marry and you know. So: our relationship, I always used to say NOW, it was always doomed from the start because there was always this woman behind, you know, from the start. 

C: the shadow 

B: The shadow, you know. So, we went out for three years, but uhm, "he couldn’t be strong enough to tell his folks that he can’t marry this girl, you know. And I could also see that this, you know. You know, he will take five steps towards breaking off with her and family peacefully, but then ten steps back, you know. Let them decide for him what to do, you know. So, I know it was going to be a ba, an ongoing factor for the next. That means we’re not going anywhere with this guy, you know°.

C: JA

B:° He likes me very much but, uhm, there’s this other woman. He can’t make a decision, you know. He can’t hurt her, you know and the family, and which I hh. Okay, then, with time I also got to understand, you know what, just the how you grow up, plays such a big role, you know, because with me, you know. With him it was just his word, he promised that he would marry her one day, you know°.

C: Right

B:° And he just couldn’t (. in spite of the fact that he didn’t lo:ve her, he just couldn’t break his promise, you know ‘cause in his community and his uhm (.2)°

C: Culture

B: °<culture, you know, it wasn’t respectful, you know. Ja, so it was dragging the family name down, you know so, eventually I broke off with him, you know. We’re still very good friends, but uhm>°;

C: But you could see it was going nowhere

B: Ja, I could see it was going nowhere. You know, he had very good intentions, or , supported me (. career-wise. I remember when I was doing my board exams-

C: A lot like your dad supported your mom

B: No, ja, a lot like my dad to my mom, you know. Very, very supportive. Ja, in a career you know. I, I used to always think, you go out with a man like your fa:ther, ‘cause he was so much like my fa:ther

C: They say that don’t they?

B: JA. I’m telling you, he was so honest,

C: Mmm

B: and so simple, you know. °My mo:ther, whereas I’m like my mother. I wear a lot of jewellery, and ah°,

C: Lovely

B: and hahaha, buy fancy cars, you know, haha

C: Hahah

B: You know, my mom drives a Mercedes, my father only drives a Toyota, he’s always had a Toyota and he’s content with it.

C: That’s incredible.

B: I’m telling you, you know. And this guy, he was a do:ctor, but he used to sa:ve his mo:ney ehm ,but supported me(,) in my career. Like, it’s stressful to write Board examinations, you know. He supported me throughout my board exa:ms and wanted me
to just, he was even telling me, no, now I must do an MBA or something you know.
He's that type of a guy, you know. So much like my Dad, you know and so honest. I mean he when he met me, he told me exact, the very first date he told me about this girl, that he really likes me, but he doesn't know if I, if I'll be able to understand it, there's this girl in Ghana. I mean I could have gone out with him for three years and never knew about this.

B: 'cause uh-
C: He's honest at least.
B: Ja, he spoke from the very word go and I knew I made an informed decision,
°when I started the relationship, I knew there was this girl in the background, you know°
But, uh, (he's very) so much like my father. My father is a very honest person, you know. I know, I can tell you, you know when I was younger when my friends visited, and I, my father: my parents would tell us to do homework,

C: Yes
B: and have a bath by four o'clock. I knew when my father comes home by five past four (smiling), so four o'clock, my friends would go away,

C: Haha
B: without fail, five past four, my father would be at home, you know 'cause he's such an honest person and you know, and dedicated person, I just uh, know my father never beat me up. Never ever gave any of us hidings, whenever °we did something wrong he would call us and say, B***, why did you do this? Do you realize (that) the consequences of doing this and this and this and apologise and that's it°.

C: He would talk to you
B: Talk to me.
C: Instead of beat you.
B: Never, never, ever, ever, whereas in our culture people get hidings all the, parents just give hidings. My father never has never given me a hiding, you know.
C: Yes. What is the one word that he used to sort of crush you? Is there a word ( )
B: Ja. WHY? He just asks you why and then (.) you can't answer. Hahah (You just go h h h) ((Makes strangling noise)). Hahaha.
C: Then you know.

B: Then you know, hahaha. °Ja, and the serious face, then you know that you: (2)'ve gone wrong, yes°.
C: and would you argue with him sometimes?
B: Ja:ja: But we don't argue really. We just talk and I (. present my facts. And .hh he sometimes, it's okay not to agree with each other, what (is ) is to respect each other, so: (2) you know (1) I can't (. give an example, but (. I know that (there) are things I can't do in my father’s presence, and yet (. he knows that I do those things when, when he's away. >Or maybe like bringing a a guy home<.
C: hmm
B: >In our culture you can't bring a guy home to spend a weekend with your folks you know.
C: Ja
B: sort of like keep your relationships a secret. So, he, he knows I’ve got relationships but I must respect him<.

C: Yes, yes
B: Ja. But I must respect him enough that I don’t bring those guys home, you know.

C: But, he knows about it

B: But he knows exactly that I’ve (got relationships).

C: But, but it’s quiet

B: ‘It’s quiet, you know. It’s just understood.

C: Have you ever tried to talk to him about that?

B: JA.

C: Is it taboo in your culture?

B: hh N (h)o, no: You know why, because I know what happens in other families and I, I’m just quite grateful that in my home I can be myself, you know.

C: Have you ever tried to talk to him about that?

B: JA.

C: Argue about it.

B: not trying to change him.

C: Compromise.

B: that’s wonderful

C: and you say that, a lot of other people it doesn’t work like this?

B: Hmm

C: most other families?

B: most families. Most black families. Okay (.) things have changed now, you know.

°Most black families now are liberal with education and all these things, but I know from my father’s family. They all come from this rural area. How they behave and what they think, even things like ancestor worship, you know.

C: Compromise.

B: compromise, ja.

C: that’s wonderful

B: ja, and it works.

C: and you say that, a lot of other people it doesn’t work like this?

B: Hmm

C: most other families?

B: most families. Most black families. Okay (.) things have changed now, you know.

°Most black families now are liberal with education and all these things, but I know from my father’s family. They all come from this rural area. How they behave and what they think, even things like ancestor worship, you know.

C: right

B: They slaughter these and this cows to you know to: worship their ancestors and my father doesn’t partake in that you know. We’ll go to the functions but we won’t eat there.

C: right

B: But we’ll just make our presence felt and then just leave (.) quietly.

C: out of respect
B: Out of respect, you know and, and, and leave quietly. So: that’s why I say, I know I’m grateful. So, what’s the use to argue about something that I know that I can do in my home here, in, in Johannesburg.

C: Yes

B: I can do whatever I want here, whereas when I’m at home in Maritzburg, I must just behave, accordingly, you know. He must feel that he’s the father, that’s why I say, I know, I’m grateful. So, what’s the use to argue about something that I can do in my home here, in Johannesburg.

C: Ja

B: that I’m the daughter, I’m the child.

C: and it keeps you both happy that way.

B: It keeps us both happy that way. I’m contented that way. That’s way I; also with my relationships I’ve seen it. As much as uhm, I’m very liberal, that’s why I need a very strong man who’s very, who knows, who’s confident in himself.

C: Right

B: ‘Cause when you find a guy who’s not confident in themselves, when they see that you are willing to give him his place, then they take advantage, you know, o, o, of you, that that boyfriend of mine I was that pay in the restaurant, you know. Then, eventually, I became the person who’d pay all the time, you know.

C: Yes

B: He didn’t realize that I was paying out of respect, trying to meet him half way. Then he took advantage, you know. Was stu, a stupid guy.

C: Ja

B: I need a very intelligent man who sees these attributes, you know and respects them, you know and not take advantage of them, you know.

C: How did that end, that relationship.

B: Ah, I was very young, I was eighteen. It ended very badly. I just told him to get lost, you know.

C: Did you tell him the reason?

B: No, I didn’t. I just phoned him ‘Cause he has a very (demanding) personality. I was very scared to tell him in his face, you know.

C: Hmm

B: So what I did, he was also very much uh was seven years older than me, you know. So: one day I just phoned him, hahaha...

C: Hahaha

B: and then he said he would like to see me and then I said, “No I’m not available”, hahaha..h Then, one day, I saw him, when I like a year later, you know and then I couldn’t be bothered, you know. Ja.

C: I want to ask you just to reflect maybe on the differences

B: Hmmm

C: between your life, now

B: Yes

C: and how your mother grew up.

B: Okay. Very differently.

C: You know, I mean not even personalities, I’m just thinking how you experience life right now as a young, professional black woman

B: Yes, hmmm

C: in this country
B: Hmmm. No, hmmm, the fact that I had a car at 21, I mean I was 20, 19 or 20 the first time I ( ) my mother only had her first car at 40 something. How I’m experiencing… I’m experiencing life to the fullest, you know. There’s opportunities available and I’m just grabbing them. You know, I’m leaving B*****, I’m, I’m lea: I’m leaving South Africa next month –

C: I believe so

B: to go to Canada. Hmmm, you know. Those opportunities were not available at my mother’s days, my, my parents days, you know and, I don’t think even if they were available they wouldn’t have taken them (.) because of the fear that (.) uhm they won’t get married if you go away out of the country for so long , you know?

C: Right

B: I:, I:, if you have a relationship here, the relationship takes precedence, you know. Sort of like, natural progression at this age. You have to be married at this age and you’ll have kids, you know. NOW I’m not worried. I mean, maybe when I come back to South Africa, I’ll be thirty years old. I’m not worried that I’ll, maybe I’ll marry somebody overseas, who knows, you know and uh, I could marry a white person (.) immediately. My mother I’m sure, would never agree hahaha.

C: Hahahaha.

B: hahaha, you know. Ja:you know, I’ve got white friends, and my mom has got white friends too, but it’s just colleagues, you know. I’ve got white friends, I go out with my white friends in the evenings and (2) I just don’t (.) you se: (.) I don’t (.) with me (.) race is, is there because it’s different and I’m curious to learn about how these other people live and I’m curious ( ). Whereas in my mother’s days, in my mother’s times, you sort of like knew but you are not curious enough to explore or mingle with them°. That fear there was so much fear around them those days°

C: Yes, and also I think so much silence

B: Silence, yes, °silence, silence, silence°.

C: People didn’t talk.

B: No, they didn’t talk. °No, they didn’t talk ° There are things you just don’t talk about, you know, ja. That coupled with the black culture, as well,

C: Hmm

B: which is always like, only speak when spo(h)ken to .you know.

C: Yes

B: uh, adds, you know to mould their personalities somehow, you know.

C: What do you talk to your white friends about? Or to your friends?


C: You talk about absolutely everything.

B: Everything.

C: It’s not like your parents

B: No: It’s far different from my parents.

C: They knew about it but they didn’t talk

B: Yes, yes. And also like, I can have guy friends; my mother never had (. ) friends who are males (. ) °i:uh (. ) ° it was (. ) wrong to be seen with males°;

C: Yes
B: and you are loose girl you know, if you were always with guys, surrounded by men. I’ve got so many guy friends, we are just friends, you know, and it’s fine you know, and I respect also my parents that they respect that. They never (like) question me about those things, you know, and—> I respect also my parents that they respect that—>

C: and is it the same for your peers,

B: Hmm

C: your black friends?

B: JA for, for, for most of my friends, because we’ve experienced life at the same time and, and grown uh, to our different careers at the same time, I would say it’s almost identical, you know. But, I know, most of my friends now, most of them are married, now, or, “want to get married.”

C: Ja

B: That’s why it’s different. That maybe some of them, <still see marriage as the thing you know and (.) > uh, I, I think marriage is a good thing too but I think at the right time, you know, with the right person.

C: Hmm

B: I won’t just (.) go out with somebody, for the sake, you know, or marry them, just because they (.) proposed, you know. And, actually (.) I’m also now, I’m quite grateful now that I’m not married, because I wouldn’t be able to take this opportunity to go to Canada<, ‘cause if I had a husband, I think it would be selfish (.) to leave him (.) behind and, you know ( )

C: I was going to ask you about this job opportunity, uhm

B: Ja.

C: Uhm, if you think about, your, your work situation and everything

B: Yes.

C: How do you think things have changed? I mean if you think about your mother

B: Yes

C: Not being able to say that she’s pregnant

B: Mmm

C: uh, how are things different for you, as a, a black professional female

B: ( ) like, our company,

C: Ja

B: you see, I’m very lucky, I have a very open-minded boss, you know. And, uhm, I think (.) who’s very honest> because what, I know what’s happening with most company’s now at this day and age is that they, black females, especially chartered accountants you know, ( ) they are just moving (.) up the top

C: Hmm

B: and getting lots of money, you know, and uh, not based on their contribution to the company but to (.) ensure that their numbers are right, you know, employment equity-
C: tokenism?
B: Tokenism, you know. Whereas uh, here, <°when my boss told me when I joined, that you know what B, hh you’re not going to be: (. ) earning the best salary a:nd whatever, but .hh (. ) if you (.2) work hard, prove yourself, you will get the rewa:nds, you know>
C: Hmm
B: >Whereas, I know, with many companies, they load you with money, they (just tell you, you’ll be earning so much) they don’t tell you that you’re just in a position for the sake of being in the position.
C: mmm
B: uhm. Not being involved in any decision-making or uh, whatever, you’re just a puppet-<
C: and here
B: Here?
C: Do you speak out?
B: Yes.
C: Do you have a say?
B: If (. ) “I don’t want something, I’ll just walk straight to my boss’s office, knock and speak, you know.” But, I must say, that to me also, that has pushed me.
C: Hmm
B: I mean, I pushed myself to do that, when I first joined it was very difficult for me to go to my boss, a:nd, ‘cause he’s also old, you know, he’s like my father-figure to me
C: Oh, I see
B: you know, he’s 50 years old
C: Ja
B: and he, go, uh, an Afrikaans background (   )
C: Quite a big difference
B: Big difference, you know.
C: Hmm
B: So, to me he was more like a father than (1) than a boss, you know
C: Hmm
B: So, “I would have an opinion in a meeting but I would be so scared to speak ‘cause uh, uh, I mean (2)°
C: That respect
B: That respect, you know and (. ) we talked about it, you know. >That’s why I’m saying I’m so glad to have a boss like him °“cause he’ll ask me what (2) about this about black culture, what about this and I’ll ask him, what about your culture too, you know. And we’ve got an understanding, and as a result, NOW, if I want something, I mean, this morning, (he walked into) my office and said “B, why are you so quiet today?”
C: haha
B: But I was on the phone so I said “I’ll speak to you later” and afterwards I went to him and said, “No, I’m not quiet today, I’m just working hard, you know, for a, for a cha(h)nge, you know.” Haha, you know.
C: Hahah
B: Hahah, so there’s that. Because we understand each other (and where we come from). He’s very curious to know about what I’m doing and I’m very curious to know about him too:
C: Ja
B: .hh Actually, we’re very cultural(ly) diverse, my friend, my colleague next door is a Poli, a Polish speaking guy, he’s from Poland, .hh uhh, (L ) is English, (I ) is from Zimbabwe, Mohammed is Muslim -
C: ( )
B: Ja: So: my boss likes that, he doesn’t like ordinary people you know
C: Ja
B: He, he, wants something different, “and uh, he likes diversity, he embraces diversity°
C: and it works
B: and it works, you know, it works
C: if there had to be conflict here what would cause it?
B: “uhm, (.) actually (.) we’ve never had conflict and that’s ( ) one of my fears that maybe we’re not too honest with each other°
C: Ja
B: But (.) the way things work so: well, that even if (.) somebody had to do something wrong (.) or something that would hurt me, I would be able, because of the relationship , we have (.) with each other
C: Ja
B: “I would be able to speak with them, you know and tell them exactly that uh, I wasn’t happy. But I think we also respect each other so much that nobody would offend somebody intentionally, you know°
C: Yes
B: “Ja, no we .hh, this is almost a perfect scenario. We had a team-building the., last year and uh ,even the, the, the co-ordinator of, of the leader, team-leader, whatever (those guys) was , was so impressed °that we worked so well together, you know. We’ll do these team-building exercises whe. and swap us around and we could work with everyone of each other, comfortable you know°.
C: Male, female, whatever race or background?
B: Male, female, Indian, black, you know, ja .
C: So, well that’s lovely to hear
B: Hmmmm, hmmm, and that’s how, I think, I needed that in my, my career my experience, I’ve just started working. I needed something like that which has helped me, °made me a stronger person, you know. Whereas, maybe if I’d started working in an environment where, I, I knew that I was black and felt that I was black, maybe I wouldn’t be where I am today, you know °.
C: When you say uhm, you knew you were black and you felt that you were black , what specifically, do you mean?
B: Specifically, like OPPRESSED,
C: Ja
B: somehow, I couldn’t make decisions or, or PUSHED…
[Tape runs out. Is changed]
B: Uhh, what I meant was, you know when you start working, you could. I was lucky that I was exposed to uhm a department where (.) my boss (3)wanted (.) new under . Also: people don’t understand what has happened to black people in the past (.) you know. So, either they feel threa:tened that °this new constitution is now there to put black people on top, but it’s just r, correcting, all the imbalances of the pa:st you know. I think my boss
(.). understands, has got that understanding uhm, where black, black people come from and (.). he’s a visionary. He knows that no matter what he does, you can’t change the fact that we need more black people in, in senior positions, you know. So, when I joined here, he sat down with me and discussed my development plan and says, “B, this is where you are now, you know and, my: this organization would like to see you there, you know. You’re not; you’re not going to get there (.). easy and to promote you every month,

C: Right.

B: to get to that position, but if you do this and this and this and, study this and this and this, you will definitely get there”, you know. Whereas, my other colleagues, or (.). my other friends out there in other organizations, do not have somebody (.). that (.). committed to their change, you know.

C: Right

B: Or to their development, you know. Where people just get promoted without even understanding why: I’m being promoted you know. But (.). for the numbers, you know, the Employment Equity requires that at this management level, there should be (.). maybe 40% black -

C: Correct.

B: O., or female, and, and those, you know. And, uhm, so people are just being pushed, not because they deserve it but (.). because of the numbers, you know.

C: Right.

B: Ja, I think I was very lucky in the sense that uhm, I've got a very open-minded boss, you know, who:-

C: Ja, can I ask you

B: Yes

C: Just to end off the interview

B: Hmmm

C: thank you very much for your thoughts. Uhm your mother.

B: Yes

C: How does this make her feel, seeing things, seeing you now,

B: Ja, she’s very proud. My mother is very proud of, of what I have achieved, you know.

B: But she’s also very supportive, you know. Sometimes, also (.). I try: and, sometimes I think, I’m domineering, I make decisions for my mother now, I decide what she must wear now-

C: Haha

B: and, and I think it’s wrong, you know. I’m like, uhm, what can I say, like uh, undermining her beautiful (.). eh personality as well, you know. She might be, she might not have had the same experiences as me.

C: Right

B: but she’s a good person and you know I sit back and I like that innocence, the trust, you know

C: Hmm

B: My mother (.). you know “now in the corporate environment, you always wonder if you should talk to this person or shouldn’t talk to this person? Where it’s going to end?”. At their times because there was so much silence,

C: Ja
B: if they spoke amongst each other, black people, it wasn’t going to go anywhere ‘cause their voice was never heard, anyway, you know.

C: Correct.

B: So there was that trust and honesty and naivety in them, you know. Whereas with me, I’m looking, who wants to sta(h)b my back, you know. Haha.

C: Hahah

B: Hahahah, you know. So: you, that pers, side of her pers, her personality reflects in every decision that she makes, you know. There is that element of trust and hh I’m always saying "Ma:, don’t be so trusting" you know, then(.) you know and uhh, sometimes I just stand back and I say, you know what, let it be. "Let her do what she wants to do, let her develop, see things, read the right material and, and uhhmm (2).hh discover things for herself. I mustn’t force this modern and this corporate environment uhm, on her, you know. Haha

C: Because she is from a different generation

B: Because she is from a different generation and difference(.) (oh no,) is not bad, different is not bad, different is good, actually, if you understand why people are different, you know, ja

C: That’s wonderful. Thank you very much.

B: It’s been lovely chatting to you and thanks. Thanks so much.

C: and good luck with your career

B: Ja; that too with your thesis too, ja.

C: Thank you.
INTERVIEW 3.
C: P, thanks for agreeing to talk to me today. I would like to ask you to tell me a bit about your background; as far back as you can remember.
P: Golly, hahaha. Well, I was brought up in E*******, ummm, which is in KwaZulu, Natal ummm, most of my life I spent there. I was actually schooled at a convent school, ummm, St ******s Convent and matriculated there in '89. Uhhmm, I studied in Durban, ummm, first went to hotel school in Durban, to study hotel management which I enjoyed immensely, then actually a chance meeting with umh, the financial director of S*****; was then offered a job at S******, which was completely out of my ( ) dre(h)ams or aspirations to be in the ra(h)ilway lines ,
C: Hahaha
P: so to speak, as they call them the S******. and umm, through that I worked in the finance department . So did not give up the career in Hotel uh,uhh, management, finished studying that. Did my internship, then had the job at S******, which then led to working in the public relations department, because it was only just one woman, and ( ) they wanted to grow that. hh And then °I had an opportunity to actually study a BA Communications through Unisa, which S****** then paid for°. Uhm, and that was my stumble into the communications arena, umh so to speak. . Uhhmm, I worked for S*****° and then T******, when I got married in ‘95 (. ) Uhhmm, moved up to Johannesburg and then worked for T*****° (. ) which is (. ) the ******** College which is the training centre for T***** employees and now they’ve actually broadened and umh gone external. So: uhm (. ) a:fter that got my hh, got pregnant with the second baby , then I thought, no, corporate not for me. > I think I still had the longing to go and do what my initial love was<, which is umh being a hotelier. So: uhm I gave up and beca:me a complete mom for (. ) 2 years .hh and umh I’m a perfectionist. S(h)o, I have to do it all, but no ha(h)lves, no in-betweens. So, I was a complete mom for two years, did absolutely nothing else, but enjoyed it thoroughly. Uhhmm, then during that ti:me I, I had the view that I would not go back into the corporate world, ‘cause(just) found it stifling. Uhhmm, I’m extremely creative as well, you know and so, therefore cannot deal, or work within the red tape environment of of a corporate;
C: Right
P: even though I had been there for seven years. Uhhm, then, also another chance meeting, met my (. ) partner, who owned L and L Marketing. She uhm, had other, silent partners, but basically ran the business;
C: Right
P: which the business ummm initially concentrated on, ummm, customized gifting, whether it’s flat or 3 –D. So, it was extremely creative environment where, a, a client would come in and saying, I’m not sure what I want to give, this is the message I wanna communicate and this is the budget that I’ve got, please come up with something. (That would) usually be a pink elephant with yellow slippers.
C: Ja
P: Something outrageous like that, packed in a blue ribbon and shipped it off to Germany or somewhere exotic. .hh So: uh, I enjo:yd the, the thrill of what one (. ) of what one could do, you know. Uhhmm, a:nd I then bought in, I bought out the other partners,
C: Right
P: ummmm and got 51% shareholding (1) a:nd we worked excellently together, >grew the business into what it is today of integrated marketing and communication< ummm,
basically taking the essence of what L and L Marketing stood for in its brand which is a 100% pure creativity and then (.) brought that into what I had studied and what she had also studied for. >She had a Marketing background, my background was communications< So: uhmm, we then integrated the two, and basically just with simple, (inner way ) of communicating our client’s brand.

P: What frustrated us in the corporate business; we just took what we’ve learnt.
C: Right
P: >We decided not to go the textbook route, just took what what our frustrations were when we were in corporate in dealing with suppliers (.) who are meant to actually manage your message.
C: Ja
P: How it was then further diluted. Uhmm, and then built uhmm, a business structure, a business model around those very frustrations. And then (.) broadened what the service offerings were of L and L uhmm, which is now eventing, uhmm, creative eventing. ((Noise from aeroplane)). Uhmm an, an event that actually has a message. So, uhmm, we actually turned away events where somebody says: “I’ve got a budget, I need a hundred people”
C: What do you say, when you say a message, what do you mean by that?
P: If it’s a launch, you know and uhmm, where cli:ents or, or >whether it’s a business event or business to consumer at then end of the day, people walking out of that event. hh It’s an event that is <well thought out, well spent> .There is a message in one’s mind about what it is they’re trying to communicate. You know more about the company, you know what they a, a, are doing.
C :Ja
P: And it may even result in a buy.
C: Ja
P: So, it’s, it’s, it’s those kind of events.
C: So, it’s saying something
P: It’s saying something, not an event for the sake of an event.
C: Wonderful
P: Ja.
C: Can I ask you to go uh, a bit that is obviously your-
P: Yes
C: you know, a big part of your life.
P: Hmm
C: Can you tell me maybe a bit about your family life from when you were a child?
P: Oh, Lo:rd! hahaha
C: Hahaha
P: Uhmm (.) . I’m the only girl.
C: Right.
P: Uhmm
C: How many other?
P: Brothers. Uhmm, I had three brothers, we lost one in 1997. And uhmm a mom and dad and we all grew up in E******* .hh I’m the eldest (.) and my brothers will tell you that I’m awful, hahaha
C: Hahaha
P: Strict, that I should have been a sergeant or a warden or something uhm, but (.) I am completely Daddy’s girl, completely. A:nd uhm, and >my mother knows it and everyone knows it and I’ve always played it well<. Haha.
C: Tell me what does it mean when you say Daddy’s girl?
P: Uhm ( 4) I’ve never actually really thought about what that meant to me but I guess ( 1) being the apple of your father’s eye a:nd uhm, a:nd we had an excellent relationship and .hh even today my mother would tell you that , you know what , if P doesn’t say it isn’t so, then her dad is not gonna say it isn’t so. So:-
P: Completely supportive, completely. He is uhm, I’m the first wife, she’s the second husb(h)and-
C: Oh I love that
P: She’s the second wife, ja.
C: Yes
P: So: completely supportive a:nd uh, in .hh whatever I did, uhm, we did it together, you know.
C: Ja
P: He, he is (.) still a runner and very (.) gym-focused. So: I would train with him (.) to run for his (.) marathons. Uhm, he used to do the Comrades a lot in those years.
C: yes
P: So: I would train with him up to the 42 , but never actually did the Comrades<.
C: wonderful
P: Ja, so: uhm, I think had an excellent relationship > but always had a soft spot for my mother,
C: Ja
P: obviously, a:nd nurtured her and spoke up for her which I still do even until today, but I think–
C: Can you give me an example of, how you speak up for her?
P: ( 3) Uhm, my father is typical Arian, he’s very, uhm, got mood swings, got tempers and so forth and .hh my mother is uhm a <serene, wise old woman> you know.
C: Yes
P: I always believe that she’s an ol(h)d soul. So: uhm she always sees the positive side of, of everything > . I mean , she’s had a horrific upbringing, background and not the childhood (.) ,
C: Ja
P: that we had, yet (.) uhm, on top of that she’s come out (1) such a, a, a, a peaceful person, at peace with life.
C: Right
P: And, at peace with her general surroundings, not bitter or harbouring anything. .hh >I mean, I’ve noticed this< once I’m older .But I think , uhm uhm, younger, she uhm, had four of us by the age of 26,
C: Right
P: you know, which, could (.) gosh, I could not ha:ndle or do”
C: haha
P: So we grew up in boarding school,
P: you know, and umm from young as six because I dunno, I think people >some of us are just born with that nurturing nature< I, I mothered my, my brothers.

P: Really, really, really did. So, that in a way just a natural response in, in in standing up for her whether it was from my dad or from my brothers or whatever. And we had a very close >close, close < family.

C: Hmm

P: Uhmm the six of us, excellent relationships and a really privileged background. I don’t think many people are able to (. ) sit back and say you know what I’m very happy, >and I’m comfortable with my childhood<.

C: Right

P: and have an excellent relationship with my (. ) parents and still do.<.

C: Ja

P: And his riches were that we would always be together,

C: Ja

P: all the time. That (. ) the world can fall around you but if you don’t have your family unit,

C: Ja

P: and you can’t count on each other, or you grow up and > ( ) you can happily say I haven’t spoken to my brother in a year or whatever< that is not (2) what he wanted.

C: Ja

P: So, he instilled that in us, you know, in a, in a very big way, and still does.

C: Closeness

P: Closeness, closeness was extremely extremely important to him.

C: Do you often speak to your brothers and to your father?

P: °Yes°(2).

C: and when you talk to them what is it about?

P: General things. >My Dad is a very loving man.

C: Hmmm

P: So, he still sends me flowers on Valentine’s and my husband forgets< hahaha.

C : ha, that’s delightful

P: hahaha. YES AND UHMM, EXTREMELY PROTECTIVE, SO: IF THERE’S SOMETHING THAT I’M WORRIED ABOUT, CONCERNED ABOUT, YOU KNOW, WHETHER IT’S BUSINESS EVEN IF. UHMM, I MEAN THEY’RE FROM THE OLD SCHOOL (. ) I CAN’T SAY THE HUGE BUSINESS JARGON THAT GOES ON.

C: Ja

P: BUT UHMM, I CAN SAY I AM WORRIED AND THEY CAN MAKE ME FEEL BETTER WITHOUT THE, THE DETAILS.

C: yes
P: So:> we speak about generally what’s happening in the family when (they see us) I actually see them quite often<.

C: hmm

P: and uhmm I think it’s just a place, or they’re people that if all else fails > you just go in and you can just sit down and not necessarily say anything but you feel better afterwards<. So: and my brothers, it’s a very, we have a very close age difference.

C: Okay

P: So: I mean between myself and my youngest brother °who’s the one that passed away° uhm there’s a six-year gap.

C: Right

P: So: my next brother is two years (. ) younger than me and °the other one is about three years younger°. So: we chat quite often uhm, fortunately my husband as well, is , is an only son,

C: Right

P: who also has three sisters,

C: So it’s just a reversal

P: It’s a reverse, the reverse. So, he’s become like their brother.

C: Ja

P: and like the son, which I think for me, is extremely important. It’s, it’s what I grew up with and it’s what I can, or it’s what my (1) soul can associate with and believe.

C: Hmm

P: You know, we’re brought up in this belief system of a happy family >°and that’s what you always look for °<and I think (2) then (. ) FOR ME THAT WORKS. You know, that (. ) he becomes part of the family ,and that he, he becomes one of the brothers.

C: Ja, sorry to interrupt. Can I ask you, when you say that you’re very much a Daddy’s girl and you play that. What were, what were your exact words?

P: uhhmm

C: you play that -

P: play that (1) role?

C: Yes

P: yes

C: what do you mean?

P:°I can get anything from him°<. Haha.

C: hahah

P: Uhhmm

C: Give me an example.

P: (3) what can I say that would be (1) okay, when I got married, when I was first married >°when did I get married°< ’95.

C: Right.

P: Uhm in African (. )tradition , a woman is supposed to go (. ) and live with her in-laws;

C: Okay.

P: for the first week or month or two.hh > in the olden days it was worse, but now (it’s a little bit modern).

C: Ja, I’ve heard of it
P: You’ve heard of that. Ja, it’s called (.) ughodusa. So: uhm, A: my father could NOT
bear that I was getting married< He could not, he (2) he, he, just took him forever
to accept it.
C: Why is that?
P: I was leaving him.
C: Yes, you’re so close
P: No, I was leaving him and (.). hh who is this man that’s now going to take care of me
and (.) if he can take care of me, I mean (2) i. It’s impossible that somebody else can
take care of me (.). better than him. Uhm, to that, I MEAN THAT UPSET ME
IMMENSELY, but now I do understand, you know, where he was coming from. So:
that tradition,
C: Hmm
P: and ughodusa, it’s like, it, it, it’s a ritual where the groom’s family, uhm (1) tests the
bride out. Can she cook, can she clean. You know, the usual male chauvinistic way.
C: Housewife
P: Housewife, you know. It it it’s very much that way.
C: How do you feel about that?
P: >Oh, I think it’s completely degrading<. Ja (1) but it, it’s done.
C: Yes
P: Yes, and you -
C: and, did you do it?
P: My Dad did it. Hahaha.
C: hahaha. Please tell me more
P: Well, there they were, we got married and straight after the wedding we went on
honeymoon for a week (1) to Knysna. (2) I was supposed to get back, we got back, got
married on the 2nd, got back from the honeymoon on the 11th, I arrived and (on) the
following day my parents arrived. My (.) Mom was dragged into it, because she did not
agree.
C: And, how did they cope with it. Your husband’s family?
P: ( ) °My father’s extremely domineering and he actually doesn’t care, °haha
C: Ja, but what did they say?
P: I think it was a shock (.). for them.
C: Yes
P: Uhm, fortunately, B’s father is a very (1) soft man,
C: Right
P: extremely soft. He has the, a, the wife, that is (1) very hard (.). and the one that is the
authority of the house. So: it was, uh, uh, uh, basically out of place, (to be heard, that)
voice out how she feels.
C: Hmm
P: Because it’s the man that should voice out how he feels. And he was fine; he got a
friend (.). for the two weeks.
C: Hmm
P: They get along very well and uhm, they went gambling or shopping or whatever it was during the day. And came back and uhm, cooked supper and. So, it was an entire family affair. It wasn’t uhm, sort of done in an in your face kind of way.
C: Hmm
P: So: I do think when they sit together and they’re alone, they think “odd”. Hahaha.
C: Yes
P: Yes, ja
C: and how did B handle this whole situation?
P: He’s not very cultural in that way.
C: Right
P: He is, he’s very Western.
C: Untraditional
P: No, completely untraditional.
C: Yes
P: and, uhm so: I think, we, we’ve chatted about it later, when one understands and. I think, the closeness that I have with my father has had an impact on our own relationship.
C: Hmm
P: Where there is a point where, my husband felt that I actually need to divorce my father at some stage,
C: Right
P: you know, I need to commit this side.
C: What, could you give me an, an example of when he specifically said that?
P: I won’t, I, I, it’s not necessarily an incident, because you know, one feels that way. One-
C: Hmm. So, it’s a general feeling
P: It’s a general feeling. Where one can say, I mean your other half knows those nuances, those-
C: Right
P: You know. Or me, just going home and just sitting or my dad driving me to do stuff because I’m tired. And afterwards >when we bought our first house, he came to visit again<.
C: and how did B handle that?
P: No, not well, because then that was in his face.
C: Okay
P: He walked in and said “God you’re so skinny “.
C: Ja
P: “Are you eating?”
C: So, it was intrusive.
P: Ja, it was very intrusive. So: THAT THAT WAS THEN A DIRECT THING, you know. So: there was some friction in the beginning.
C: How did you uhm sort out that problem? Just, have you sorted out that problem?
C: Ja
P: And he needed to understand that that now is my husband°,
C: Ja
P: you know, and he needs to respect that he needs to be either in the boat with me or out.
C: right
P: So, uhm, and he has a wife and he has a family. I mean it sounds awful, it sounds incestuous even. somebody said to me the other day 'cause I did need to speak about it at some point. C: Ja
P: And um which he does now. he respects that and he understands that and he knows his place. He's, we're still very close, I'm still Daddy's girl. C: good
P: And uhm, knows this and understands it. And it's and it fits where it's supposed to be. Ja, so-
C: Ja, can I ask you as well P
P: hmmm
C: When you were still at home, living with your three brothers, with your parents, when there was a con, when big decisions had to be made, who made the decisions in your house?
P: °my father°.
C: your father.
P: °yes°
C: And was it accepted?
P: °Yes°. He was extremely authoritarian of note. >I, the first rule is I'm the Boss, the second rule is if the Boss is wrong, then the first rule applies<Haha.
C: Hahah
P: Haha. Ja> very much like that.<
C: Yess, and tell me, who would you say, you take after?
P: (3) >I think a bit of both.<
C: In which way?
P: The I(h)'m the B(h)oss part is mine is my Da(h)d,
C: Right
P: and um the the humility of my mother as I get older I think, I, I AM becoming that and>understanding things from somebody else's point of view< a:nd, EVEN THOUGH MY FATHER WAS THE AUTHORITARIAN AND THE BOSS, MY MOTHER WAS THE NECK. A very firm one.
C: Would you like to explain that to me?
P: She 's also a very (.) strong (.) woman.
C: right
P: Strong-willed and, and firm, very firm in her ways.
C: Hm
P: A:nd, uhm she just didn't take things at face value, uhm, very honourable, very honest
C: Ja
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P: even in context. My mother is, it’s black or white, she can’t see anything in between
hh So: uhm (1) I think in, she is, I believe the pillar of the family. >Yes, my dad took the
decisions < and
C: Hmm
P: and yes, when they worked or didn’t work, he (3) > she was the safety net and she still
is the safety net in, in, ja<,
C: that’s a lovely expression
P: Ja, in, in, in the family.
C: Right, uhm, then when there were conflict situations
P: Yes
C: Like arguments
P: Yes
C: Were there many, and what did they argue about?
P: you mean my parents?
C: Yes
P: Yes. OH, GOD!!! Hahahaha
P: and yes, when they worked or didn’t work, he (3) > she was the safety net and she still
is the safety net in, in, ja<,
C: that’s a lovely expression
P: Ja, in, in, in the family.
C: Right, uhm, then when there were conflict situations
P: Yes
C: Like arguments
P: Yes
C: Were there many, and what did they argue about?
P: you mean my parents?
C: Yes
P: Yes. OH, GOD!!! Hahahaha
P: They argued (1) like (1) I don’t know, the Lockhorns, I called them, I used to say.
C: Yes
P: ’Cause (it was the time) that I (.). alone lived with them when my brothers were in
boarding school. We, there was a time when we all were and then I came back a:nd uhm,
C: Yes
P: Yes. OH, GOD!!! Hahahaha
P: They argued (1) like (1) I don’t know, the Lockhorns, I called them, I used to say.
C: Yes
P: ’Cause (it was the time) that I (.). alone lived with them when my brothers were in
boarding school. We, there was a time when we all were and then I came back a:nd uhm,
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P: They argued (1) like (1) I don’t know, the Lockhorns, I called them, I used to say.
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boarding school. We, there was a time when we all were and then I came back a:nd uhm,
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P: They argued (1) like (1) I don’t know, the Lockhorns, I called them, I used to say.
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P: ’Cause (it was the time) that I (.). alone lived with them when my brothers were in
boarding school. We, there was a time when we all were and then I came back a:nd uhm,
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P: Yes. OH, GOD!!! Hahahaha
P: They argued (1) like (1) I don’t know, the Lockhorns, I called them, I used to say.
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P: ’Cause (it was the time) that I (.). alone lived with them when my brothers were in
boarding school. We, there was a time when we all were and then I came back a:nd uhm,
C: Yes
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P: They argued (1) like (1) I don’t know, the Lockhorns, I called them, I used to say.
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P: ’Cause (it was the time) that I (.). alone lived with them when my brothers were in
boarding school. We, there was a time when we all were and then I came back a:nd uhm,
C: Yes
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C: Yes
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C: Yes
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C: Yes
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boarding school. We, there was a time when we all were and then I came back a:nd uhm,
C: Yes
P: Yes. OH, GOD!!! Hahahaha
P: They argued (1) like (1) I don’t know, the Lockhorns, I called them, I used to say.
C: Yes
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C: Yes
P: Yes. OH, GOD!!! Hahahaha
P: They argued (1) like (1) I don’t know, the Lockhorns, I called them, I used to say.
C: Yes
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C: Yes
P: Yes. OH, GOD!!! Hahahaha
P: They argued (1) like (1) I don’t know, the Lockhorns, I called them, I used to say.
C: Yes
P: ’Cause (it was the time) that I (.). alone lived with them when my brothers were in
boarding school. We, there was a time when we all were and then I came back a:nd uhm,
C: Yes
P: Yes. OH, GOD!!! Hahahaha
P: They argued (1) like (1) I don’t know, the Lockhorns, I called them, I used to say.
C: Yes
P: ’Cause (it was the time) that I (.). alone lived with them when my brothers were in
boarding school. We, there was a time when we all were and then I came back a:nd uhm,
P: It’s, it’s sort of quite apparent.
C: Right
P: and, um so, with us, where I would argue (.) about the spoon being left on the
right-hand side of the pot, something small like that-
C: hmm
P: B would see it as “Oh my God, we’re getting divorced!”
C: Okay, because it’s so contrasting.
P: You see, yes, completely contrasting. And I’m saying, wha, wha, what about again?
He says that (.) in the, in the morning. I said what was in the morning? He said : “You
went off on a rocker about a spoon.” “Oh, that? Ag, no.”
C: Ja
P: So: we, we, we handle °conflict situations differently°
C: What would be a really serious conflict situation between your parents? What would
( )
P: What ,what, what, what would it be about?
P: “us (1) the children”
C: In what way, could you give me an example?
P: uhhm (.) whether it’s about decision that we have taken, us, my mother let goes quite
quickly,
C: Right
P: my father doesn’t. He ( ) that’s why we musn’t get married, we must be close, we
must live and never leave.
C: Why is he like that?
P: (2) Uhm, I think it’s from his upbringing. Uhm, he has stories that (.) he hasn’t spoken
to his brother in years.
C: right
P: And that does not sit well with him.
C: right
P: And I think, perhaps at an early age he made a conscious decision (.) not to have that
in his family.
C: Uhm
P: That his family will be close and umh there won’t be a divorce in the family. He, all
his brothers are divorced,
C: right
P: a:nd umh (3) I think that’s possibly why he is like that, ja.
C: And when you say your mother, lets go easily, is that from an independence point of
view?
P: Yes.
C: letting the children go out of the house?
P: Yes, ja. O, o, or, letting us decide for ourself what would work for us.
C: Ja.
P: Ja.
C: what, does your father want to, he obviously wants to decide for you?
P: Yes
C: and how do your brothers handle that?
((Noise from car driving past ))
P: Uhm you know, I, I, I look at them now being older, that (2) growing up, him and I were close.
C: hmm
P: My father and I,
C: Right
P: and that was (.) very apparent . The the boys were my mother’s. The boys never rode. They did ride bikes and whatever.
C: Ja
P: But they didn’t do any manly stuff .hh so: it ( .) disappointed my father a lot, you know. >They didn’t run, they didn’t do sport<.
C: Ja
P: I was (. ) athletics captain and I,
C: haha
P: you know, all the things (.) that a, a man wants from a son, he, he got that from me.
C: Yes
P: Oh, and the boys were lazy they just (. ) ate and just ate , haha that’s all they did. So: (. ) I think (.) >when I when I try to look at it from their point of view, I think that must have been quite frightening < or daunting.
C: Ja
P: That they feel that perhaps they have disappointed him in some way .hh a:nd uhm maybe not entirely happy that I, uhm the spoil t one so it seems.
C: mmm
P: and uhm, but fine because I’m their bigger sister and their only sister, but they love me, so:
C: Yes
P: it’s quite (. ) conflicting emotions.
C: Ja
P: A: nd uhm because, I must say, I’m also spoilt by them. You know, always I’m very, very lucky.
C: Ja
P: My brothers spoil me till today.
C: What is their relationship with your mother like, now?
P: Very good, they speak to her more than I do.
C: That’s wonderful
P: J(h)a, very, very close.
C: Hmm
P: They’re very, extremely supportive of her and uhm (1) no, I’d say excellent. Uh, I, I, think a bit, not difficult but perhaps strained with my Dad.
C: hmm
P: Because they want to go there and make their own decisions.
C: hmm
P: °A:nd uhm,be allowed to fail or not fail. So: when they do have failures it’s a bit difficult to (. ) let my Dad know (.) or rather (.) they’d keep quiet about it and rather not say, uhm, but know that my mother would understand (.) a:nd help them along in their next decision°.
C: Could I ask you, uhm going back to your mom specifically, how, how was your childhood different from hers, in what way?
P: Uhm, she, wa, is is was from a broken ho:me;
C: Right
P: an illegitimate chi:ld.
C: Okay
P: °Uhm, my grandmother actually had 5 children, all different fathers and brought up by a stepfather. Very, very, very, very poor. Very poor. And (. ) she’s coloured ,
C: Okay
P: and my gran is black and her stepfather was black° A:nd therefore that didn’t sit down, sit well with him AT ALL. That he now had to bring up these half breeds, he called them.
C: That’s interesting
P: Ja, so uhm (2) I think on the whole, a very (1) sad childhood, you know.
C: Ja
P: °Not a happy one. Happy with her brothers and sisters, I think, to a certain point but then she also married young. Twenty, she was married already, you know. Went into a teaching degree or diploma then, uhm, got married°.
C: And in contrast to her, you would say that your childhood has been very happy?
P: Yes.
C: And, uhm, your father’s background, his childhood?
P: °He, uhm, comes from a very big family.
C: Right
P: But a, a family unit, meaning the mother and father, I think eleven children, between nine and eleven°.
C: (Goodness)
P: Lots of brothers and lots of sisters and he was very close °to his mother.
C: Hm
P: I think the apple of his mother’s eye° a: nd uhm I would say a happy childhood.
C: Uhm
P: °But a, a, a distant father, who: uhm, you know he ploughed the fields and was your very old traditional man that, not really involved with the children so much. But (. ) you know the woman must take care of that .
C: Okay
P: And uh, better when they’re older, but (. ) what I find about him and his brothers and sisters, there was always a longing (. ) to make their father proud.
C: Ja
P: Ja. There was al, a a a deep longing throughout, even now.
C: And, and the father specifically, or the mother as well?
P: No, just the, specifically the father °.
C: Why is that?
P: I don’t know.
C: And in your family is it similar?
P: You mean just my parents, and my brothers?
C: Ja, yes, your brothers, yourself?
P: There is, there is (. ) wanting to make both of them proud, though.
C: Ja, so that’s quite a different thing
P: Yes, ja, both of them proud ja.
C: Now, going back to your career, who encouraged you to go study, who encouraged
you to go and study after Matric?
P: °Both of them°.
C: and what were the reasons that they gave?
P: WE PAID A LOT OF MONEY FOR YOUR CONVENT SCHOOLING, PRIVATE
SCHOOLING, YOU HAD BETTER, hahaha.
P: Ja, but didn’t, you know, expect you to be a housewife, get married
P: No.
C: You know, have a job and then get married
P: No.
C: What were their dreams for you?
P: Uhm, to be independent;
C: right
P: meaning independent even from a man. That, my mother was very specific about.
C: What does she mean, what did she mean when she said that?
P: Financially independent.
C: Okay
P: Ja, uhm that uhm, able to be self-sufficient in every way. Uhm, no aspirations that I
should get married,
C: Right
P: young.
C: And that’s sort of untraditional isn’t it?
P: Yes, yes.
C: Tell me do you think that she said that or she has that thought because of her own
mother’s situation?
P: Yes, yes.
C: Did she ever say that to you specifically?
P: No:, no she didn’t but I think (. ) it comes from uhm, another traditional thing is that
when a woman gets married, you now (. ) you’re supposed to take whatever your
husband dishes out (1) .hh a:nd uhm, my parents’ advice was: no not at all, if you are
unhappy, you are welcome in our home.
C: Right
P: If it lasts one month, six months, ten years, you can come back at any time.
C: When they say uhm, whatever your husband dishes out, what?
P: meaning uhm (2) there’s actually, I , I don’t know whether there’s a tradition or it’s
just a way of li:fe, but, when a a woman, a black woman goes into marriage, women
mourn >because it’s like you’re going in to suffer< (. ).
C: Unusual.
P: Because you’re. Yes, have you not heard of that?
C: I’ve never heard of that.
P: Really?
C: No.
P: Ja, no women mourn because you’re going to take care of, you leave your family,
you’re going to take care of another family.
P: It’s very specific, you’re not going to be a housewife and be taken care of.
C: you are going to take care-
P: Yes, ja
C: of someone else
P: Yes, ja, that’s why there is a tradition of ughodusa.
C: Ja
P: You go there and you prepare food for them. hh and they test how you do it, test your food, see how you can handwash and (.) the nappies or give birth and there is a specific job that a woman does, so: when they pay lobola;
C: yes
P: it’s not a freebie. A woman ( )
P/C: (value for money))
C: Tell me did your parents pay lobola?
P: B’s parents?
C: Yes.
P: Yes.
C: for, for you, that’s right and how do you feel about being paid for, so to speak?
P : You know what? .hh I agree with it. I agree with it. I believe that uhm, not in the sense that I’m, I’m, I’m being bought;
C: Ja
P: but I believe in life, if you do want something you must work hard for it and you must put something in it,
C: Hmm
P: and (.) you the item (1) that is being paid for (.), so to speak,
C: Ja
P: must give that value, but not to your detriment.
C: that’s interesting.
P: Yes. It must not be to your detriment.
C: so you must both benefit from the arrangement.
P: Yes, yes, yes, yes, the arrangement and the union.
C: Can I ask you, how do you mourn, when you say the women go into mourning when they get married. Is it a specific ritual?
P: No, it’s not a ritual, it’s like a bridal shower.
C: Okay
P: Ja, there’s an African bridal shower where old, wise women come to you, all of them married, my mother arranged it for me.
C: Yes
P: A:nd (1) they speak to you. They say: “Be quiet, don’t answer back, uhm a man will come and one day, you cook for him, and he says your food is too cold, or it’s too hot or it’s too, whatever”.
C: Hmm
P: “Be quiet.” And I used to, I remember sitting there and thinking who on earth are they talking about?
C: Haha
P: That’s not B(h)y, he’s never gonna be like that ((faking mockery))
C: Ja
P: °and he did become like that°.
C: why is that?
P: Men are the same. Men are, men, I think what black women have realized and I can only speak for black women.
C: hmm
P: >Is that the old wise women have realized how men are and then been able to manipulate the situation<.
C: Right
P: When they say to you, be quiet, I think, ag, I’m NOT gonna shut up.
C: Ja
P: I mean, if HE says, I’m gonna say back. But no it’s that old sense of mindful. Be mindful. Be mindful -
C: So, it’s not in other words, not speaking?
P: tolerate. It, it, it doesn’t mean not tolerate.
C: What does it mean?
P: It means (.) be mindful.
C: Right
P: and to be mindful, you have to be quiet. And when you are mindful, you are able to be clear in your decisions.
C: hmmm
P: Clear in whatever it is that that person is giving to you .
C: hmm
P: And clear in what you decide to take from it.
C: So that you benefit?
P: Yes.
C: So that you don’t lose at the end?
P: No.
C: Do they all see it like that. These old wise women?
P: Yes?
C: And your peers, do you?
P: No, the peers don’t. My peers don’t.
C: Could you explain that to me
P: . hh My peers are very Western.
C: Ja
P: It’s (.) you know what hahaha ((sarcastic tone)): I’m an equal here.
C: Yes.
P: Ja.
C: So-
P: You say and I say.
C: So-
P: So, we speak from (2) uhm (2) we don’t speak from the same place.
C: Right
P: meaning the old wise women and us, as the, the western
C: different generations
P: Different generations, yes ja ( )
C: How’s your mom about that? Is she an old wise woman or is she more in your generation?
P: She’s an old wise woman but with an understanding of this generation. That’s why I’m able to speak to her and say “oh is that what you meant”?
C: and your Dad, how does he feel about that understanding? You know, about being mindful? Does he agree with it, or, are you exonerated from it, being his daughter, you don’t have to?
P: >No, I don’t have to agree(h)e. I don’t have to. The, the there’s different rules that apply for me and my mother, I think. Ja, ja. I mean it hasn’t been said or I haven’t. There, there definitely are different rules<
C: In your household
P: in, in our household.
C: but in other black families?
P: I think there would be. Men generally have different rules for their daughters than they would for their wives.
C: That’s interesting.
P: Ja .
C: I want to ask you, just getting back to B. Uhm , when you said he started behaving like that, can you give me an example?
P: Oh, I must give you a BIG FAT example.
C: Haha
P: .hh Uhhhmm, we met at varsity, carefree, burger eating, movie-watching.
C: haha
P: Strolling on the beach, romance, the works. My best friend. He still is my friend.
A:nd , uhhm, eat on the side of the road, you know on the pavement. Get a burger and sit there. .hh COMPLETELY UNTRADITIONAL,
C: Ja
P: VERY WESTERN, something that you would do with your buddy. “We’ll, we get married (and) the first six months, I phone my mother in a frantic. ‘Cause my mother always said to me, you know what, if you want me to love your husband,
C: Ja
P: don’t tell me your problems. I actually don’t want to know.
C: What did she mean by that?
P: I thought that was awful, I thought that was horrible.
C: Ja
P: But I do understand. She said: “I love you immensely and I’ll never forgive him. You’ll forgive him. I won’t.”
C: So, he will become her or she will be come his enemy.
P: Yes.
C: By speaking about your problems?
P: Yes. Ja. >But if I speak about my problems in the third sense, if I come and I say “Aaah, mommy, he pulled my hair!”<
P: You know, she’s gonna (.). take her shoe,
C: yes
P: and go and hit him with the heel over the head and never forgive that.
P: So, I, I got to understand what she meant by that. hh But the little things that were, sort of hiccups along the way,

C: hmm

P: that I (.) couldn’t figure out.. hh I phone her in a flat spin, she says: “What is wrong? I said: You won’t believe it. B demands that I serve him with a tray”. C: Hahah. Yes?

P: She says: (1) “ But you must. I say: NO, I MUSTN’T. I say: Mommy, we,we,we,have demands that I serve him with a tray”. (1) we,we’re WESTERN, we, we’re NOT THERE!”

C: ja

P: She says: >“No, but that’s a sign of respect. How can you give your husband food just by (.) throwing it. That’s what you do with a dog. You take a pan (.) you throw it on the floor (1). Give him the tray.”

C: What happened in your parents’ household? How was your father served? Was he served?

P: No, Yes, he was served.

C: How

P: Well.

C: No, but I mean with a tray?

P: It wasn’t an issue.

C: You must ( )

P: MAYBE HE FOUND FOOD ON THE TABLE, I, I,

C: haha . Did anybody serve him like you had to serve B?

P: No:

C: Is that why you were so shocked?

P: Yes. My father cooks. He’s an excellent cook. He: makes, >he walks in the house, he’s hungry, he makes food for himself< .

C: how did you deal with the situation in the end?

P: Oh, in horror. I just (2) No! Then I thought, you know. Then my mother said to me  °what skin is it, it’s no skin off your nose,

C: mm

P: it’s just a tray.

C: hmm

P: So he wants a tray, give him a tray. You (.) make up your mind what it is that you want in return, that you would get°.

C: And how did it work out, what did you do?

P:°I still serve him with a tray°.

C: You serve him with a tray

P: I still serve him with a tray.

C: Still today

P: Still today, if it’s not on the table, he gets his food on a tray.

C: Who cooks?

P: I do. No, no sorry, I lie. I used to, I ha(h)ve a maid that co(h)oks.

C: hahah

P: Haha. I have a maid that cooks but uhm, and he’s fine with that.

C: Ja
P: But he cooks too.
C: Ja
P: Ja. He’s come out of his shell.
C: Okay
P: And uh, it’s okay for men to walk in the kitchen actually and open the fridge and make a sandwich.
C: So, he’s changed from the old traditional way ( )
P: Ja, his FATHER is very, he sits on his bot and his mother arrives with a tray.
C: and his other, no he’s got sisters. And your brothers, are they married?
P: Yes.
C: and how do they?
P: No, very liberal.
C: is it
P: Mmm, they clean up, they mop.
C: and the wives aren’t expected to serve them.
P: No, no, no. And, my, only my youngest brother is married. I mean, my brothers come into my house and when they’re visiting, they clean up. They was the dishes, hang out the washing, if it’s in the washing machine. Make themselves useful.
C: Ja
P: Hmm
C: To get to your career, back to your career
P: I now SOLELY own the business >’cause I bought my partner out <,
C: Right
P: ° a year ago °
C: tell me and, when you make decisions, do you have other people assisting you or do you make all the decisions,
P: I make,
C: especially the big decisions
P: I make all the decisions.
C: and do you ever get queried?
P: on my decisions?
C: well, by your staff, in the first place
P: Ye:s but they don’t pay the bi(h)lls!
C: haha, like Daddy!
P: Ja, no, I do, and unless, and I do welcome any suggestions, if they’re better than mine!
C: Ja
P: and, uhm and they make sense. And uh, I’m quite comfortable. But, most of the major decisions that have to do with the direction of the company,
C: hmm
P: I make and I take the rap for them if they don’t work out, at all. But when it comes to client pitches and cre:ative .hh and uhm operational stuff;
C: hmm
P: uhm, then I do let them make their decisions.

C: hmmm

P: And, I’m quite fine for them to fail, ‘cause they’ll fail once, learn their lessons and hopefully if it’s the right staff, move on.

C: Ja

P: So, uhm, I’m easy. Just depends on the decisions. Then, i, if they invo: I finance grew up

P: yes.

C: In this country specifically

P: Yes.

C: for a black woman. And now that you actually own your own company

P: yes.

C: and you have the say

P: Yes.

C: over the big decisions

P: Yes.

C: Tell me and how do you feel things have changed? If you think of how your mother
grew up

P: So, how do you see that?

C: How do I see the change?

P: How do I see the change?

C: yes.

P: Gosh, it’s quadrupled. I mean the decisions I take now, my mother (2) could never take or understand. I mean, I realize even when I try to speak to her about it now.

C: Hm

P: I just speak to (her on it) in a very basic sense you know.

C: Ja

P: Uhm, most of the principles I believe still are the same, but .hh what women are allowed to do now than then in her time, is completely different.

C: Would you like to explain me a bit, be a bit more specific?

P: Uhmmm, my business is mine and not my husband’s. That’s point number one.

C: Right

P: So, the decisions I take, my husband (.) doesn’t have to know, or be involved in it (.) and he’s comfortable with that.

C: Ja

P: Ja. Whereas (1) in my parents’ time, >even if she had a little spaza shop, and my dad had another job, any decision that she would take, he would take them <,

C: Right

P: >and she would implement<.

C: Ja

P: >So: I think in that way then it’s changed completely<.

C: Okay and then also from a political point of view

P: Hmm

C: Since the new government, you know

P: Yes.

C: and the Bill of Rights

P: Yes.
C: equality for all, no discrimination
P: Yes.
C: How do you see the changes, if any
P: Well, I think there’s immense changes and I, I think, commendable changes.
C: Hmm
P: But uhm, those changes I always say, that people can write the fat books and have the Bill of Rights in those books. It’s the implementation and how it’s received by all those women or black people who it’s supposed to be for-
C: Ja
P: Then that makes sense;
C: Ja
P: or, or (2) and that’s where you would rate how commendable it is, ‘cause it looks great on paper,
C: ja
P: and I think it’s a great milestone for the country to achieve uhm these Bill of Rights and these gender equalities that they are, are working on. Uhm(1) in terms of it being implemented, what I wish is that black women (1) specifically can take the bull by the horns,
C: Hmm
P: because, yes it is written down and yes, it is law.
C: Ja
P: But we still very subservient in our mind and uh, I think that’s gonna take a generation to actually sort out. That, my generation is perhaps probably the first step even though we have not gotten it right as of yet-
C: You’re still in the process.
P: We’re still, we’re still very much in the process. That I can sit here and say, I have this business,
C: Ja
P: which is completely separate from my marriage.
C: Yes
P: Hm, that’s, a married woman is, belongs to the husband’s family, lock, stock and barrel.
C: and you, yet in your generation you’ve managed to change that?
P: Yes, managed to change that. Uhm, I’ll give you a funny example. >I bought this building about three years ago. I bought it, I drove past, I saw it, I said: “Stunning”. I called A, my partner then, I said: “I saw this building, I think it’s stunning. I think we should buy it.” Next day, saw the agent, walked inside, loved it, made changes. Uhm, B didn’t have much of a problem with it, I think. Or I wasn’t (.) really noticing<
C: Ja
P: Maybe he did, but he dealt with it< S(h)o: o my father-in-law, arrives (1) for a visit,
C: Here
P: here. On a Tuesday, at ten°,
C: while you’re working
P: While I’m working.
C: haha, I love it
P: It’s their building, I assume. No, I JUST THINK IN HIS MIND.
C: Yes, I understand.

P: YES, YOU UNDERSTAND

C: It’s P’s work, it’s,

C: Ja

P: it’s like her other house.

C: Yes

P: So, he sat in front of (1) my (.) desk and they served him tea. I think he had about

three or four cups >You can imagine how many hours that was<.

C: I can imagine

P: No: completely comfortable, yes.

C: Ja

P: Very comfortable and fine. No qualms.

C: Ja

P: So: I don’t think the next generation will suffer that, hahah.

C: Yes,

P: ja. So: in in that aspect it’s gonna take a while to entrench that in the minds of

the women (.) >as well as in the minds of the men<.

C: hmm

P: hmm

C: so that once and for all there is

P: yes, yes, I think it is-

C: it’s not even being questioned

P: it’s not being questioned, ja.

C: Hmm

P: In the Western culture, you, uh, i. it’s understood >when you marry into the family

that you come with your own riches, which have got nothing to do with this union.

C: that’s right

P: And they do and they are kept separate. hh In our African culture where there were no

riches really, so: (1) lock stock and barrel, you belong here<,

C: ja

P: you know.

C: and you’re there to look after that family

P: ° yes, yes that’s your primary°.

C: But now, you’ve changed that. Just to recap.

P: hmm.

C: you have your own business, you are not looking after that family, you are looking

after your own family.

P: Family, hmmm, my own family.

C: and your mother

P: yes.

C: did she look after her husband, your father’s family?

P: °Yes, till today°.

C: in what way does she do that?

P: °She buys clothes for my mother-in-law, groceries every month . hh They go and

visit (1) religiously°.

C: yes
P: More than they do (.) her family.
C: but you don’t
P: Unfortunately (1) not.° Hahaha.
C: when you say, hahaha ( )
( )
[tape has to be changed]

P: by society
C: whose family? by society
P: °by society.°
C: but you are breaking the rules
P: yes
C: and you are for breaking the rules
P: yes
C: For your daughter, how would you want her to live her life?
P: . hh I don’t have one, but I wish to have one. But, uhm ( 1 ) I would want her >still to
be self-sufficient, like my mother wanted me to be<.
C: Right
P: <Completely independent; >
C: yes
P: <realize why there is a necessity (.) for a male person (.) in one’s life ( 2 )and agree
to that >;
C: hmm
P: <and don’t believe that a man is going to provide. There’s no (1) uhm (1) prince on a
white horse >
C: Ja
P: <in shining armour that’s gonna sweep you off your feet> He doesn’t exist.
C: So, wha, what would the man’s role be, to your daughter?
P: To provide and protect.
C: okay
P: Ja, he must provide for the security of the house, >and not necessarily finance<.
C: Ja
P: Provi:de in terms of security for a house .hh and protect her and love her and cherish
her and honour her (1) a:nd over and above that she needs to be self-sufficient with , not
only financially;
C: hmm
P: but within herself, within her soul;
C: hmm
P: and rea:live that >if you look at a cake (2)and it’s beautiful and has icing and has the
cherry on the top, all that the man is supposed to do, is the extra cherry. If it’s removed
the cake is still (.) just as beautiful.
C: that’s a lovely expression
P: hmm
C: do you, just to finish off the interview; do you feel like that about your marriage? Is
your marriage like that?
P: I want my marriage to be like that-
P: more and more. And I think with me: growing up and accepting, I read a lot;
P: ° and uhm and accepting that and not feeling bad or guilty that I haven’t seen my
mother-in-law or that I don’t provide for them or that I don’t go on Saturday (.) and cook
and bake. What has led me to believe, or what I’ve grown up believing is the right thing
to do. Accepting that, no, it’s, it’s not that, necessarily°. That, that (.) if I accept that that
is what a man is supposed to provide,
P: then I won’t be hurt or disappointed (.) because I will find fulfillment within myself.
He’s not gonna provide happiness.
P: He’s gonna provide a com, companionship, which one can get from anywhere. He’s
gonna provide the sperm (.) for reproduction. Hahaha.
P: Haha,yes and uhm, and that’s it.
C: Ja, he’s not going to make you a whole person
P: No, I’m already whole, I’m already whole.
C: That’s lovely.
P: Ja.
C: Thank you very much
P: Hahaha. Thank you, thanks, ja.
C: thanks for your time and for speaking to me
P: This was therapeutic, hahaha.
INTERVIEW 4.
C: F, thank you for speaking to me today. Can I ask you to tell me a bit about your background, going as far back as you can remember, how you grew up and how you experienced life?

F: Hmm. Well, I’m 37 years old. Uhm, I haven’t always lived in Johannesburg. I grew up in Durban, uhm in a suburb called D, on the beach, D beach. I come from a middle-class Indian family of Muslim origin and I went to school, I went to high school in D. I didn’t go to private school, not to private school. Uhm, and then I studied at the University of Natal for a, a drama degree. Uhm, English drama, majors, uhm, and then thereafter, studied law at Natal University. Uhm, I did an LLB.

C: Community service

F: aspects of life, you know so -

C: yes

F: do service in a sense

C: hmm

F: I’m very much a people-oriented person and that came through in my growing years in terms of drama and all those things that I was interested in. Uhm, I also was politically active from a very young age, DESPITE coming from a middle-class background. I kind of broke out of the community. I suppose my family were not the traditional Muslim family

C: How could you. Could you explain that to me when you say that?

F: They, they are practicing Muslim people. We grew up fairly comfortably

C: Right

F: uhm both my mom and dad also came from sort of middle-class backgrounds. We were a rebel. I remember that very clearly where I wouldn’t want to go to religious school because I, I, I never

C: ( )

F: I well I mean as a as a growing kid I was forced to go to madressa

C: Right

F: and you know, after school you have to go to madressa to learn the religious study. Uhm so, I mean up until I was about I was always a rebel. I remember that very clearly where I wouldn’t want to go to religious school because I, I, I never
ever saw myself being part of a particular (.) sect or community, you know I just, for me it was important that my friends came from, and you must remember in those years we were only. We were restricted to Indian people only.

C: Certain areas

F: You know > certain areas in terms of the Group Areas Act<

C: Ja

F: >So, all my friends were Indian<

C: Right

F: But (2) >I mean, those, those years you were not even exposed to < a maid’s child, because, you know, it was-

C: that’s just the way it was

F: >they couldn’t keep their children with them. I mean, although we had a maid that could stay over

C: Yes

F: it was in later years “where she had a little baby and the little girl stayed with her and, you know, became sort of, part of our family, but that was much later. But, s, so for me, you know, being part. I (mean, I) was never seen as Muslim because of the way I behaved. Uhm (.) and my friends were also from the different, the other (religious groups whether you were a Hindu or Christian or whatever)

C: How, how did you behave that made you stand out?

F: Also, well, I THINK I DIDN’T DRESS, you know, you found that in Muslim schools, you’ll still find it now

C: yes ( )

F: The Muslim girls dress (.) like Muslim girls, < they wear trousers with their skirts and (.) a doek on their->

C: and your parents, allowed you not to dress

F: and my parents (.) didn’t insist (.) on that sort of thing you know

C: Ja

F: <You know we never grew up with that sort of thing. My Mom still doesn’t do that sort of thing > (4) SO THAT WAS THE ONE, BUT THE OTHER WAS IN TERMS OF MY INTERESTS

C: Hmm

F: My interests went further than the average sort of (.) Muslim ki:, girl

C: Ja

F: you know, in terms of extracurricular activities and everything, sport and drama and (.) whatever. Hh I belonged to theatre groups and you know (2) I think from about standard > from the time I was about 13 or 14 I already started belonging to political groupings. And I initially belonged to a Black Consciousness, to the Black Consciousness Movement, then moved into the ANC<

C: yes

F: So, so, at THAT time you never found (1) you know the sort of middle-class Indian girl, forgetting the fact that you were even Muslim

C: yes

F: > the middle –class Indian girl doing that sort of thing. You know you had to go into the working class areas to find (2) .hh the, the girls-

C: politically active people
F: politically active people
C: Ja
F: You know. >And then I went into high school and it was the same I think in high
school < IN HIGH SCHOOL it was even worse > because nobody recognized me as a
Muslim, they always saw me as something else, ja<
C: yes
F: >and was surprised when I said that I ‘ve got a sister that’s (.) you know, in the school
that’s two years, you know, below me and they, for them they could see her as being a
Muslim, but they couldn’t see me: as<
C: cause did she dress traditionally
F: She would, she would. My sister for some reason and she’s now, she’s become
orthodox and it it’s funny a: all the children took a different kind of- ( )
C: approach to all of this. How many siblings are you
F: my sister, myself, my sister (.)
C: Ja
F: °and a brother that’s older than me. She’s the youngest; I’m the middle, my brother
(he’s the oldest)°
C: alright
F: My sister’s now become orthodox ( ) you know
C: Ja
F: My brother’s fairly liberal and uh
C: what are you
F: AND I’M YOU KNOW, I’M just spiritual
C: yes
F: °You know, I (.) that’s what I see myself as being. I’m not ma: married to, I mean
you know, you’ve seen my husband. I’m not married to a Muslim, I .hh <°(4) you know.
I’ve got friends from various (1) religious groupings, I : from time to time I , I (.) attend
their (.) functions and gatherings-°<
C: to see what it’s like
F: >and I’m completely comfortable to experience it. And that, that also happened to me
as a child where
C: Ja
F: >for instance on Christmas, I , I’d spend time with my Christian friends and (1),
because there was a large Hindu community in our area, dhivali, I’d spend time with
them<
C: Hmm
F: >You know, so I think it was (.) and I , I think, my parents (1) My parents also have
friends outside the Muslim community and that’s not how the Muslim community < .hh
(1) live, exists now, they all live. They now exist within their own little plan.
C: Hmm
F: They’ve become worse (. ) now(. ) I find (. ) despite the integration
C: Why is that? Are they trying to protect it?
F: I don’t know, I think they want to protect their own culture.
C: their own culture
F: IT’S NOT ONLY, not only with Muslim people
C: Ja
You find it’s happening amongst Christian people it’s happening amongst Hindu people, it’s happening among Jewish people—you know.

It’s a fear of getting assimilated.

F: >°as (. ) Jewish people, Muslim people, you know, whole lot, culture, tradition.<

C: So, how do you fit in if you’re neither the one nor the other?

F: WELL, I YOU KNOW I, I MEAN I FOUND THAT WHEN I GOT MARRIED TO J**** (. ) that’s when >I MEAN, A:LL THROUGH THE YEARS nobody ever saw me as being religious ° never saw me as being a Muslim as, as, as conforming to (. ) you know, Muslim lifestyle and (1) they always just thought, oh, you know, she’s on her own little trip and whatever else °

C: Ja(h) a

F: Ultimately she’ll marry a Muslim and come back into the whole thing, BUT (. ) AND I THINK IT REALLY WAS MY FAMILY, >°not my immediate family, they know me too well to know that I wasn’t going to you know, marry a traditional Indian man. Uhm, with with the extended family, I, I think, you know °

C: Is it a shock, do they accept him?

F: WELL THEY ACCEPT HIM, they have to accept him, you know.

C: hmm

F: >Uhmm, most of them came to the wedding and all that stuff.<

C: Ja

F: >I wasn’t going to do it in the quiet and not, you know. Uhm, so, I did everything out in the open, had a proper wedding and everything. I mean, they were all there but they all had things to say, you know, they <

C: Yes

F: °They, how could you marry a black man, or, you know°

C: Tell me, uhm, they expected you to marry a traditional Indian man. What is a traditional Indian man like?

F: Uhmm, I, mean you have to, you have to be within the community, you have to be, you have to know the, the Indian community to know what (. ) traditional Indian men are like

C: hmm

F: °Uhmm, I mean he could have been a businessman, he could have been a lawyer, he could have been a professional, you know°

C: Right

F: but at the end of the day he’s a Muslim and his ways are particularly Muslim (2) in the sense that (. ) they (. ) Muslim men are very chauvinistic. My father’s not, my father’s not

C: hmm

F: I, I see him

C: as completely different

F: com, I see my father and my father and my brother as being completely different and I don’t even I don’t even, yeah (. ) AT NO TIME do I even see them as part of (. ) that Muslim (. ) community

C: community

F: you know
C: Ja, and your mother is different and your father, except your sister is not
C: my sister is now married a traditional Indian man, who (.)
C: Yes
F: you know, who, >I mean I can’t say he forced her into orthodoxy but I but .hh(.)<
C: did it play a role?
F: it obviously played a role
C: hmm
F: You know, >she was always (..) uh, religiously astute for some reason. I think through
her friends or whatever, you know. Even as kids (..) she would know things that we didn’t
and
C: more about that
F: and she would want to learn religious things that we wouldn’t. Uh, so you could see
that it would come, she would take on some kind of (..) or re, religion would play a big
part in her life. But (2) she ultimately married a man °who, you know, who didn’t want
her to continue with her studies°
C: right
F: she’s now, twelve years later you know, ( )
C: continuing
F:I mean, she had. . hh She’s a dress designer
C: hmm
F: and now, she’s start, she started, you know, she then did a teacher’s degree, he didn’t
allow her to teach, she’s now doing her Honours and whatever and whatever ( )
C: how did your parents allow this?
F: my parents didn’t wa: like it at all
C: yes
F: but the point is that she wanted. You know, she (..) .hh she had accepted what he
wanted for her in the sense. >It’s only now ten, twelve years later that she’s realized that
she made a big mistake and that she now needs to<-  
C: educate herself
F: >(ja, edu.:) she was educated but she never( )<
C: never got any practical experience
F: >but she never got any practical experience. She she’s now set up (4) you know she’s
now got a little designing studio and she’s doing that sort of thing
C: hmm
F: but she’ll ultimately get into education I think, she’ll get back into education ‘you
know because now she’s persuing<
C: so that is also people-oriented, just like you are, to a certain degree
F: ja, ja, ja. She IS ALSO very much people-oriented, °she loves dance and , you know,
all of that stuff. She was also very involved with (. ) modern dance and ballet. .hh But
more of an in: she, she’s very much an introvert° but people-oriented
C: yes
F: she’s happy to serve people
C: okay
F:° but she was quiet and you know°
C: and tell me a bit about your mother, her personality
( )
F: .hh My mom was also a clothing-designer,
C: right
F: uhm (2) and I, to a large extent, >my mom was a clothing designer that didn’t have (.)
all the opportunities that we have now<
C: ja
F: in the sense that my dad also, in his, in his early years, he’s become a different man
now, but she tells us when when they just married, because of family pressure, his mom
and (.) whatever. Uhm, it wasn’t, it wasn’t, you know, okay for women to work at that
time
C: correct
F: °so, despite that fact that her parents would have put her through college and she, she’s
very talented, my mom (1) in her field (of design)°
C: she, uh, she is qualified dress designer
F: qualified (clothing) designer, ja, ja
C: so, that’s quite unusual then for a girl then, to become qualified as anything
F: ja, ja
C: and then for how long did she not work
F: °soon after°
C: when she married your dad
F: °she married my dad when about 22°
C: right
F: °so she would have probably just finished her diploma (2) at Technikon at that time
and uh, then she married him°
C: and what happened
F: so she never worked as a designer. What she did in later years, was that she started to
work from home,
C: right
F: °>for her fri:ends and fami:ly and all of that stuff and people then saw the talent. Well
she then, even designed her own wedding dress, I’m told° and and then people sta, so
she started running a business from home<
C: Ja
F: °>about, I don’t know, I think we were teenagers when she then set up a business, you
know, but by that stage it became okay for my dad °(1) to say, okay well, now you can
do it, you know. Other women are doing it and the family, it it was a lot of pressure from
the family, she says in those years°<
C: not to work
F: not to work
F: >a: nd when she would have, she would have studied further, she would have done a
whole lot of things with her life<
C: yes
F: and, we’ve also had a family business, you see. My dad’s been part (. ) of a family
business
C: right
F: and, as we were growing up, I remember, my Dad’s elder brother had three daughters
and he had no sons. My, my brother was the only son
C: hmm
F: so he wanted my brother to get into the family business. It’s, it’s, it’s a it’s a sound engineering business, and it’s about 60,70 years old now. It’s a very well known

C: Ja

F: Business. > uhm, And because he didn’t have a son he wanted my dad, my brother to get into the business, my mother didn’t allow that. She said, you go to university and you study, you know<

C: that’s amazing

F: >and he thought, he thought, I would then be interested because I was very boyish, you know, sort of.

C: Okay

F: SPENT A LOT OF TIME in the business. Our holidays, we never s:, we never, we never (2) did nothing in our holidays

C: hmm

F: we worked

C: hmm

F: >we all had to do our little share in the business. It wasn’t a little family business, it was a big family business but we’d spent holidays working. We had Saturday mornings, you know. Sort of earned our own pocket money, in that way. But he, he for some reason. And he was very fond of us, my Dad’s elder brother. >And we never had grandparents you see<

C: hmmm

F: >My grandparents died when we when we were babies and (.) three or four years old or whatever, so<

C: Right

F: I’VE NEVER KNOWN grandparents (2) s save from my uncle and aunt (.) who were my grandparents

C: Yes (so they really took on that role)

F: >They took on that role and they really treated us ( ) their own kids. And they wanted us (.) to be just as involved in the business, you know as their kids (.) would be<

C: ja

F: >and he had three daughters and they didn’t really go further in education and stuff and got married quite early <..hh So, he really saw as as having the potential to –

C: ja. To take over the family business

F: to take over the business, whichever way. You know, he didn’t mind us studying, (1) ultimately you had to come back into the business. My mom said: “NO, NO, NO. These kids are not gonna grow up in this family situation. They need to

C: get educated

F: get educated”

C: why did she say that?

F: she saw the conflict as she was. She was a young gi:rl ,went into this family

C: hmm

F: the business always dominated everything, you know. I mean, I don’t know if it if it happens in your (group)

C: Yes (definitely)

F: a family business is terrible<

C: I also come from a family with a big family business
F: Ja
C: and I am definitely not part of it
F: In the same way that I’m not part of it
C: Ja. Uhm, also went and studied, so now to get back to your mom. You know, they
were just married and everything. Who used to make all the decisions in the household?
F: I would think (1) MY MOM IS, IS A DOMINANT PERSON
C: Hmm
F: you know, although she wouldn’t go out and, she wasn’t allowed. Not, ja, I suppose,
my dad would not allow her to go out and wo:rk. But I think she is, I see my mom as the
stronger person
C: okay
F: and I see (. ) a lot of a, a, a, I see a lot of my mom in me, you know. For me, my m:,
mother was my friend, my mother was (2) uhm, and that that’s how we relate to each
other now. Uhm, there isn’t that daughter kind of mother relationship
C: Ja
F: we’re (. ) more (. ) friends
C: what characteristics of her do you feel that you ?
F: I’ve got, well, I look like her
C: oka(h)y
F: except that she’s taller. But I think when I look at her, our ( ) and her face, she’s,
she’s a very beautiful woman
C: Ja
F: very dignified looking woman
C: Yes
F: and, uhm (. ) I think my sort of outgoing personality and, just my, my, my approach to
life is her approach to life.
C: Which is? Tell me a bit
F: >which is (2) I: (2) I mean I think professionally, my profession is very important to
me but I have a spiritual side as well, you know<
C: hmm
F: I, I, I meditate, I do yoga. .hh uhm All of that helps me with my professional life and
I’m happy to explore things that (. ) assist in my development
C: right
F: but I don’t only look at my development, but I look at development, how I could
benefit
C: other people
F: other people as well. You know I’m not a slave to society, (or anything of) that sort
C: Ja
F: you know, uhm but but I , for me it’s important ((sound of mineral water being poured
into glass))
C: tell me and is she a bit like that
F: °she’s like that, ja, she’s like that. ((sound of lid falling on table)) Very much like that,
you know. She hasn’t been able to, °she has done it in her own little way
C: Ja
F: Uhmm
C: How has she done it for example?
F: well I just think in terms of (2). hhhh (4) she hasn’t done it in the way that I would, in the kind of (2) 
C: through a career 
F: through some kind of career or intellectual ( ) but I just see it with her friends (.) and her (.) people that she is surrounded with and (.) Every now and again when I’m in Durban and there’d be people that I’ve never seen, I will say now who’s this. She’ll say that’s just a woman down the road and she needs to help me with this and you know 
C: Yes, so — 
F: somebody needs to go and help them with this 
C: altruistic 
F: Yeah, you know. Very altruistic ( ) you know, very altruistic, so I’m saying , she doesn’t do it. I would go out to a public meeting and address them, or- 
C: Right 
F: or that sort of thing 
C: but she helps in a small way 
F: but she helps in a small way. Or I would take on a public interest case 
C: Hmm 
F: with the *** ( ) but she does in her own little way. >I’m always saying “Mommy, but why are you doing this, do you have the time for this?” and Ja, but that keeps me going in a sense or she’s happy to. Some (.) poor woman (.) is getting married and she doesn’t have a WEDDING dress 
C: hahaha 
F: and she’ll sit and I’ll, you know this is COSTING YOU THOUSANDS OF RANDS 
C: Ja 
F: You know it’s okay, it’s okay, they have done things for me, and you know. They will help out, and, when you were kids they babysat you or: .hh you now that kind of thing 
C: hmm 
F: and, and I also see it with the family, the young people in the family, love (.) being around her 
C: because she’s kind 
F: because she’s kind and she’s also, she’s also very, she’s not narrow-minded like their parents would be 
C: right 
F: You know 
C: when you say that? 
F: Uh, you can talk to, I mean, they would come to talk to my mother about (. ) problems that they are having in their marriages 
C: Hmm 
F: Or (. ) you know 
C: ( ) 
F: ( ) They couldn’t talk , which they won’t be able to talk to their own parents about. And I think to a large extent they see the way she brought us up 
C: Hmm 
F: and it’s, so they feel, okay, you know, her kids are this way. She obviously 
C: Now do you think she brought you up differently because she’s educated 
F: °No, I don’t think she’s, no I don’t think that that°
C: Why do you think that is?
F: I think, I think
C: Just her personality?
F: I think it’s just her personality. Not, as much as it is, I think she must have been a rebel in her own day, you know or-
C: So, you’re very similar that way?
F: Hmm, Hmmm, Hmmm. ‘I think she was in her own way a rebel’ You know, I see it when I, when I compare her to her (. ) sisters and well, her brothers were much younger so they come from a different (. ) generation
C: generation
F: from her (2) but her two (. ) elder sisters when I, when I compare her to them
C: hmm
F: she she is just she she is like a shining light (. ) you know as compared to them
C: Is she a go-getter?
F: She’s a go-getter,
C: Ja
F: and ummm, I think she believes that she didn’t, she didn’t do as much as she could have done
C: Right
F: You know and she should have broken through those restrictions (. ) earlier but you can actually see it coming through now, you know, when she’s very comfortable what she’s doing and she’s (. ) SHE DOES WHAT SHE WANTS TO DO in a sense. My father doesn’t restrict her, you know
C: Hmm, hmm
F: whilst he MAY HAVE
C: done so
F: in the earlier days restricted her in some ways, he doesn’t do it anymore, you know
C: and tell me, when they used to have, when there used to be conflict situations in the household when you were children. Who used to, what did they used to fight about?
F: you mean between my mom and da:d?
C: Yes
F: '2 I think it was (2) you know I don’t know, it could be, uhm. I’m just trying to think‘ (4) There were times when they went through troubled times in their marriage, I remember (1)>there was one particular period when we were in high school when we thought that they’d divorce for some reason, I think, you know, uhm, it was also to do with, and after that I saw my dad kind of, just kind of becoming a (2) more liberated man in a sense, you know .There was a complete change and almost it was like my mom had to (2) say to him ‘you know I want to walk out of this now because I can’t have this for myself and my children
C: Ja
F: and I think it wa a lot of it at that, if I remember clearly there was a lot of family pressure and business and. She had to then go into the business, she had to spend a f: a number of years, she had to spend about 8, 9 (. ) years managing the business
C: that’s interesting
F: Ja, she, .hh uhm
C: up to a point though
F: up to a point
C: When she put her foot down?
F: when she put her foot down
C: Yes
F: (   ) and that. She then left the business and then she opened up her own designing studio (. you know, and I was already at (2) Less I was already in #standard 10#. > I think I was in Matric when she opened up her own, so she spent about eight years in business and.>...hh Ja, it was almost and then then they started and then they became part, they became part of the Rotary group and the JC’s and you know it was a different lifestyle altogether
C: altogether
F: altogether
C: and you feel, that she that she actually (   )
F: IT WAS LIKE THE FIRST TIME, IT WAS LIKE, >I remember I must have been standard seven or standard eight, and it was the first time I saw my MOM actually speak to a public, you know (.) speak_<
C: That’s amazing
F: which is, wh: and the first time that I saw my DAD do it,
C: Ja
F: Uhm (   )
C: So where does this person come from?
F: Well, this person was there all the time
C: Ja
F: they had to; they just needed an avenue,
C: Ja
F: to actually come to the fore, you know and maybe this Rotary Club or the JC’s or whatever (.) through their interactions there and the training they got there helped them, helped THAT part to come out
C: So she basically laid down the law and said to your father “I’m , this is it, I want my own business
F: Ja
C: I want to change things
F: Ja
C: because it’s too stifling in the family business”
F: Ja
C: That’s why she wouldn’t allow you to go into the family business either, or your brother?
F: WELL THAT WAS, WELL THAT WAS THE ONE. The other was just through the years of conflict not just. You know, it was probably, she probably saw the way the family interacted with my dad, and the demands that THEY made on my dad
C: uhhh
F: I mean, I remember when we were growing kids we spent more time with my dad’s elder brother >because he was already retiring from the business than with my dad because with sound engineering you’re out at big, you know. Hh concerts and rallies and whatever. And these things happen at night most of the time you know and your pa: , my dad used to come home at 2,3, o’clock in the morning, so we wouldn’t spend our evenings with him. We’d see him in the morning at breakfast and that was it, you know
C: Ja

F: we were asleep when he’d come, so we, we, we spend a longer time with my dad’s elder brother. He was a grandfather to us. I remember sitting with him and doing things and going to movies with him and you know ( ).

C: And how did your mom, what did she do? Was she on her own? if you dad was out working till three o’clock in the morning?

F: WE WOULD ACTUALLY GO OUT AND HIM, you know, my my uncle and his wife, and my mom would go along and we’d go out as a little family, you know, and uh there were other times when my, if there were, if there were, like concerts and those sorts of things then my mom would attend with my Dad. So, there were also some times when we spent more time, I REMEMBER WHEN WE WERE AT HIGH SCHOOL.

C: Hmm

F: ° and (.) late, late primary school, I suppose°. My mom and dad would go out, they’d they’d be involved together with whatever. So, if my Dad was going to a (.) some concert where he was doing the sound engineering. I mean HE’D OBVIOUSLY had his people to deal with all the manual stuff.

C: Right

F: °So, he’d be there as the manager or the owner of the business whatever °and then my Mom would go along with him, (so they’d) kind of attend the function together in a sense.

C: Ja

F: so, there was a, we, °I remember they were away from home a lot. My mom was also away from home (.) a lot. °Uhm

C: Who looked after you then?

F: It was my aunt and my uncle, you know, like (1) grandparents

C: and is your aunt very traditional?

F: <she was quite> she was also quite a nice, wo: lovely woman. She was traditional, but not, not (2) you know she had this thing that kids must be allowed to do whatever they want to do, you know

C: quite open-minded (herself)

F: very open-minded. She only died, two months ago, °I just you know, uhm, nine October°

C: Yes

F: It was quite sad

C: I’m sure

F: she was about seventy-eight or eighty years

C: Can I ask you just to reflect a bit on how your life is different to your mother’s. If you think when she was just married, and you. How old were you when you got married?

F: Well my mom, my mom was 22 when she married. I’m, I was 37 when I married, you know

C: Yes

F: Uhm° (4) when she married (.) somebody (.) from her cultural background,(you know) religious background. I didn’t. °Uhm (4) I think she married somebody that was not (.) I don’t think my dad was an established, although he was part of the family business, I don’t think he himself (2) was (.) an established businessman at the point where (.) she met him. So, obviously they had to (.) grow together and
C: Right
F: and, and I think J*** was fairly established when I met, you know met him, uhm. I THINK I, I PROBABLY, I, I knew J*** for seven years before I married him.
Not that we courted for seven years
C: Hmm
F: We were friends for seven years. We, we spent a short time, >3 or 4 months in a relationship, in 1994, 1995, and then we called it off and then we remained friends, so I had the benefit of getting to know him over that period before I married him. My mom probably got to now my dad, well a month or two and then her parents must have insisted that they be <
C: Was that an arranged marriage?
F: that they be married. No, it wasn’t an arranged marriage, it was a love marriage
C: Okay
F: but in those days you never courted for very long, so once, your parents knew that you were seeing somebody, it was formalized as quickly as possible to get married, you know
C: yes ( )
F: So, she must have been ( ) within six or eight months of knowing him she was already engaged and married, hh uhm
C: and when you make decisions in your household?
F: We, I think (1) I think J*** and I ( ) are very much equals in our household, uhm
C: Would you like to give me examples of that, when you say equals?
F: J, ja I think in terms of (2) well, I mean I think in terms of de de (2) like now we’re doing an extension, you know.
F: >We we’re talking about that together, we met with the architect together, we met with the contractors together, you know all of those decisions we do together. We don’t, he doesn’t say, oh well, I , I ‘m gonna extend the house now and this is my plan <
C: and you must just be happy
F: >and I must just be happy about it. If I don’t like it, I don’t like it, you know< So, I think he’s also despite (his age) he’s already 43.
C: yes
F: Although he’s an old school person, I think, he’s still a new school person in the sense that I SEE (2) You know I, ja : In a lot of ways he’s old school and a lot of ways he’s new sc: new school
C: tell me a bit about being uhm, old school?
F: I think you know, just in terms of hh (6) ag, you know I can’t see, he’s just in terms of his way:s and all of that stuff. He’s quite an old soul and.
C: hmm
F: >You see he, he’s not typically South African as well because he, he also spent most of, you know< He only came (.) back (.) to South Africa in 1990, (in 1989, 1990.) He was away from South Africa, hh when he ( .) from the time he was 2 years old. He was just born here and then his parents went abroad.
C: So, yes.
F: So
C: from a different culture really
F: from a different culture, ja: So, even (. ) when it, even when it comes to African
tradition , I mean, (. ) the man is completely (. ) in the dark , you know, and he can’t
C: Hahah
F: ^he just (. ) I mean, it’s horrible, because he:°
C: Does he, do you, does he feel he needs to know more?
F: He doesn’t feel he needs to know more. He feels he needs to know nothing he wants to
have nothing
C: haha
F: to do with it and that’s terrible (. ) for his parents, you know
C: Yes
F: because as much as he, his father is a theologian, uhhh
C: Right,
F: and, uh, you know, uh (2) But, but, with, despite the theology, it’s African theology
He he he integrates (. ) African custom into (. ) Christian theology (. ) and J*** doesn’t
like that part of his father. °<He doesn’t like that African (. ) customary part>° > And as
much as he lives a modern life and whatever, you get married then he wants you to go
through the customary wedding, and (. ) J didn’t want to do that and you know<
C: and did you do that?
F: WELL, I AGREED TO IT. >I said “I am willing to do it as long as it’s not going to
take anything away from me” .you know. I mean<
C: Yes
F: It’s, it’s, I’m not required to go and do any ritualistic thing. > I mean, it was just a
gathering of people< and uh (2) the father wanted to slaughter an animal and (. ) he did
that and we didn’t even (. ) see this. It happened
C: Yes
F: before we arrived ( )
C: and how did J feel about that?
F: Oh, he was just aah, what, you know, this is barbaric. And I said J it is not bar;
barbaric, because (. ) the Jewish sacrifice, the (. ) Muslims do it, you know, during Eid. I
have, I have grown up seeing it
C: Ja
F: Uh, so it’s not something horrendous, I mean, I can look at it being done >as much as
you don’t want to see it being done <you know
C: and tell me if you ever have uhm, arguments, what do you argue about?
F: °.hh God, I don’t know, what do we argue about? I think it’s more (8) am trying to
think what do we arg(h)ue about, uhh°
C: How long have you been married now?
F: °We’ve only been married a year, now, a year and a bit°
C/F: but you/we have known one another for 7 years
F: °.hh I think, .hh (4) you know when we have, .hh I mean it’s, it’s not the arguments
°that I’ve had with other boyfriends in the sense where it’s fighting and ranting and
raving°
C: Ja
F: you know, throwing tantrums. I’m not that kind of person ( )
C: That was more emotional
F: Ja, it was more emotional. I think J and I... to a large extent give, give each other our space, you know. I mean, I, I’ll kinda say something nasty to him, but he’s not... he doesn’t respond in a nasty way, you know.

C: He doesn’t rise to the bait.

F: He doesn’t rise to the bait. So, I realize, okay, you can say one sentence but you cannot (get a) go on nagging about these things, so: I MEAN, FOR INSTANCE, now, we want to have a child. And, you know, I had. I thought I was pregnant, three months ago, four months ago... and then they discovered (that) I had fibroids and endometriosis. Then they said I had to go for surgery and two months ago, and I spent a long period at home, about four weeks.

C: I’m sure.

F: Hmm and uh, J then had to go for his sperm count because he’s 40 so the doctors think that. You know, now that I’m ready to fall pregnant, they need to sort him out.

C: Yes.

F: and he’s been, he went for his first test, and now the holiday went by and he hasn’t gone for his second test. I said to him: “Listen, you know, I really don’t want to, I don’t need to have this baby, I can...”

C: Ja, haha.

F: you know, I can go on with my life without having this baby but it’s important for you. I know it’s important for you and it’s important for your family.”

C: Right.

F: “SO GO ON WITH THE BLOODY THING AND GO AND GET YOUR TEST DONE”

C: (It’s) that the family name, is he the only child?

F: No, no, he’s not the only child.

C: Ummm.

F: but uh, he’s not the only child, there are 2 or 3 other brothers.

C: Ja.

F: and there are lots of other grandchildren but J is special to his family.

C: Hmm.

F: A:nd uh, I see it, I see the way. I think he just never married for all the years, and he was, he was away most often from them. The other kids had spent many years with them, you know.

C: Ja.

F: But J was the one that was away the longest period. A:nd then I also see a lot, of his, in a sense, his Dad won’t admit it and he won’t admit it.

C: Hmm.

F: but I can see that he’s really the, his dad’s favourite child and a lot of, I can see a lot of him in his Dad and visa versa.

C: Hmm.

F: So: it’s very important for his Dad for some reason to... and I think he’s also the brightest of the lot.

C: Ja.

F: They probably wanna see grandchildren with (their whatever)

C: Haha, whatever.
F: I mean all his siblings are very successful.  
C: Yes  
F: I mean they’ve all studied abroad, they have all come back. Well, not they, not they’ve all come back. There’s one’s at uh (Crest) University in D***** in the US and the other one is professor in Canada  
C: Amazing  
F: Two brothers and uh, al, although J is not an academic he’s just excelled in business and I, you know. .hh uhm, I think it’s very important for his Dad  
C: Ja  
F: for whatever reason “to have a grandchild”  
C: And how does he react to this, you telling him he’d better get it done?  
F: Oh, I’m gonna do it, I’m gonna do it. And I say, you’ve been saying this now for about a week, you know. We’ve all been back already (for a week)  
C: that’s right  
F: we’ve been back for two weeks, go and sort it out. You know, he doesn’t, “Ja I’ll do it tomorrow morning” and then there’s a silence (.). and. He got up the next morning, and I remember, he, he left at about eight, I thought he was going to the gym and (.). hh I asked the maid and said has J left and she said yes, and then he phones me at about 9h30, to say, no I’ve gone for the test, “I’ve done it” and you know and he wants that kind of Ja, well, now I’m pleased with him ( )  
C: ( ) So you can leave him alone, haha  
F: but so, it’s it’s and then .hh ° other arguments that we’ve had you know, it’s just like. ° (2) You see there are NO arguments when it comes to finances, because  
C: hmm  
F: we, we have our shared responsibility at home, and I run my own finances and he runs his own finances. You know, I don’t, I never get involved in what he  
C: So you are quite independent  
F: very independent  
C: of one another  
F: and, uh, the marriage is accrual with ANC accrual thing and .hh in that sense he never asks me about and I think that would, you know, if we had to have some kind of joint account or  
C: Hmm  
F: I’d have insight into his finances and he into mine, then I think that would (have) cause problems ‘cause that takes away your independence to a large extent, you know  
C: Ja it does  
F: and I, and I think (.). we’ve (.). managed to keep that separately (.). uhm (2)>I’d argue with him over the television  
C: Hmm  
F: ‘cause he spends so much (of) time watching soccer and that (.). pisses me off<  
C: Haha  
F: English soccer English soccer fan and that really pisses me of  
C: ( )  
F: but then we just got ourselves another decoder and (put it through (.). the other room)  
C: Yes, so there’s a compromise all the time  
F: Yes, there’s a compromise, there as well
C: And can I ask you maybe now just to, to ask you some questions about your career?

F: Ja, ja

C: How have you see things change for women in this country, for instance since 1994? Do you feel there have been any?

F: just broadly?

C: broadly and then specifically, whatever

F: Ja . hh I think . hh ja, I, I, since 19, well for black women specifically uhm ja, Ja I think I’m (. ) constantly surrounded. Because I’m married to a black man (1) and we socialize so much with (. ) with black people which I didn’t , previously. I mean, I had lots of black friends

C: Ja

F: but I wouldn’t (. ) kind of go to gatherings that are entirely black .

C: ja

F: Now I would do that . Uhm and WHENEVER I’M AT THESE GATHERINGS, all of the women are so completely empowered, you know

C: hmm

F: they’re all professional women, they all hold (. ) high managerial positions, CEO’s, directors of companies. Uhm (3) you know most of them have (. ) a graduate, post-graduate degrees, so I’m constantly surrounded with very, very successful women. Uhm HOWEVER, AT THE BAR I’M NOT SURROUNDED with very,very successful Black women (1) you know

C: when you say that, what do you mean?

F:Uhm (. )I think women as laywers still struggle. Especially as advocates. Uhm , we’re in a very, very white, male-oriented (1) uh, profession

C: Ja

F:Well . not broadly the law profession but advocacy itself

C: Right

F: the advocate profession itself..hh Because it’s so specialized

C: hmm

F:(3) uhm, and we’re completely dependent on attorneys for work, so: the work doesn’t come directly from ( )

C: do they refer to you ?

F: ja, your work comes in from an attorney, so you really need the attorneys to . gain confidence in you and you, you need to actually build up (. ) profile before, you know they know who you are and that you are good at what you do and (whatever)

C: Ja

F: I’M QUITE FORTUNATE as an advocate in the sense that (. ) you know I, I ,let me just tell you broadly what I did. I (. ) probably finished my law degree in 1990,91, oh,1990. In 1991 I did a fellowship at a, at the ***** Centre

C: right

F: . hh which was both (. ) had a practical component and an academic component which suited me fine because I’ve always seen myself as (1) taking on, oh, you know, uh pursuing some kind of academic career as opposed to hh practice.

C: right

F: but it has changed over the years
F: and then while I was there I applied for a scholarship and I won a scholarship. So, then I went to, I went to study at G******** in the US, G****** University Law School. So, I did an LLM there and uh (4) That was also great because that was the first time I actually moved out of home.

C: Ja

F: You know all through my university, my LLB and my undergraduate I lived at home, with my p: you know

C: ( )

F: ALTHOUGH I HAD PART-TIME JOBS and all of that, suddenly I was you now, know

C: ( )

F: I had travelled overseas before or whatever

C: hmm

F: But with my parents, I’ve never, you know. Suddenly now, I was, going, going out to live on my own as well. >So it was the first time that I had actually lived on my own<

C: Ja, how long was that for?

F: That was for 2 years, two, two and a half years (or something of that sort)°

C: How did you experience that?

F: It was wonderful, I enjoyed every moment of it, because I went with an open mind and I said I’m gonna, you know. .hh I just want to (. ) enjoy this as much as possible, uh. I’m not just going to (. ) you know, see it as an uh (1) academic experience

C: Ja

F: You know, I want to uh (2). I, you know, I, I want to also see it as some kind of social .hh experience and a self-development experience. And I think (1) I came back with a whole (. ) lot more confidence. I I HAVE ALWAYS BEEN CONFIDENT

C: Hmm

F: But I think being with Americans makes you so much more confident. Uhm, when you’re there for the first three or four months, you’re kind of, especially when you’re sitting in university classes, and it’s the Socra, the Socratic method and (. ).hh you know, you kind of just (. ) .hh ask questions and answ. .hh you know you’ve gotta then answer questions in front of five hundred people WHICH WE NEVER DID AT UNIVERSITY. It wasn’t that kind of thing

C: Right

F: you know, you’ve been to a South African University as well

C: Yes

F: So you know ((coughing)) and (. ) in the beginning, it was like °Go:°d these Americans have a lot of confidence° and then you realize

C: Haha

F: two or three months later that you have just as much confidence but (. ) you know

C: You must just use it, apply it

F: But, you must just apply it, you know, and uhm

C: Ja

F: and, often their confidence (5) doesn’t equal (. ) intelligence (. ) you know

C: Hmm
and that you realize within three and four months as well, that, you know when you think through something silently and and you will articulate it in two or three sentences, you’ll get to the point.

C: Hmm

F: they’ll say something for half an hour and, you know

C: Maybe not get to the point?

F: not get to the point

C: Lot of words and very little sense

F: Ja ja .So:

C: And then you came back and you started your own practice?

F: AND THEN I, I LECTURED THERE at Uni.. °I finished at G******* I lectured for a year I think at the university of M******** (2) and I had done this course, uh gender. I lectured a gender studies course so essentially we are dealing with issues of poverty and women and the question of AIDS and just broadly, sexual harassment and a whole lot of those areas, you know.°

C: hmm

F: °that we were dealing with from, from a legal perspective °

C: ja

F: hmm. And (. ) the courses I studied when I was doing my Master’s there were also like International Human Rights Law, °feminine, uh, feminism and the law, uhm, interna., what was it, there was some international women’s course I did, uh,homelessness law °

C: Can I ask you

F: and a whole lot of

C: Ja

F: those sort of public interest oriented courses

C: So, now when you with, with that background and that wealth of, when you came back and you, and you see how the black advocates, female advocates, really they’re still struggling, how do you feel about that?

F: I DON’T LIKE IT AT ALL

C: hmm

F: and that’s why I think I’m very active (1) in terms of transformation at the Bar

C: Yes

F: I, I’ve, I, let me just. > I need to go back, you need to know a little bit about my public interest background<

C: Right

F: Uhm. >I told you about, I was politically active at university<

C: Yes

F: >I belonged to student organizations and the labour movement and all of that stuff at university as well .hh and then (. ) when I chose to, to (4), you know, when you finish university you’ve got to do your articles. I chose not to go into the commercial art, uhm, commercial law firm

C: Rmm

F: I chose deliberately to go into the ********** Centre, you know, because I saw this as some kind of .hh umh (4) a weapon to to achieve justice in a sense

C: Right

F: You know and for poor people especially
C: Ja
F: uhm then and then when I got the F******* I also chose courses that were uh, public interest related so it was supportive of that whole idea
C: That’s right
F: Uhm, I rem. I remember, my colleagues said to me, other South African (people),° why the hell are you wasting your time with homelessness law°
C: Haha
F: go and do commercial (transactions)
C: Mmm
F: I said well, that’s not, where my passion lies
C: Ja
F: So then I, and then I well, then I. Okay I came back to South Africa after the year of teaching there. After the studying and the teaching .hh and then I wanted to kind of pursue this whole women’s, human rights, women’s rights, human’s rights area. That was about ni:, March’94, or something just before, ja, it was C: the election
F: °before the elections, ja. March, April ’94, I think. °.hh> And then I (.) ugh, you know, I could (.) apply to Natal University, I could apply here at Wits or UCT
C: Hmm
F: I chose deliberately to go to the University of the Western Cape (2) and be part of their community LAW Centre°<
C: Yes
F: .hh at that point , the person who was heading their Women’s rights project (2) moved into government became a minister, B M
C: Okay
F: uhm, when I applied I then got that position, they then (.) asked me to also do a (.)to teach. Uhm, so I then thought, constitution law and international human rights. Kader Asmal was also going to government to become (.) Minister at that time.
C: Right
F: so that post became vacant, vacant from May. I, I then spent May to December teaching there. .hh And I, I, I thought it was going to be, you know. I really thought: “Oh I’m gonna feel completely satisfied and fulfilled” and you know, lecturing to (.) black university students,
C: Hmm
F: essentially black. I mean there were white students
C: Hmm
F: at UWC. I did some part-time lecturing constitutional law at UCT .hh uhm. >I thought, oh this is, this is really what I want to do, work within this kind of community
C: Hmm (environment)
F ‘cause it was essentially working class<
C: Ja
F: university students at UWC. >I hated it. I hated every minute of it.
C: Why is that?
F: I think Cape Town for me was just a complete shock at the time uhm (4) for me I always saw Cape Town as being more, for some reason

C: more liberal?

F: More liberal. And I mean, JO’BURG WAS ALWAYS THAT WAY, you know, uhm

C: Yes

F: Uhm, (2) but I always saw Cape Town as just, ja, the ultimate place to be at and to work at and you know all of those things, and. But the racism there was just tremendous. I mean, not that I, I didn’t it wasn’t something that affected me personally (.) in terms of (. ) my existence there

C: Ja

F: but ( .) in terms of my interaction ( .) with the students. (2) .hh >I mean it was it was for me, it was even worse in the sense that it wasn’t. It was coloured on black, coloured and African (as opposed to black on white)

C: So was it unexpected

F: It was completely unexpected. Uhmm. I SEE THAT, I just came back you know, having a completely ( .) idealistic view of ( .) what society was going to be in 1994 in a sense

C: Ja

F: you’re away for three years and aaah o you wanna get back now (and you’re ready to do this thing) o

C: because of changes

F: It’s changed and you’re looking forward to this integrated society and YOU HAVE ALSO NOW BEEN IN A MORE INTEGRATED SOCIETY, you know

C: Of course

F: YOUR FRIENDS NOW COME FROM ALL OVER THE WORLD

C: Ja

F: No longer just South Africans. .hh Uhm o it was completely disappointing and (4) as much as I enjoyed it, the academic ( .) part of it, you know, the writing part and the the presentation of papers and all of that

C: Ja

F: Cape Town for me, just didn’t, didn’t like it at all o. Uh< (2) I then (2) oh, that was ‘94, and beginning of ‘95 was when the constitutional court was established. And ah, (6) well I mean, I suppose, ja, because my boyfriend was here in Jo’burg and I wa(h)s, I was in Cape Town. He was, he was also (2) he had lived ( .) in America for about 14 years when I had met him

C: Hmm

F: and he was about to come back. Within a year of meeting him, he came back. So we were separated for a year while I was still in America and then when I came back although I was in Cape Town and he was here in Jo’burg,

C: Hmm

F: We kinda still had a relationship .hh (3) and at the end of that year he decided uuhh, he thinks he wants me, you know he wants me in Jo’burg

C: Right

F: for this relationship to work. And I, I was reluctant and I thought, okay if I come here it means lecturing and whatever else. And I, for some reason, I didn’t wanna

C: go back there
F: go back, hh to lecturing.
C: Ja
F: you know, I was, I was (for eight months). I mean America, it was fine
C: Ja
F: I loved it, but I didn’t like it here in South Africa at all. Uhm, and fortunately then
the court was gonna start in, in, in January of the new year ‘95 and the judges were
looking for clerks uhm, clerks in the Centre ********. Researchers that came in with
some kind of constitutional experience-
C: knowledge
F: And (.) you know .hh I had fortunately finished, come back from America and had all
this knowledge through the lecturing and also my experience there (2) and all these (.)
new areas (.). of constitutional law. (2)So I then, ja I sent in my CV there and I got a job
THERE and then I spent (3) 95 working at the court
C: What what was your experience there?
F: It wa: it was nice but at the end of the day you’re a researcher
C: Ja
F: and you don’t make decisions
C: you can’t really change things
F: you can’t really change things. As much as you can give the judge ideas, and you
know, incorporate that (into the judgement). We worked on all the leading judgments,
there’s the death penalty judgment and (.). there were, lots of leading judgments in that
first year of the court (2) and WE MADE OUR CONTRIBUTION in terms of our
research ideas and stuff. But at the end of the day, it’s. It all goes through to the judges
and they all go through that and then they, you know articulate it in the way that. .hh So
while you can see your kind of contribution there, it’s at the end of the day
C: hmm
F: you know, you, you’re subject to somebody else’s
( )
( Interruption: tape has to be changed )
C: You were telling me about your experience as a researcher
F: Ja, I mean I, ja (2) and this is, I mean, ja, and I also, .hh the judge that I was (.). that I
worked for *********, who (.). was a (.). pure affirmative action (.). appointee (1) uhm
(2) she hadn’t really, she hadn’t really practiced law, she was an academic (.). you know.
She studied at the University of****** (or something and came back ) and
C: Right
F: lectured somewhere, I dunno, lectured at one of the ***** Universities I think. But,
not even proper lecturing, you know, sort of African customary law or something, not
real (1) substantive courses
C: so you you worked for a female judge-
F: Ja, I worked for
C: I was going to ask you how many male judges and how many female judges there
were ?
F: No there were only 2 female judges. It was herself and ********
C: Okay
F: and the rest were male judges
C: Right

F: uhm, and I remember the the the (.) *********who died (Chief Justice)

C: Yes

F: he asked me to work for him and she she asked me the day before

and he asked me a day later. I already say, said yes to her and I couldn’t

C: (back out)

F: now, ba: back out. So, I stayed with her

C: Uhm

F: >I could have very easily backed out and worked with him and I would have probably

developed (2) learnt more (.) from being with him. But at the end of the day you’re

interacting with all the judges, so it wasn’t so bad. < But just working with her

specifically, she didn’t inspi:re me in any way

C: Hmm

F: Uhmm, I think she may have learnt more, I I I’m not being arrogant here

C: Hmm

F: °but I really think she would have learnt more from me than I would have learnt from

(her). She’s a lovely, lovely person. I loved her°

C: Hmm

F: She, I I I’ve seen her develop over the years you know, uhm. She was just too new at

that time. Not young, she wasn’t young; she’s 45, so.

C: She didn’t have the knowledge

F: She didn’t have the knowledge, °you know ,for and and here she is now a judge in one

of the highest courts in the land°

C: Ja

( )

F: (...) ((confidential part omitted on request of subject))

( )

F: a:nd (.) as much as I enjoyed the year there and (4) well, enjoyed the experience of

being the judge’s (.) researcher. I did, I (.) could have spent another year there, felt I

don’t, didn’t want to do that

C: Right

F: you know, uhm. At that point I, you know, we’d sit in court every day and watch (2)

the advocates here from the Bar arguing all these matters before us.° They were

essentially male, I, ja they were essentially male, I think. (Maybe) one or two women

(2) that appeared, uhm (1) >and I kept looking at them and I kept thinking < but you

know why do I want to (.) pursue this academic°

C: career

F: career (.) in law (.) when I can, you know, I can stand out there and I can argue these

cases

C: and actually make a change

F: actually make a change. That will happen quicker than, you know, taking this

academic route

C: Ja

F: uhm (2) and as, for a year I just sat there (.) watching these people. Not for a year,

within six months I decided I (really) want to (.) practice law

C: Right
F: so I think July of that year I had to now decide because (.) you must remember when I
left UWC they wanted me to come back the next year so I had to then (2) say to them, I
want to resign, you know, pursue uhm, (a) career as an advocate here in Jo’burg.
C: Hmm
F: So, it meant me going back into training now. So, by J, by January of that year, no by
the July, August of that year, I spoke to one or two of the advocates that were coming
to court all the time and said you know is it possible for me to do this?, but I really can’t
afford, because I live in Jo’burg, my parents live in, in Durban<
C: Ja
F: I haven’t amassed any money to actually spend six months now.
C: Ja
F: You gotta, when you train as an advocate you’ve gotta spend six months without
salary,
C: Right
F: without income you know, and here I’ve got my, I’m on my own, I’ve got my rent to
pay, ( ) you know. I was completely independent of my family (.) now. AND I
REALLY DIDN’T WANT TO, I COULD HAVE GONE BACK TO DURBAN, lived
with him, with them and you know
C: done it that way
F: done the six months there. Yea, but I didn’t want Durban, I didn’t want to go back to
Durban, °for me it was now just not (.) you know°
C: Haha
F: °gonna do anything for me at all.° Uhmm (1) >and then I went back to the, I spoke
with ***** who was at the *****Centre at the time as their Constitution Litigation (.)
Head Director, and he was from the Bar previously. >And I spoke with him and he said
well why don’t you come and do, you know, why don’t you come and work (.) with us
C: Hmm
F: we’ll pay you a salary. > Now you must remember I was also part of the *** Centre
many years before
C: Yes
F: So, I had a relationship with them< uhm, he said, “Come work with us and we’ll pay
you and you can then do your pupilage at the Bar (1)” you know. Uhm, and then I got a
special, you, normally you’re not allowed to earn a salary, while you (.) spend those six
months in training at the Bar<
C: Right
F: but they, but they gave me a special dispensation because I, it was, °I was part of a
public interest firm and I, you know, wasn’t part of the (.). com, commercial world where
that was competitive. I mean, here you were purely dependent on (.). funders and funding
for, for your litigation<
C: Ja
F: So you were not competing in the, in the open market
C: That’s right. You qualified as an advocate then?
F: Ja, I spent the six months qualifying as an advocate°, the only thing they wanted me to
do at the ****Centre is to spend (.). a period of twelve months with them, after I finished
as an advocate. So I needed to, in a sense, pay them back
C: Right
F: for the time that they paid me (. ) to, to study
C: Ja
F: so I agreed to that and I worked for them for a year (1) and in that time of working I
acted as the, acting director° when W** was away as a judge, and all of that stuff, so it
was quite empowering °
C: position
F: position.
C: Was that quite, did you feel that you changed things, that you were able to?
F: Well, I think in terms of, (4) I think because I came in with kind of (a ) specific
knowledge with public issues
C: Ja
F: and you must know that there were people there ( ) they were working there for many
years, twelve years, 13, 14 years, public interest law. >You know, their career is when it
comes to public interest law, they’ll NEVER GO into commercial law<
C: Right
F: I think I learnt a lot from them, but I think (. ) with coming in with new ideas, and also
coming in with specific litigation uh skills, which uhm , uhm, they, you know >they were
attorneys ( ) that had kind of been working (in one area ) of land or whatever< So,they
didn’t have broad litigation experience
C: Hmm
F: uhm, and I came in ( ) with kind of those ( ) writing skills and argumentative skills,
that, you know, THAT THEY WERE THEN PREPARED to kind of
C: allow you
F: allow me: you know, to run the case (. ) in a way that I wanted to in a sense. ‘Cause
ultimately I was the one who was arguing the case in court as opposed to THEM. You
know, they’ll do the b, the basic preparatory work, we’ll do the, the actual argument
C: Ja
F: and I think, working with people that were in for for in this area of law for a long
time, I think I learnt from them and I think they learnt from me. >I, I kind of didn’t come
in with this, the arrogance of the new, you know, advocates te. tend to be very arrogant
and always see themselves as being better than attorneys<
C: Yes
F: and I didn’t want to be that kind of person because at the end of the day I knew these
people over the years
C: Yes
F: you know, although I may have not remained with them, they were good to me and
they actually started me off in my interest in this area of the law. Uhm and it’s not, uh,
although I was based here in Jo’burg
C: Hmm
F: you, you had uhm, interaction with all of the offices, Cape Town, Durban, PE, uhm
and you were getting work from all of the offices. You were pretty busy at the ti:me and
(1) it was also interesting to work with people like George Bizos and Wim Trengrove, to
learn, you know, to pick up skills from them,
C: That’s right
F: because they come with years and years of experience. Uhm (6) what happened then I
, I spent a year there it was really wonderful, I was going to go over to Canada, to spend
six months doing a (. ) specialized constitutional course (. ) in Canada at the University of
Toronto which the *****C was going to, which the Canadians funded but I was going
through as an *****C person. But, you must remember when I worked at the
constitutional court; I was earning a fairly comfortable salary. And now when I went to
the ****C, to do my pupilage
C: That’s right
F: it dropped (. ) somewhat, not substantially, but it dropped, it dropped a, a (. ) bit
C: Hmmm
F: and then I had to take a loan in order to subsidise the, the shortfall, .hh and (. ) the
agreement with the ****C was that (. ) after I finish my pupilage they will then increase
my salary. (3) uhm, to what (. ) you know, I should be getting. Uhm, and when that period
finished and I worked for a bit and (2) then somebody else (. ) whose colleague of mine
here right now, a black male , came in. He had a wife and family (1) and he had exactly
the same experience that I had, not exactly, the same
C: Hmm
F: but if you look at the number of years and
C: similar
F: the academic (. ) achievement and all of those things, we’ve had similar experiences.
Uhm I PROBABLY HAD SLIGHTLY MORE THAN HIM. (2) He was older than I was
C: Hmm
F: he was, I was I was, (what I was 30,31, he was, no I was about 20, ja, I was about
30,31 at the time). He must have been about 45 already, you know. And when he came
in they paid him a higher salary (3) and when I discovered this I was unhappy with it
C: I’m sure
F: but I thought, okay, I’m not, I’m not asking for (. ) what he’s earning right now
C: Right
F: I’m saying, increase my salary by this mu. By this percentage, you know, and they
refused to do it and for me that was (1) double standards, that was discrimination, I was a
woman. No, and then the other thing is there was a WHITE woman that came after me,
six months LATER
C: Ja
F: she came in as an attorney
C: meanwhile you’re an advocate
F: she also came in. I’m an advocate and she came in with less experience than, than I
had. But she negotiated her salary up front
C: Hmm
F: . hh Now, because I had that I had that agreement that I would, we’d get it increased
after my pupilage, they then, nobody wanted to talk about it. But she was earning a
higher salary than me and he was earning a higher salary because he was black and male
°and had w.wi. wife and children and I was .hh a single woman
C: ( )
F: and I thought, this is completely (. ) discriminatory
C: Yes
F: and I’m not prepared to (. ) to work for you
C: Yes
F: You know. Oh, and then this caused such a .hh raucus at the ****C because
C: Haha

F: you know I then put in my resignation. OBVIOUSLY I went through the proper channels, and all of that stuff

C: Hmm

F: and it came to EXCO and (2) one of the women directors then said absolutely not, why should we pay her a higher, a higher salary you know

C: instead of supporting you

F: instead of supporting me. And then they were people that were clearly supporting me

C: Ja

F: and then, other than the woman, hh you know the

C: Hmm

F: the key decision maker decided

C: No

F: this is not gonna happen, you know. Who the hell does she think, she wants a higher salary. So, I said well, to hell with you guys, I'm not prepared to work here, you know

F: and then I spoke to other people and a few judges out there and they said listen you’re wasting your time, within the public ser, the ********** Centre, you really need to go, you’ve got the potential to go and make it on your own at the Bar< you know

C: Right

F: Uhm (4) so I put in my resignation and the IRONY of it is that when I came to the Bar, these people were then (.). briefing me and they were paying me for one case what they (.)

F: paid me in a month there

C: (poetic justice)

F: you know and they still brief me

C: Hmm

F: you know, I charge them a reduced fee right now, I charge them, I don’t know 40% of my normal fee but IT STILL AMOUNTS TO MORE THAN what they would have paid me in a month there

C: unbelievable

F: and they’re completely dependent on me, they love me

C: Yes

F: wa. Use me all the time and you know. Hh so:

C: ( )

F: they’ve asked me on various occasions to come back to them but I can’t work for them for the salary that they pay, you know, it’s just impossible

C: Ja. Can I ask you a final question? Maybe to reflect on how you feel working as an advocate, is there any, are there any changes that you would still like to see?

F: Ja, I would, I I would, I mean I’ve been here now since 1996, 1996 at the Bar, 1997. April 1997 I left the *****C. Uhm, I've been fairly lucky in the sense that I came in with a profile, so people kind of got to know me, years before I got here

C: Right

F: and when I got here, I had a lot of kind of big (.). ready made work in a sense you know

C: Ja

F: Brought into matters by senior council and uhm, but BEING A WOMAN, I still see that (1) I mean my practice could have been three times, I could have been earning (1)
three times what I’m earning now if I was a man doing exactly the same thing that I am
doing
C: Incredible
F: Ja, uhm you see men that are (. . .) intellectually less astute with NO INTELLECTUAL
CAPACITY
C: Ja
F: they have no passion for the law. They really. hh (2) they just don’t have the art of
litigation, uhm don’t know the art of litigation, and these people are earning much more
because (. . .) they’re men
C: Yes
F: you know and because they’re white men
C: Ja
F: or because they’re black men. Now, you find now there’s black men are doing very
very well, because attorneys (. . .) through government pressure
C: (have to refer to them)
F: or other agencies have to (. . .) bring in (. . .) black males.
C: Right
F: uhm, so (. . .) if an attorney has to make a choice between (. . .) somebody that’s a
constitutional expert
C: hmm
F: that’s a woman (. . .) and (. . .) bringing a black male that has no constitut, you know so you
need to BECAUSE YOU HAVE TO BRING A BLACK MALE, you bring in a black
male who’s got some experience of constitutional law
C: instead of a woman with a lot of experience
F: with a lot of experience, you know and and and I find that the attorneys are also not
seeing Indian women as being black women. Indian and coloured women are not being
seen as being (2) black
C: Well then, what are you?
F: So
C: Ja
F: if they had to choose between me an African woman, they’ll, they’ll choose an
African woman, a woman<o
C: That’s very interesting
F: hh but now, the other thing. What then happens, is you have, you bring in this black
man or you bring in this black as in African woman, that have got (1) little or no
experience in a particular area, and (then) they’re making a merry mess of it and then
ultimately, it it then spoils it taints
C: Hmm the whole reputation
F: the reputation across the board
C: Ja
F: so, then you, you know, then you have those attorneys who have a lot of confidence (in
you) they know your work, they know your skills, they know you can do the job
C: Hmm
F: and they (. . .) with no hesitation will bring you into matters, you know. I mean, for
instance, (if) there are matters that come from Nat, national treasury, they’ll always
bring me in
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C: Yes

F: ‘cause they know that I will achieve the results (.) that they want ( )

C: so, your knowledge and your skill

F: and PURELY ON MERIT at the end of the day, they’ll bring you in

C: Yes, not because you’re a woman, or that you are not white or whatever

F: Ja Ja Yes. Okay, so that. So I think at the end of the day, women whether you are

black white or green (.) will always

C: Hmm

F: are always, are still (.) uhm disadvantaged at the Bar. You’ll find the women, just

speaking generally. You’ll find that most women run practices that are not commercial,

non-commercial practices, they’re doing family law, divorces or those sort of things .hh

C: Hmm

F: I CHOSE DELIBERATELY not to go into those areas

C: Hmm

F: .hh I could have made much more money when I started off at the Bar, >you know

because you can earn a lot on divorces, and custody battles and all of those things

C: Ja

F: uhm in the family law area, but I chose not to do it, because I wanted to pursue this

constitutional law, (public, not just public interest law, but constitutional administrative

law.) And then I also have, I, I from time to time will work on a big tax matter or a

intellectual property matter or a foreign exchange matter

C: Right

F: so, there is a (.) commercial angle there but you know (.) we come in because we’ve

got the constitutional skills.

C: Yes

F: .hh So in that way you can I can

C: cross over, so to speak

F: cross over,

C: Ja

F: you know and gain gain knowledge in the commercial area as well. Although I don’t

go and do, I won’t go and do insolvencies, and you know that kind of

C: Hmm

F: Pure commercial work, it doesn’t interest me, it’s just a .hh I mean (.) I think one case

is like every other case

C: Ja

F: There’s nothing different. You do fifteen of those

C: ( )

F: and you become, you can earn 200, 300 thousand Rand a month. I don’t want that.

SO I MADE DELIBERATE CHOICES EARLY (.) in my career as an advocate. It’s

now paid off, you know,

C: Ja

F: where I’m now kind of seen to be the (.) specialist in my area and I’m brought (.) into

cases because of my specialization

C: And do you feel that you can make a change. That your voice is heard?
F: Hmm hhmm. Well, I think although that’s the one, the one is litigation wise in the sense where you. Ja, most of the cases I work on are precedent setting cases in the sense, it’s a new area of the law.

C: Right

F: It’s a new point within the law. Uh, sometimes I do it completely on my own, other times I, I work with a senior council. So essentially, you as the junior would do all the argument and draw up the the (heads of) argument and that senior council would go in and argue it. Uh uhm you know there are only about, across the country there are only about I’d say ten, twelve senior council women.

C: Incredible

F: You know but you’ve gotta spend at least 15, 20 years before you reach that level.

C: Ja. Uhm and I also find that the women that are senior councils don’t have the same knowledge or experience that the male senior councils.

C: Why is that?

F: Because, the the women that are senior councils now would have also been fast-tracked. They also came from very specialized backgrounds. Family law backgrounds.

C: Ja

F: They would have done some commercial work, but they knew, they’re not broadly knowledgeable when it comes to all. When you’re senior council you’re supposed to be knowledgeable in all areas of the law.

C: Hmm

F: You can be brought into any matter, you know, you must apply yourself to it. Now, you, you, you’re never gonna get that situation with males, with female senior council because most of them were fast-tracked after 7 years in practice or 10 years in practice whatever, as opposed to men who spent 20 or 25 years...

((interruption: phone rings))

F: It’s I mean in one sense it’s good that they’re being fast-tracked ‘cause you’ve gotta now

C: ( )

F: YOU’VE GOTTA THEM TO SENIOR COUNCIL REALM to actually now what was that word? You, you’ve gotta, ja, (you see we) it’s a whole, it its a chain in a sense. You’re junior council, you then become senior council from being a senior council, you then become a judge

C: Hmm

F: Uh, now in order to get women judges to the bench.

C: Hmm

F: You have to have sufficient.

C: numbers,

F: numbers

( )

C: So you have to fast track

F: so you have to fast track them

C: Ja
F: but the point is that they, (2) I mean there are some women that have done wonderfully,
C: Hmm
F: I mean, for instance if you take six that was fast tracked
C: Hmm
F: uhm, six, now that’s developed over the last six years
C: Right
F: you know, as judges they now, they they’re doing exceptionally well. Uhm And there
are other women judges, ( ) and a whole lot of other people, you know, that are doing
very well but (.) but they’re still not as knowledgeable as men because they’ve
never had the same
C: experience
F: experience
C: Ja
F: you know, because of the discrimination in the past and if anybody suffered
discrimination, they, they have been
C: Ja
F: you know, the victims of it, you know. We’re still, we’re still fortunate in a sense that
we live in an age where (.) we still, men still respect us
C: Ja
F: you know, they had to fight through (.) many more
C: battles to get there
F: battles to get there. So it’s very unfortunate, hh you , and and you’ll also find that
their practices are also not as busy as the male senior council
C: Hmm
F: It’s just
C: the way it is
F: ◎ it’s the way it is but it’s gonna take a while before we can (.) remedy that
situation ◎ so the the the. So you, so you still find, I mean there are now a
number of women at the Bar ◎
C: Hmm
F: ◎ there are probably about I don’t know if there if there (2) say if there are three
thousand there are about 3000 of us across the ◎ country.
C: Right
F: but say now, at least a hundred and nine, a hundred or maybe a thousand of us, are
now women (1) you know
C: Ja
F: ◎ uh, no, no it’s not even that, (I’d probably say, six, seven hundred of us are now
women. ◎ But (.) you still don’t have the same opportunities that the, that the (.) male
has and we’ve gotta break through that
C: Hmm
F: uh in the same way that black people don’t have the same opportunities as white
people
C: Right
F: because (.) society will always see white people as being better than black people
C: Right
F: uhm (2) and I, I mean, I think that (2) and I’m very involved in the, °in the
transformation body at the Bar council, those sorts of bodies at the Bar °
C: Ja
F: you know, for the last 4, 5 years now. I went from being the ********* of those of the
Bar council
C: I saw your photograph
F: Ja, >that was when I was still general secretary and then I became an elected member a
year later and last year I became an elected member< but I RESIGNED. I was elected on
the Monday and resigned on the Tuesday
C: Hmm
F: because I didn’t see this body as, well, me and firstly there were two resignations
C: hmm
F: °myself and a, and a black male.°
C: Ja
F: He was very much a leader of this Bar (1) .hh and uh, and we’ve been involved (.) for
the longest period
C: Ja
F: now there are many more black people in this last election there were many more
black people that were (1) involved . But what we saw, is that we, D and I always stood
as a buffer (.) between government and (. ) the white Bar
C: Right
F: and (.) as a result of having us there to protect (. ) them, the white Bar
C: Ja
F: they became very complacent .hh
C: Ja
F: so, lots of (3) .hh the the kind of .hh transformation winds (1) that we had made
previously in the past three years (1) stopped happening now
C: Hmm
F: >°because people were oh no, we’re protected from the government, we’re not ( ) the
government is not gonna regulate over us anymore . We’re gonna maintain our
independence as an independent Bar °<
C: Hmm
F: and all of those things. And (1) things that we thought will happen (1) last year for
instance,
C: Hmm
F: >didn’t happen and we thought well what is the point of
C: exactly
F: of sitting on this on this body, you know<
C: Double standards
F: double standards. >°We really need to go out there and, and fight our own battle as
black people and (.) .hh the other eight black people that were also elected soon as we
resigned, two, three days later they then resigned . So, there, at the moment there’s just
one black person sitting on the Bar Council and he chose .hh purely for professional
reasons, he doesn’t care a damn about anybody’s, anybody else’s°<
C: Other people, the general population almost, so to speak
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F: Ja, ja a: a: and we, you know. All of, all of us (are not happy) not because of us, we’re now fairly senior
C: Ja
F: we have now, you know (. ) ((clears throat)) achieved and have fairly successful practices. >It’s these young people that come in that are here for six months and one year<
C: Right
F: ( )
C: The juniors
F: The baby juniors. We call them baby juniors. You know, they just finish ( ), they come in and they are here for two years and then they have to le:ave, you know and I mean, if the government expects us now to fill that bench
C: Right
F: with judges, with black people
C: (you need to train them)
F: ( ) you need to start changing patterns here on the ground and start training them.
F: The only way .We train them, we give them advocacy training
C: Ja
F: >You know, as advocates we, every two or three months we run courses and we go into court, and you have mock trials and all this and then we all partake in that<
C: Ja
F: We’ve been trained as trainers and we then partake . We’re doing a wonderful job when it comes to that.
C: hmm
F: But unless () you give them ()
C: opportunities
F: o opportunities and unless the attorneys are prepared to brief them () they’re not gonna gain any experience. And, and, now we’re trying to change those briefing patterns
C: Right
F: and uhm, just () you know we’re introducing various scholarships and funding and soft loans, and, you know, where we might have to sacrifice a bit () general () population at the Bar, may have to sacrifice a bit
C: Ja
F: because their subscriptions will be higher, whatever°
C: Ja
F: but, at the end of the day, at least these young black people are being trained () and women. Women and black people are the same
C: Ja
F: >whether you’re a black woman or a white woman uhm. Unless you give them the opportunities. You know, in twelve years they’re not going to be ready to go to the bench, in twelve years they’re, or 13 years they’re not gonna be ready to become senior council<
C: Hmm
F: so at the end of the day, you know
C: Well, that’s wonderful that you are doing something so constructive
F: Ja, ja. I'm now involved in that. We have now set up a new transformation committee and we work, we're working. We're not part of the Bar Council anymore.

C: Hmm

F: because we have resigned from there. However, they have kept our seats open and they're hoping that we'll come back at some point but we're not ready to go back.

C: Hmm

F: ((coughs)) but we have now engaged with the Bar Council. Uhm, it's a fairly, fairly, fairly, conservative Bar Council, uhm I think the white population here, the conservative white population there's a substantial number of conservatives here they decided to stand for ele, when they saw a lot of black people were coming on and were making.

C: Mmm

F: great strides transformation-wise. They decided to fill the the senior category with conservative people.

C: to block it

F: to block it, ja, ja. But uhm

C: at least you are making

F: Ja, so, a lot of, a lot of a lot of time gets taken up with these political issues.

C: Ja

F: You know you spend evenings, you spend weekends. I mean here we've only started this week and I'm already, on Sunday we've got a full day transformation meeting you know, to discuss ways of changing these patterns and going out and meeting with the corporate world and the black empowerment world and attorneys and

C: Hmm

F: you know you can't only just meet with attorneys, because the, at the end of the day the attorneys get their work from the corporates

C: from the public

F: from the Anglos

C: Ja

F: and whoever

C: That's right

F: and uh, so we actually need to go out there and meet with the public, you know. So you've got to now in terms of your commitment to change society. Uhm, I mean, it happens in the commercial world.

C: Hmm

F: you know, affirmative action is applied, why aren't you? You know, why are you only bringing white lawyers into matters, bring in black lawyers. We're not saying you need to bring in the black lawyer as your senior council.

C: Hmm

F: bring in the senior council

C: You can give them experience

F: but bring in a junior

C: Ja

F: even as a third. We've now introduced something called a third junior rule

C: Hmm
F: where (1) for instance there’s there’s a senior. Say, I’m brought in as a junior, okay;
C: Hmm
F: and you bring in a THIRD junior
C: Hmm
F: who actually learns from the second junior and then WE will give a portion of our fee
to that third junior
C: Okay, very interesting
F: You see, so there are some, some sacrifices that we have to make
C: ( )
F: but people have to be prepared to make it and uh. I think the ( ) white community
were given a huge fright
C: Hmm
F: they were given such a massive fright when we resigned
C: Hmm
F: they didn’t. You know, they just thought initially, oh it was two people that resigned
C: and then everybody left
F: >and then everybody realized that all twelve people are gonna resign. Now they’re
sitting with a Bar Council that’s ( ) all white that’s not legitimate <in the eyes
C: No
F: of the government, you know.
C: So they’ll be forced to change
F: They have one token black member,
C: Okay.
F: So they’re forced to change. NOW WE’VE SET UP THIS TRANSFORMATION
COMMITTEE and they wanted two people like the, the chairman ( .) and the deputy chair
of the Bar Council that sits with us, but at the end of the day, we control, and we’ve got
the ( ) .hh progressive people (2) the Jules Brodies and The George Bizos’ and
C: Hmm
F: Coral Tipp and ( .) all the old NUSAS kind of people. .hh sort of the ( .) progressives
at the Bar
C: Hmm
F: sort of ( .) assisting with this and umh, ja, so we just. So it it it really, it sits, it’s a body
that sits, it works parallel to the ( .) Bar council right now.
C: Thank you very much for your time
F: Hahaha, I hope, you know I hope you ( )
INTERVIEW 5.
L, thank you for talking to me today.

C: Okay, sounds like I'm on TV, or something, except there's no camera. Aaah, ja: (2). hh I come from a family of six, including my parents and uh, grew up in the Northern province, quiet, you know, your, your typical pfoo (sound made with lips) have-nots of South Africa, if you know what I mean. Typical poverty-stricken background and I studied in the Northern Province. Not a very flamboyant school, your ordinary, school in rural areas, ( ). hh and high school education >and that's when I went to the University of the North to do my B. Juris.

C: Okay, can I ask you then, uhm, how did you manage to go to University?

L: Uh, all right, my parents financed my education. My mother is a teacher.

C: Hmm

L: and my father, okay they are sort of educated but uh, pfoo (sound with lips), cause my father has a law degree himself. He was once a magistrate, but then (1) for some reason, he, I think, resigned or whatever. 'Cause he couldn't put up with the system, or whatever, I really don't know. So, my parents financed my education.

C: Right and then can I ask you a bit about your parents? When it comes to your home situation, when you were a child at home. Who used to make the major decisions in your family?

L: You know, I, I think, uh> it's very difficult to know what goes on behind closed doors, in. But I think my mom has been the pioneering figure in the family. 'I think so. She's the one that is making the major decisions'. Oh, well it depends, what decisions you're talking about, but obviously, household, as to the running of the household, what we eat and that kind of thing, I mean they used to come to us, the kids, as a united front, I would say. It's very, it's very difficult to say, but I, I, I think my mom has always had, uh, "has always been the influential one, that's my impression".

C: In which way do you feel she perhaps shaped your life? With her character?

L: hh Ai jeez hh Gmhff, you're asking difficult questions, hahaha. hh U:H, for example, uh, when she got married to my Dad, she only had a , it was called a JC at the time. She had a standard eight and she then, when she had gotten herself a diploma in teaching, that kind of thing. hh BUT FROM , while she was a teacher, and working, she then developed herself. You know, got to do her Matric and then registered with Vista, and you know-

C: Wonderful

L: So: she was kind of, she has always been moving forward.

C: Yes

C: Hmm

L: 'O(h)kay, sounds like I'm on TV, or som(h)ething), except there's no camera. Aaah, ja: (2). hh I come from a family of six, including my parents and uh, grew up in the Northern province, quiet, you know, your, your typical pfoo (sound made with lips) have-nots of South Africa, if you know what I mean. Typical poverty-stricken background and I studied in the Northern Province. Not a very flamboyant school, your ordinary, school in rural areas, ( ). hh and high school education >and that's when I went to the University of the North to do my B. Juris.

C: Okay, can I ask you then, uhm, how did you manage to go to University?

L: Uh, all right, my parents financed my education. My mother is a teacher.

C: Hmm

L: and my father, okay they are sort of educated but uh, pfoo (sound with lips), cause my father has a law degree himself. He was once a magistrate, but then (1) for some reason, he, I think, resigned or whatever. 'Cause he couldn't put up with the system, or whatever, I really don't know. So, my parents financed my education.

C: Right and then can I ask you a bit about your parents? When it comes to your home situation, when you were a child at home. Who used to make the major decisions in your family?

L: You know, I, I think, uh> it's very difficult to know what goes on behind closed doors, in. But I think my mom has been the pioneering figure in the family. 'I think so. She's the one that is making the major decisions'. Oh, well it depends, what decisions you're talking about, but obviously, household, as to the running of the household, what we eat and that kind of thing, I mean they used to come to us, the kids, as a united front, I would say. It's very, it's very difficult to say, but I, I, I think my mom has always had, uh, "has always been the influential one, that's my impression".

C: In which way do you feel she perhaps shaped your life? With her character?

L: hh Ai jeez hh Gmhff, you're asking difficult questions, hahaha. hh U:H, for example, uh, when she got married to my Dad, she only had a , it was called a JC at the time. She had a standard eight and she then, when she had gotten herself a diploma in teaching, that kind of thing. hh BUT FROM , while she was a teacher, and working, she then developed herself. You know, got to do her Matric and then registered with Vista, and you know-

C: Wonderful

L: So: she was kind of, she has always been moving forward.

C: Yes
L: She never, sort of, stagnated and said to herself, >I’m now married, I’ve got kids<.hh and it, it really became helpful (.) because at some point, >I think my father spent about five, or so (.) years (.) unemployed<.

C: Right
L: And uh, she was (.) the one carrying (.) the entire family, so uh, in a sense (.) I think she made it possible for me (.) to be where I am today, you know (   ).
C: So she’s a very strong person
L: Extremely, extremely.
C: Tell me a bit more about her personality
L: Ugh .hh, (1) well, I mean, like every other Mom, she’s sweet and supportive and all that, <but she’s also very firm >;
C: Hmm
L: <Sort of uhm, no nonsense kind of mo:m, you know. I don’t, I think (.) she has that (.) kind of balance. I’m not sure (.) if I’m answering you >
C: yes
L: <properly, but uhm > she, she’s always been there. Financially, emotionally and uh (1) otherwise,
C: And your dad, what is your relationship with him like?
L: .hh IT’S ALRIGHT, EXCEPT .HH SHE’S MO:RE, or rather, he is mo:re, .hh I think, uh, great, he has (.) enjoyed good education, he has a degree. .hh But I think it wouldn’t be unfair to characterize him as uh, somewhat irresponsible.
C: Hmm
L: More into friends, always out there with his friends, drinking (.) and that kind of thing.
C: Right
L: So, our contact point, really, if we needed to talk to our parents, it has always been my mom. If we need anything (.) we’d always run to my mom.
C: Ja
L: So: uh, but I’ve got a good relationship with him, because he’s quite a (.) nice person.
C: Hmm
L: >He’s got a (.) beautiful personality<.
C: Haha
L: But when it comes to (.) the real serious stuff, uhm . hh < I’m sure, he doesn’t really score (.) good points there>.
C: Ja
L: Hm. He’s more (.) on the entertainment side of things. He just plays and pfoo
C: Sort of a frivolous, light-hearted kind of person
L: Ja: that’s it.
C: And your siblings? How many, you’ve got three other siblings.
L: >I’ve got three others, but uh, the one that comes immediately after me, passed away in 1995.
C: ( )
L: So, I’ve got only two < .hh A:nd uh, the, the other one .hh all girls, so my little sister that comes immediately after me, you know after the one that passed away. .hh
She’s..(cellular phone rings)) excuse me-
C: Okay, we were talking about your siblings, (you were telling me about the one-)
L: Oh, ja the other one, she, she ‘s a (. ) what (. ) >medical aid consultant< a ( ) a broker, that kind of thing and the other one (( sound of coffee being stirred)) .hh who is eighteen (. ) studies computer sciences at Wits. So (1)-
C: And how do you get on with them?
C: And ( )
L: I stay with the one that’s at Wits, .hh in my house here in P*****º ( ).
C: That is lovely.
L: “Ja”.
C: Tell me and um, your siblings, how do they get on with your parents?
L: Extremely well >. I think my father, there’s been a marked , uh, sort of improvement, in my father’s .hh sort of outlook .hh towards life, ( as a whole). < .hh <I think he has some kind, he regrets the fact that>. HE WASN’T REALLY there for me, in the sort of sense that I would have expected him to be there. He was more in, a consumed uh, in his own life.
C: Hmm
L: Like I say, he’s a big socialite, if you li:ke,> in his own sort of sense<.
C: Right
L: hh <You know, he’s obviously not your Tokyo’s, and you know, in his eyes I’m this successful thingº.
C: Of course
L: Uhm, well in his eyes, I mean, that’s not ne(h) cessaril(h)y s(h)o;
C: Ja
L: (It’s relative) rig(h)ht.
C: Ja
L: In his eyes I’m this successful thing and I guess he has this regret that «if I had been there (.) for my daughter, I would be enjoying this mo:reº».
C: Hmm
L: As in, it would be like wow, it was all worth the while.
C: Hmm
L: The investment.
C: Hmm
L: It’s more putting in and getting out of it what you put in. SEE, HE HASN’T REALLY put anything in,
C: Right
L: «if you like and uh, for him he doesn’t really enjoy the fruit as much as he would have enjoyed it if he had ( ) sort of put a lot in. So, I see (. ) some kind of a change in his (.) attitude towards life. Because now, .hh he’s very (. ) much involved (. ) in (. ) C****, the one that’s at Wits>. Scholastic activities,
L: he wants to know, he’s there. I mean in more ways than one. (.) in the sort of ways in
which he was never there for me.
C: Hmm
L: ‘hh So, I guess he has sort of learned. ‘hh uh, (well) I suppose it’s more, he has grown;
C: Right
L: maybe that’s what I must say. So ja, “he’s got a very good relationship with both of
them and with me too”, I mean (   ) .
C: Ja
L: Ja. ((sound of coffee being stirred)).
C: And tell me, how did your mom handle the fact that he was very seldom at home and
that she was basically the sole breadwinner for such a long period?
L: No, I think, uh, you know, it’s uhm .I think she, she .It was very hard for her, but she
stuck around, I mean she hung around and uh, when I told her, “Mom I’m leaving my
husband”. It was like “No, no, no. But I stuck around your Daddy, (why you’re such)”.>
> “Those were your choices, I’m not making those choices today and those choices were
purely relevant then, not today”. Okay<.
C: That’s right
L: So: ‘hh hahaha
C: Right
L: It wasn’t easy for her and uh, I guess she was doing it for us.
C: Right
L: Hmm
C: Tell me, if I may, ask you about your husband, uhm. Who used to have the major say
in your, in your relationship?
L: (clicking of tongue) hmmm. <HE WANTED TO HAVE, I mean, he’s obviously your
South African (. ) Black (. ) ‘hh male that has (. ) that social (. ) sort of background,
C: Hmm
L: you know, which men are domineering, (. ) that kind of thing> But, ‘hh I didn’t mind
to let him have this say,
C: Hmmm
L: but I found that he (2) over the years, .I think we just grew apart, you know and (. )
> he wasn’t making sense to me anymore. So, it was difficult for me to entrust (. ) MAJOR
DECISIONS IN HIM<
C: Hmm
L: because his decisions (. ) were not (. ) making sense (. ) to me.
C: Right
L: So: that was (   )
C: Resulted in friction
L: Ja. It resulted in (. ) friction. You know, because obviously he’s. HE WANTED TO BE
the sole decision maker. > I was happy to let him make decisions, except his decisions
were not appealing to my sense of lo(h) gic!<
C: Ja, hahaha
L: It didn’t wo(h)rk!
C: How long were you married for?
L: ‘hh Te(h) n years
C: And can I ask you what does he do for a living?
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L: He’s an optometrist.
C: Okay, so you’re both professional people.
L: Hmm, ((sound of cup clattering against saucer)) yes.
C: And what were the major conflicts in your marriage.
L: I-
C: really about?
L: .hh (2) Ag,º I think, everything, heyº. I mean (. ) from not liking my fri:ends, to (1) .hh not agreeing on the sort of schools (. ) the children should go to. He wants the kids to go to public school, I want them to go to private scho:ols because I feel it’s a worthwhile investme:nt and ( ) you know.
C: Hmm
L: We, we, we quite, I think we differed about. I think the real source of uh; I think we grew (. ) differently. I think for some reason he stagnated intellectually,
C: Hmm
L: you know instead of, with our profession it’s different. <You grow every time>. 
C: That’s right
L: You, you have to .hh .
C: You’re challenged
L: You’re challenged all of the time, intellectually and (. ) you have to grow.
C: Hmm
L: you know. But in his sort of (. ) uh, work environment, I mean, all he does is look at the eyes and .hh he never gets to interact with people(. ) cleverer that he.
C: Right
L: He is this doctor and everybo.. In his practice, what’s worse is that it’s in M*****
now. The sort of community. Or, rather, ja, the sector of the community, he is serving is your .hh <not so educated kind of people>. So, I, I think he never (. ) got (. ) feedback from his work-environment, that sort of .hh contributed to his intellectual (. )growth.
C: Right
L: And he sort of stagnated, when (. ) I, on the other hand was, at all times (. ) I mean I had to (. ) grow intellectually. I mean, if you’re servicing CEO’s of some companies and you’re this black ti(h)ny gi(h)rl.
C: Hahah
L: You always have t(h)o, push hahaha
C: push yourself
L: Push youse(h)lf, you know, haha . A(h)nd, uh ultimately , you have to close the gap (. ) one way or the other,
C: Ja
L: between the CEO and yourself. But wi. In his case, he always had to go down and meet his people, down, you know, half the time.
C: Yes, very true
L: So, I, in that sense, .hh intellectually we grew (. ) apart and uh, we , we <couldn’t connect>. 
C: Ja
L: We s. we, uh, really, we were not functioning at the same wavelength (. ) anymore.
C: Ja
L: It wasn’t a joke.
C: Ja
L: > you know, the sort of things that appealed to his sense of logic. To me it was totally ridiculous, how could he even <(1) think (_) that, Y(h)ou know.
C: Ja, ja
L: Haha, it was that kind of thing, ºso it had to stop. °
C: And your parents if they fought about things, what did they fight about?
L: .hh
C: What were the disagreements in your household as a child like?
L: .hh Hmmm. º>Like my, my father, he abused alcohol a lot. (3) So: you know. Half the time it was that. (1) I think it was (.) thatº. Alcohol abuse.
C: Hmm
L: I think it was that they were fighting about mainly .hh and the the coming late, >you know the sort of consequence of alcohol abuse, namely coming home late, not sleeping, not sleeping at home<.
C: Hmm
L: .hh Being irresponsible .hh those sort of things, not contributing to the upkeep of the common home, ºand that kind of thing. So, I think those were their disputes. But I think what lay at the heart of their disputes was the alcohol abuse becauseº every time he got off alcohol then he was like .hh the sort of Daddy that anyone would have wanted him to be, you know.
C: Ja
L: .hh º So I think it was just more alcohol abuseº.
C: Ja, and what is he doing at the moment?
L: ºHe’s a sheriff now, (1) of the co. uh, lower courts, S***** and ( ) in the Northern Province (I mean, he’s doing very well )º.
C: So, he’s actually gone back into that career after that brief period of unemployment?
L: Ja, ja and now that he’s doing, he’s, he’s well, he’s doing well, financially (. ) he’s doing great.
C: Hmm
L: º'Cause he’s the one that ‘s financing my sister’s education at Wits and it seems he’s coping very wellº.
C: That’s wonderful, so things really have changed
L: Hmm
C: And can I ask you now in your new relationship
L: Oh, you mean, this Malawian guy?
C: Yes
C: How are things different from your marriage?
L: .hh PERFECT! .hh Okay, my, my my ex, ºokay the divorce is going through on the 9th of November, I call him my ex. º .hh (2) uh , I was born in ‘70, born in ‘67, I’m 32 this year, he’s 35. Now, that man (.) is 47
C: good looking, hahaha
L: Thank you, he looks good, he’s tall, ºhe’s got everything. The sort of person I want º.
C: Ja
L: >But most importantly, he’s mature.
C: Yes
L: He’s more experienced, he understands me more. He’s not FRIGHTENED by my so-called intellectual, WHATEVER, I mean, I’m not trying to .hh I think part of (.).hh the difficulties in the other relationship, because, >as I say, we grew apart, he stagnated and I, I think (.) really in a sense, I grew. <<That’s how I read the situation>. So: (1) in our discussions, <he came in>, that is my ex, <already with, uh>.hh you know, intimidation, he was already intimidated.

C: Hmm
L: So, he wasn’t confident, the self-esteem had gone. hh because he would want to make contributions or rather want to make suggestions.
L: and I would just (.).
C: Yes
L: eat them (like a mango) >but you can’t do that if we do that what if ( ) you know that kind of .hh . I’m not sure if I’m coming across clearly <. <But, it was that sort of .hh uhm, intimidation that comes with (.) all pfoo (sound with lips) intellectual prowess or whatever>. <But I find that with (.) him, we sort of connect (.) at the same sort of (.) level. If not, he’s higher, I mean, he has to be because he’s older, more experienced .hh So:, he’s not worried about, he’s not, the small things like uh .hh he’s not intimidated by my career success ( if, and just put it, uh bluntly) you know.

C: Ja
L: He’s not worried about those things.
C: Ja
L: >ºHe just wants a person and how are we relating and are we making each other happy and that’s all, you know. If you win your case, well, I’m happy for you, if I’m stressing about a case, okay, I’ll assist you where I can (yawning)º,<
C: Ja
L: and if I can’t (.) sorry. SO, I FOUND THAT, qualitatively, there’s so much difference. “And I think it comes with maturity, I don’t know”. °
C: Right
L: ‘Cause he’s more mature, I don’t, that’s where I place it.
C: Right
L: He’s equally educated. I mean he’s got a Master’s in .hh He’s an MSc .hh a marine engineer and all that. So, he’s (.) well educated as well, so: .hh I I don’t really feel. “In fact, if anything >I might be an intellectual liability to him< because I think it’s more, °
hahaha
C: Hahaha that’s lovely, hahaha
L: Hahaha. You know, so that’s great.
C: Ja
L: So long as he doesn’t mi(h)nd.
C: Someone to grow up to in other words
L: JA, WELL, EXACTLY and I mean that’s, that’s who does. I hope I’m (.) it’s not gonna be too much of a compromise (.) for him (.) to sort of (.) come down to my level. <The men love that, don’t they? >
C: Yes, I think so.
L: Ja: they love-
C: Why do you think it’s going to be a compromise for him?
L: Well, .hh
C: What, what makes you feel worried about that?
L: I'M NOT NECESSARILY WORRIED. SO FAR it’s going .hh okay. I guess men (.)
would like to know that we depend on them. =>which was difficult for me to depend on
the other one, 'cause he had nothing to offer.<
C: Right
L: >But he’s got something to offer, ° so I find that’s he’s dependable, I can depend on
him on some of the issues°<
C: When you talk about depend on him, do you mean it financially?
L: No.
C: Emotionally?
L: No.
C: What do you mean?
L: No, intellectually.
C: Ja
L: Intellectually.
C: So you can go to him for advice.
L: "Yes, do that all the time".
C: Hmm. Can I ask you, when you have, how long have you been in a relationship?
L: "Uh, three months .hh, it’s very new°.
C: Have you had any sort of, argument yet?
L: Not yet, you know what, because he’s far away.
C: Ja
L: Every time we meet (.) it’s honeymoon, you know, so we haven’t really (.) .hh had
an opportunity I guess, to go through .hh. It’s still new.
C: Ja
L: It’s still honeymoon days. Hmm
C: That’s right
L: Hmm
C: But you feel quite serious about it?
L: Ja, I’m confident. I think he’s the sort of guy (.) I’m looking for. I mean, he’s a widow,
he’s got his children, he doesn’t . So there’s no child, we’re sort of, we’re not looking (.)
at (1) making kids. ° All we want, I need a friend, he’s got his own career, I’ve got
mine, so, he’s the sort of guy I’m looking for°.
C: Ja, that sounds lovely. Congratulations.
L: Thank you. Hahah
C: Hahaha
L: I hope it’s gonna last, hahaha.
C: Ja, time will tell.
L: Ja.
C: Then I want you to tell me a bit about your career.
L: <I love it>.
C: The intellectual side of you.
L: <I love it. I love it. This (.) is my life.> Ask me any question, I will tell you, what do
you want me to tell you about this?
C: Start from the beginning, where, what made you decide to become a, a lawyer first and
then obviously an advocate and how-
L: It was by accident, I mean (. ) really, really. My father, uh, a lawyer, he’s got a law

degree. When I passed my Matric I wanted to do (. ) medicine. You know all of us, well,
most people, (2) during those days, our generation, most of our (. ) age group (. ) at some
point of our lives ° wanted to be doctors°.

C: True, ha ha

L: J(h) a, so: .hh when I bounced that off my mother. My mo(h)ther, again, haha. She
said <Look L, medicine, no. She discouraged me, because (4) wh, .hh someone in our
family, I think, uh, my cousin, (1) her brother’s son, < >°niece nephew, I never got that
one right, never get that one right.

C: Hmm

L: °>Niece or nephew, but it’s a boy .hh very clever, straight B’s at .hh Matric, but went
to medical school, failed (. ) first year. So, I wa, I wasn’t that clever, I was a C, D, you
know.

C: Ja

L: I wasn’t an A, B student, kid.

C: Right

L: So she says, look (. ) that one we all know, that if .hh he (. ) couldn’t make it, <I mean,
(. ) my (. ) dear (. ) daughter>,

C: Hahaha

L: let us not ra(h)ise our ho(h)pes.

C: Hahaha

L: So how about trying law?  I said, “Law”, I said? She said listen to this: “Law (.) all
you do: read stories”. Now, stories (. ) are cases (. ) according to her.” °Oh, they’ll tell you,
so and so did :that and this is what the court fo:und . Don’t you think that could be
lovely? ° It’s stories, man, ultimately”. So she sold .hh (hahaha)-

C: Very, uhm, creative way of putting it

L: Oh, ja, I mean, she sold it very creatively.

C: Yes

L: And I was like wow, who doesn’t like to listen to stories all day, in class?

C: True

L: So I went for it. And, uh, well, I went through ( ) studied, I kind of loved it. I had the
support of my father (. ) in a sense (. ) there intellectually,

C: Hmm

L: because I’d go to him. He knew the stuff, said Dad (this, this, this ) .hh he’d help me
whenever I (had a) problem so , pfoo (sound with lips) , something very difficult .hh
Went through it all and uh, .hh when I completed LLB it was very difficult to (. ) come,
you know to get articles, you know.

C: Why was that?

L: I really don’t (. ) know.

C: Ja

L: I guess (. ) the big (. ) fence >obviously, historically, historically big (. ) attorneys firms
are white firms<.

C: Right

L: I mean, that’s a historical fact and uh .hh at the time (. ) that was ’94.

C: Hmm
L: They were not too keen on uh, hiring black attorneys.

C: And is that male and female or just because, just black, in general?

L: I GUESS IT’S JUST BLACK because I think with, insofar as transformation is concerned we were not where we are today. It’s still difficult now; I think the big firms now are not taking in as much as they should be. So it was even worse then. So:

C: How did you find that experience?

L: Aah, it was, it was challenging. I mean, straight from varsity, no: practical experience.

C: Right

L: So it was quite tough, but we all have to go through challenges in life.

C: Ja

L: It was quite tough, but uh, for a year. I did, you know, I did it twice.

C: Okay

L: Because we, the duration I think, it’s, not even six months, but four to five months.

C: Right

L: So, the first term I failed, the second term, that’s when I passed. Hh that was ’94, ’95 I started practice and I have been in practice ever since, so, sort of like it. It has been, it hasn’t been very easy, but (1) I mean, the sort of things that I was doing then, criminal litigation, <people, uh for (.) impecunious people; doing divorce matters, uh for (.) impecunious people. So, it was quite hard, I mean, in terms of survival, generally. I wasn’t writing any good fees at all. But for some reason, survived and uh, things have changed no:w, doing good wo:rk, uh, corporate work>.

C: Hmm

L: °<.hh you know, uh, corporate work> °.
C: Hmm
L: °<It’s more (. government work, I mean, if you like°>. .hh But, it’s the sort of work that uh, one wasn’t doing (.°<some five years ago. So, there has been a movement (.)
°h I think (.) economically, uh, women and black practitioners depending on their seniority, are beginning to crack and to do .hh real, exciting work°>.
C: So now that kind of barrier that you found when you wanted to practice as an attorney, you struggled to do your articles,
L: Hmm
C: Ha, do you feel, do you perceive that to have changed?
L: .hh well, uh .hh
C: Where you are now?
L: .hh (4) Ja: well. .hh You know, I think it’s a , it’s a different sort of. It was at an, you’re just entering the, the profession at the time.
C: Right
L: So, so, now I have sort of (. entered.
C: Right
L: So I am (not) (. getting the work .hh.
C: Right
L: uhm.hh I THINK .hh <slowly, but you know, slowly, one is beginning to crack it and beginning to get (. the real kind of work. “But, I think things are changing in all fairness really, you’ve got to be fair. ° .hh >I don’t know if things are changing in respect of everybody<.
C: Hmm
L: I do know that there are some of my black colleagues who are not (. enjoying good quality work. .hh <I don’t know why that is so> but speaking for myse:lf, I think I’ve got to be fair and say: Hmm, I’m getting good work.
C: And how are you accepted by the traditional white male uhm, attorney who refers to you?
L: .hh No, those (1) you’ll find. I think (.) ultimately it’s about ha, >distinguishing (.)
yourself. Obviously they’ll come to you because client has (. forced you down their throat.
C: Okay
L: client will insist (. that uh,” I want you to brief L T, in this matter”. >°They’ll say “But I’ve never used L before”<and they’ll say pfoo (sound made with lips), “I don’t care”. .hh So they’ll come obviously with the
C: Ha
L: .hh (,), doubt and (be skeptical and all that).
C: Ja
L: So, it’s up to you as a practitioner, (that) to show to him, that (. brother, I’m equally.
°So, so, it, it’s hard. But we also, we always try to rise to the occasion. °
C: Now how does that client know, about you?
L: .hh Aaaaagh, I wouldn’t know. I wouldn’t know. I wouldn’t know, I wouldn’t know,
C: hmmm
L: you know. I really wouldn’t. Uhh, (. probably word of mouth, people chat. How many do we have? How many black (. female (. advocates do we have?
C: Right
L: .hh. Then your name will be thrown around, whatever, I don’t know. People s. think, well, let’s give her, let’s give her a try or something like that, I wouldn’t know.
C: Right
L: => Ja, but the point is, the work will find its way through to your desk and when it comes .hh instead of interrogating or rather investi(h)gating how it came about, you just wanna focus on doing the wo(h)rk.<.
C: That’s right
L: Ja, because that’s the critical (1) point.
C: Ja, and what are your aspirations for your career further?
L: .hh I don’t wanna rush things. I think (.I still wanna learn.
C: Hmm
L: I don’t (.I consider myself sufficiently learned.
C: Hmm
L: So, yes, <I know that we need female, black female judges and all that >. But I don’t wanna commit suicide and go to the bench , hahaha .
C: Haha
L: .hh .Whilst, when I’m not re(h)ady yet or whate(h) ever. I mean, how old am I, I’m 32.
C: Ja
L: So, I think time is on my side.
C: Ja
L: I’m just gonna take. Ja, of course I’m gonna take it ea:sy.< Learn as much as I ca:n .hh and just gro:w. I just wanna be (.) this (.) learned (.) council, be this (.) knowledgeable (.) person. Be, perfect the art of practice,
C: Ja
L: you know. <Each and every case that passes through my hands, I’ve got to feel that I’ve given it .hh all that, which the case deserves you know. And uh, you know, I just want to perfect the art. > FOR NOW.
C: Now, ja
L: Ja, that’s, that’s what I want to do.
C: and maybe when you’re say, 40 or so. What would you want to do?
L: Well, when I’m -
C: What would you want to do?
L: Fifty.
C: Hmm
L: Of course. I think I will, I’d want to give back to the community and sit as a judge, yes of course.
C: Hmm
L: .hh But only when I’m sufficiently learned.
C: Right
L: For now I just want to perfect the art.
C: And what, how many other female judges are there? Who could be a possible role model for you, at the moment?
L: Ugh. aijaijaijai, uhm. No, who? . hh >I tell you the , the sort of people that inspire me are your (2) whose this lady that was the girlfriend of (.I Steve Biko? Mampele Rampele? >
C: Hmmm
L: She was with the UCT.
C: Hmm
L: Uhhh, hh I think I like her. But (.) in the legal profession as such (.) ha, people who inspire me are, my male white colle(h)agues. Hahah ( I promise you).
C: Amazing.
L: ( )
C: That’s ironic, haha.
L: You now wh(h)y? Because, I tell you because they are just, they have (.) this level of skill.
C: Hmm
L: that I aspire to. hh To, I ,I aspire to having some day. I mean, I haven’t come across one of our own and it’s, it’s history. It’s historical.
C: Ja
L: I haven’t come across one of us (.) who has that amount of skill.
C: Ja
L: It’s a fact of life and it’s all historical. >It’s not because we’re stupid, <
C: Hmm
L: > .hh it’s simply because they’ve had the benefit (.) of exposure ever since .hh they were young advocates<.
C: Ja
L: Now they are sixty and old. And they are so: mature in their understanding, in their knowledge of the law and those are the sort of people that inspire me. Because I wanna be like them,
C: Right
L: at their age,
C: Right
L: .hh IT’S NO USE SAYING I wanna be like M. Hh I mean, M is like me.
C: Ja
L: >She just had to be (.) quickly (be put there because)<
C: Ja
L: >you know those are the dynamics of the situation. I’m not saying she’s not good, <
C: Hmm
L: but uh, gmmmmff, I’d uh, I would like to be somewhere else where we haven’t been (.) as a people (.) because of history.
C: Like a trailblazer
L: A trailbla(h)zer. Whose tha(h)t?
C: Well, you want to, you want to be, probably, a person that is, complete at that stage in your knowledge?
L: Ja, ja.
C: So you don’t want to be fast-tracked?
L: No, no, no, no, no, no, no. I wanna run (1) the race, that’s why I’m saying, I’m not rushing anything.
C: Hmmmm. And then, can I ask you, you made an interesting comment earlier when you said that your dad perceives you to be very successful, but you don’t know if it’s necessarily so,
L: Haha
C: Why do you say that?
L: hahaha, a:h. .hhh hahaha because I DON’T KNO(h)W. I DON’T KN(h)OW, I REALLY,
HOW A(h)M I SUPPO(h)SED TO KNO(h)W?
C: How do you feel about what you’ve achieved?
L: I feel go(h)od, Jeex, I feel great, I’m feeling great. Uh, she’s given. >I feel great. .hh I
think I’ve come a long way<.
C: Yes
L: I think there’s (.) still room for improvement> I still consider myself a baby, you
know<.
C: Hmm
L: >I remember I was sitting with senior counsel, I was working with, .hh in another
group. There was an advert, an advert .hh I think they, they were looking for a judge to
act in one of those (.) remote divisions..hh So: his secretary said, L   here is an ad, don’t
you wanna go act in, I think it’s Kimberly, one of those. I said “N(h)o”.
C: hahaha
L: I mea(h)n, I’m just a baby, do(h)n’t you, and this girl. M(h)y se(h)nior  was, he was
like, surprised, how, how can she, yeah but. That’s just how I think. I consider myself (.)
still a juvenile in the profession.
C: Hmm
L: (I know), people have all sorts of (.) ideas. They look at you, you’re practising in
Sandton, they come to your chambers, they see your library, and
C: Right
L: AND WHATEVER ELSE .hh and they think, my God! But I consider myself an
infant still. Perhaps it’s because (. ) I measure myself against, well, ( )
C: Right
L: and I know I’m still (.) way off, you know, .hh like I was saying to you uhm, the
people that inspire me, are, unfortunately, the white males in this profession because
they’ve had the advantage,
C: Ja
L: that uh, some of us haven’t had.
C: Tell me and uhm, you have three children. Boys or girls?
L: Two boys and a girl.
C: And what would you want for your daughter?
L: .hh You know, I just, I tell you. I’m sure you’ve had this, I just want her to be (.)
happy, and to be the person she wants to be, I’ll support her. Oh, I’ll guide her
accordingly, I don’t want to make choices for her, I don’t wanna put pressure (.).hh on
her. But one thing I’d like, for her is, for her is, to be intellectually and financially
independent. I think it’s important.
C: Ja
L: I think that’s important ( )
C: That’s the kind of thing your mother wanted you to be
L: Ja (2) and I think ( ) is her (.) intellectual in, at her own level
C: Hmm
L: and uhm financial independence. I think has, it has helped (. ) our family pull through.
C: Ja
L: Like I said to you, I probably won’t be where I am, had she not uh, developed
herself further.
C: That’s right. How does your mother feel about what you’ve done with your life?
L: Oh, she’s very happy. And obviously, like I told you when I told her about my
divorce, “but I stuck around”. Ultimately she said, “He’s beating you up? No w(ay)s!
“You know, just leave him, my baby don’t worry, you’ve got a good education, you’ve
got beautiful kids, leave him”. You know, so and she keeps coming back to the point,
that uh, “don’t you worry my baby you’ve got your education”.
C: Right
L: “Look after your kids and look after yourself, don’t worry”. So: him. So: I guess,
ultimately, although there’s that societal sort of pressure, daughter divorced but (she
keeps saying, you don’t need a man for anything)
C: So she changed her mind when you actually gave her the real reasons?
L: Ja, no, no. She changed her mind, and she now supports me and she feels that,
because I’ve got this sort of education and in her mind this success. career success;
C: Ja
L: It’s fine, I can do it. I can go it alone. So: I think, coming back to your question,
how does she feel about where you are? I think she feels that I can, you can throw me
anywhere,
C: Hmm
L: and I’ll cope, and I think she feels that’s the best gift she has given me (. education
and the, the ability to: to fend for myself.
C: Wonderful
L: So I guess she gets a lot of satisfaction from that.
C: And your dad? How does he feel about your being divorced or getting divorced?
L: No, he’s, he is (. supportive. He feels, he’s the one that said to me, “L, as soon as a
man’s self-esteem is gone,
C: Ja
L: And he has an inferiority (. complex, forget it”. So: he’s the one that hit it on the
head the first time.
C: Ja. And your ex, well soon to be ex-husband. How does he, how is he coping with the
fact that you’ve left him?
L: I think it’s pathetic. I think uh, I think he’s. contesting the divorce. God knows
why. So: his attorney says to my attorney, he thinks that he wants me back but he
doesn’t have the guts to say so, because I guess,
C: (clears throat)
L: he fears (that) you know, further rejection.
C: Ja
L: So: I don’t really know. I mean, it’s all, I hear those rumours (. that he ( 1) wants a
reconciliation but he doesn’t have the guts to say so. Uhm, I think, the psycholo, the
psychological make-up of someone who wants to let go, I mean would, uhm, would be
different from, you know. I think he would have uhm, entered into a settlement with
us, because we made reasonable
C: Right
L: sort of proposals and he’s not agreeing to it. So: he’s more (. an obstructionist in this
divorce process>
C: Hmm
L: to the point that, uhh, .hh <I find that the inescapable conclusion is that he’s not really
(4) ready to let go>.
C: Hmm
L: <But he is fearful of saying it because he doesn’t. He fears a further rejection as it
were>.
C: Right
L: But, uh, because I think his business is not doing well and all that . hh “He loves his
kids at least so he says so it’s not even-
C: Does he see them, quite a bit?
L: .hh Ja well, I take them to him. I mean, he, he’s a nut.
C: Hmm
L: I mean, uh, haha WITH RESPECT.
C: Ha
L: I say to him, “Look, (you, you) can come and fetch the kids.” He says: “No, I don’t
wanna see where you live”. So: , pfoo (sound made lips). “N(h)ow, must the k(h)ids fly
(1) to yo(h)ur place?”
C: Hahaha
L: “Bring them” ((said in a mimicked, hoarse voice)).
C: I love it!
L: “Bring them” ((said in a mimicked, hoarse voice)).
C: Hmm
L: For their sake then, I take them and I’ll go fetch them.
C: Ja
L: So, but you can see the sort of personality. “I think he’s an absolute nut”. Haha
C: Can I ask you about your black female colleagues when you say that you’ve been
fortunate in the sense that you get referrals, hmm, excuse me, referrals and good work, so
to speak?
L: Hmm
C: How is their situation different?
L: “I don’t know. Uhm, let me think.” Uhm. Here black women, colleagues. I mean, I
know F, but I’m, I’m not sure, I don’t know how her practice.
C: Ja
L: I don’t really know much about (. ) her practice .hh and the other females are in town,
black females. I’m not in touch with them.
C: If you think in general are you thinking they’re not getting such a good deal, y et?
L: Perhaps, it might be so. I THINK the se more senior ones, because the point is I’m
Senior
C: Hmm
L: to most of them
C: Hmm
L: So: the more senior ones, I think, tho. those that are senior to me, I think they are
getting (. ) good work and I’m senior as well so I’m getting good work. I think it’s the
Junior
C: Right
L: ones that are not (. ) really there yet. But TIME (. ) is the healer. Ultimately when they are sufficiently experienced, uh the market will feel comfortable (. ) to entrust, I think, crucial cases to them. >I think, ultimately people are interested in service more than empowerment>. C: That’s right 
L: Ja.
C: Can I ask you, getting to empowerment, how do you, how have you seen things change since sort of the 94?
L: I think they have changed quite uh. In. My personal experience (pooh) I think there’s been a great (. ) deal of change, uh, < for the better> Some (. ) of our colleagues, I mean (. ) unfortunately the world is (. ) the way it is. People never get to experience the same things, you know.
C: Right 
L: Each and every one (of us have to walk their separate roads) .hh But I think, uh, in all fairness (. ) things have changed for the better. I mean we, we’re doing government work, we’re doing (1) public enterprises work .hh Yes, private sector work is not coming, because private sector is still in the hands of your male, white people who are not really buying in .hh
C: Hmm
L: ((clanging sound of cup on saucer)) ºJa, my quality of life has, has improved (. ) a great deal. It hasº.
C: Can you give me an example?
L: Hahaha
C: Explain it a bit?
L: Haha, okay as an example, uh no, I’m not telling you (   ) hahaha.
C: Hahaha
L: Hahaha, but I, I tell you, it’s changed, uh, for the better. Ja, I mean, (2) .hh It’s changed. .hh Example, I stay(ed). Before I moved out of the house where (. ) I was staying with my soon-to-be ex .hh his business is not doing well, so I mean, we’ve got three children, all in private school. We, we were coping very well with those sort of obligations and uh, what? I think we were, we were comfortable
C: So, in general
L: in general. Ja, I moved out. I’m renting a place, he’s not assisting me at all. But the lifestyle, I think we’ve managed to maintain. “So, I think, we are generally (. ) comfortableº
C: Thank you 
L: You’re welcome, haha.
C: Thank you for spending this time with me and chatting to me.
L: You are welcome
INTERVIEW 6.
C: Y, thank you for having this interview with me today
Y: Hmmm
C: I want you to tell me a bit about yourself, going as far back as you can remember.
Back to your childhood
Y: Gee, it’s a bit of a long time, ( ) about 40 years. I was one of five children (. ) Uhm, both parents were (. ) teachers, grew up in Klerksdorp (. ) was born there. Grew up there, went to school there, up to Matric. ((sound of footsteps )). Then, came to (. ) Johannesburg toWits, as a student, at Wits, 1988,’81. Matriculated in 1980. U:hm,’81 and then I qualified in ‘86. As you know. ((Interruption by receptionist)) As you know I was (. ) >I was probably fortunate enough, I was the (. ) first Coloured female to qualify (. ) from Wits<
C: Right
Y: Ja. Uhm, THEN AFTER THAT, I went out to (. ) Soweto, I worked there at the clinics for a year. .hh “I had a government bursary so I had kind of a (. ) duty to work it back .hh A:nd I was in (2) Soweto only for a year, at which point I said “This is NOT ON, (I’m gonna be bored ° I: .hh came back to Wits .hh 87 (1) >and I sort of hung around, waiting for a registrar’s post, because that time Rand them got in, R and J<
C: Right
Y: I stayed until 89 (1), uh (. ) full-time and then I was offered to .hh (. ) join (. ) M H’s practice, which I did. And
C: As a prosthodontist?
Y: >No, no, no, as a dentist. °I hadn’t qualified at that time. I mean, I was just qualified (.) as a GP lecturer, you know. °
C: Okay
Y: General dentist lecturer. A:nd > I still stayed on part-time. Did a MDent, a MSc<
C: Right
Y: Did some of the primary stuff (. ) and so forth. Uhhm, in 1990, uh, (. ) my mom passed away. >That was also the time I had finished my first primary, start(ed) with the research project, ”and everything under professor S*** at that time<°. A:nd in 1991 I was offered a registrar’s post. That’s when J and R and them finished. °So L and J (. ) M (. ) got (. ) in, °
C: Right
Y: M H. >SO, YOU OBVIOUSLY had to wait for, you know, for the cycle to finish and then you could get in. °Cause there were only certain number of posts available
C: And it’s interesting that it’s so many women that got in
Y: AT THAT TIME
C: ( )
Y: Yes, ja. Three ladies (. ) got in. I was on the fixed side
C: Hmm
Y: and M H, although he (. ) gave up after a year.
C: Right
Y: At that time after 3 years, it was only the three of us that qualified (2) >Uhmm, ja because that ,were all males<
C: Yes
Y: J, uhm, I mean, N V finished, then J , and (. ) then came the three of us. Literally, before that were all boys, D S, D A, R,
C: Right
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Y: uh, DB (and all of those guys were all males)
C: Ja, so what, motivated you to apply if, if the role modes really were all male?
Y: Ja. I NEVER ACTUALLY particularly (.) looked at myself (.) a:s (.) a woman
C: Hmm
Y: as such. I:, I, took it as such, that (.) when, when you do dentistry, or when you’re a
professional ,uhm, people go to you as a clinician uh, and, and the expectations from you
is not different (.) between male and female
C: Ja
Y: You must still do the same job. You must still be able to manage the same things. (1)
Uhm, asking me why I did dentistry, I: (. ) always wanted a medical profession (.) a:nd it
was my first choice. >Medicine was my second choice, pharmacy was my third choice<
C: Right
Y: So, at first I didn’t get in (. ) for dentistry a:nd for medicine I could get in and do the
first half a year, you know, those bridging courses that they had because they were full
C: Ja
Y: and then I could reapply again to get in or, I could go to do a BSc and come in to
second year. A:nd I, when I got (1) in for dentistry, uhm, I grabbed it and I started. >In
fact when I started, I had already registered for BSc<.
C: Okay
Y: You know, when I was called by this Mrs G lady. So that’s when I (. ) went and I
changed it. I (think that I got in)
C: So it almost happened by accident
Y: Yes
C: Ja
Y: to be accepted
C: Ja
Y: I WAS ALWAYS sort of (. ) very good with my hands, played piano, uhm, did
a lot of sport, lots of activity and uhm (2) I suppose at school, very sort of, academically
inclined. <Had teachers for parents which, and they actually were (. ) instrumental in (.)
encouraging us and pushing for education. >
C: Right, I was just going to ask ((footsteps in background))
Y: <we were never pro-active, encouraged to not be pro-active in all the political
activities because she, she was adamant> that (. ) you need to sort of empower yourself
first
C: Right
Y: and then you have the mouthpiece. “Then you have an instrument or something behind
you”. But if you don’t have, it’s like an empty tin makes the loudest noise.
C: Ja
Y: <so, uhm, grew up in a very, very strong, Christian background, very much so.Very
strict, uhm, discipline>
C: Hmmm
Y: >strong discipline, particularly females< uhm (. ) <I was never allowed out at clubs
and things like that>
C: So, when you say strong discipline over the females, who was the disciplinarian in
your family?
Y: “Uhm, my mom”
C: Your mother.
Y: *(my mother was the disciplinarian)*
C: Could you give me an ex, okay you you could never go out
Y: Ja, no she particularly, for me, also kind of had a very watchful eye over the
FRIENDS that I chose
C: Yes
Y: and uhm well who I was out with, when I was out with. JA, things like that, <º It was,
not not an accepted thing for her (.) to not be involved in your life and the choices that
you make>
C: So tell me, who made, if, if major decisions had to be made in your household, who
made them, your father or your mother?
Y: No, both of them
C: Both of them
Y: Both of them. When it were major decisions, they would always, we would always sit
together (.) and, and talk about things.
C: Right
Y: As far as going to different schools and different towns were concerned, uhm,
because my father carried mostly the expense <
C: Ja
Y: My father was a school principal (.) in Potch at that time for about 9 years. (They
used to travel in and out)º. So, when it came to (. ) academic decisions, going to schools,
applying to universities, meeting people, (2) uhm, applying for (. ) finances, bursaries,
etcetera. My father did that
C: Ja
Y: (Yes)
C: with your mother’s support?
Y: Ja, very much so, very much so
C: How many siblings do you have? Three?
Y: I’ve got two elder brothers
C: Oh, two. Hmm
Y: and, they were both in the teaching profession. ºThey both became teachers ºAND
married teachers.
C: Okay
Y: Then came myself, at which point. At THAT time, political time, in the Seventies and
Eighties, non-whites , particularly, Coloureds, Blacks, Indians, were not accepted in the
very uh, cream of the crop professions,
C: Ja
Y: medicine and dentistry, you know. It was .hh it was TOTALLY UNHEARD OF.
You could either do law.
C: Ja
Y: Or you could become a teacher
C: so it was very limited
Y: Ja, so, my mother wanted to push me to go become a teacher as well, or if I wanted
to I could choose to go do nursing and (.) I didn’t (.) want to. .hh I refused. Uhm, she (. )
DIDN’T WANT TO send me to Western Cape because (. ) a lot of my school friends
and neighbours have gone to Western Cape but all became very politically involved
C: Ja
Y: and some of them actually got *side-tracked* and never actually even completed their degrees
C: Ja
Y: So: small town get involved with social activities in the town etcetera. So: the trend was either, when you just finished Matric, your next step, your next profound thing to look forward to is to get married and drive a car and have children, type of thing. So, uhm, my mother was *very, really, very strict* about that. A:nd, she (.) *VERY AMBITIOUS*
C: Ja
Y: Not AMBITIOUS IN TERMS OF MATERIAL GAIN, you know. As teachers they earned (.) *very little*
C: That’s right
Y: (in those years). Uhm (.) we didn’t have a (.) fancy house, we had a standard house. All our needs were met. We were, didn’t grow up (.) rich with having to, the cars fetch you from school and things like that.
C: Ja
Y: You know, we walked to school, we worked HA:RD, we didn’t have a *domestic*, all kinds of things. So, you, you *really* had to *work* for what you got.
C: Ja
Y: Uhm
C: So, how did she handle the fact that you then applied for dentistry?
Y: WELL SHE DIDN’T WANT TO. Uhm , she wasn’t *impressed* about it. >But I, the fact that I had applied for medicine as well <
C: Hmm
Y: uhm, was okay for her and AT THAT TIME you had to apply for ministerial consent to study at a *white* university
C: That’s incredible
Y: <they then sent me a letter back, (2) Wits (.) to tell me that I must go to Western Cape>
C: So this is 1980?
C: Ja
Y: I must go to Western Cape < So, my fa:ther (.) wrote a letter (back)
C: Hmm
Y: <and said that he refused to send me to (.) Western Cape. I had never been away from home>
C: Right
Y: and he made me some examples. Uh, he had a bit of clout because he was quite involved in uhm, in municipality affairs. At that time, if you can remember (.) they, they started with this tri-cameral parliament and all of that
C: Yes
Y: And they started getting (.) uh, uh, (then) the House of Representatives at that time. Uh, and you had these Hendrickse people and they, THEY WERE ALL KIND OF TEACHERS and involved (and everybody knew everybody)
C: That’s right
Y: so, my father had a bit of clout that way and he, he: because he was now, <uh, elected
on the local council, he, he made contacts > with some of the members there of the
Rotary Club and one of the guys there was a dentist
C: Ja
Y: On, on, on this committee uhm, and they endorsed. My father had the, uhm, mayor of
the town (.) wrote another letter ( )
C: So they wouldn’t keep, you know accept it?
Y: Ja , no, they wouldn’t. They sent me to a, they said ( . ) particularly
C: Uhm
Y: I must go to a ( . ) non-white university
C: Hmm
Y: and my father didn’t, (said, no it’s too far out of town) “and he’s not prepared to send
his daughter there”. So, THEN OBVIOUSLY CAME BACK and then said well, I must go
and apply and do: like a BSc or something.
C: Right
Y: Ja
C: ( )
Y: ( . ) There were no, there were no places available for ( . ) other than whites
C: And was this at Wits, applying at Wits?
Y: ( . )
C: Yes, incredible. So, in spite of being turned down, he insisted that you apply in any
case.
Y: Ja.Ja, no he said: “ >Okay fine, go in for the BSc ( . ) and then if you have to, and then
go into second year medicine”, or<
C: Ja
Y: you know, decide from there what I want to do
C: Ja, do it in a roundabout way,
Y: Ja
C: Virtually
Y: Hmm, ja
C: how did your mother feel about all of this? Writing of letters?
Y: >SHE FELT MORE COMFORTABLE WITH JOHANNESBURG< because
C: Hmm
Y: she grew up in Johannesburg
C: Hmm
Y: all her sisters were here
C: Hmm
Y: and her father ( . ) still lived here in Coronation. So, uhm , when I came, “the fact that
we ( . ) were not allowed at that stage, to stay on campus, we were not allowed ( . ) there”
C: hmm
Y: Uhm, I then stayed with my grandfather ( . ) in Coronation ( )
C: Right. And how did you experience those years? Being one of the few female students
and non-white students, so to speak?
Y: Hmm. Uhm, I think ( . ) you, you were <particularly aware ( . ) of the fact that you are
different>. I think ( . ) uh, what usually sort of irked ( . ) me the most ( . ) at the time, was
that, (1) your class members (.) were conditioned to think (.) of themselves as being different
C: Right
Y: Okay. LATER ON, AS TIME WENT BY, towards when we came to our second, third year. Then (1) you started becoming like, ONE. >Okay, where they didn’t have a problem being a partner with you <
C: Ja
Y: (because now they knew you)
C: Oh, because you had to work in teams
Y: You had to work in partners
C: Hmm
Y: You, you had to work in partners. >In the first and second year (.) wasn’t that critical<.
C: Hmm
Y: “It was when you came to the clinical years, when you had to have partners. In the first year you were anatomy and physiology and all those subjects and really you had to really work for yourself
C: Right
Y: SO WHAT USED TO HAPPEN. We were five non-whites in the class (1) we were like 3 Indians and myself
C: And were they male, female?
Y: Yes, there were 2 Indian females, one male and then myself
C: Okay
Y: and another black guy. In fact, this M****, D****’s husband
C: Okay
Y: Ja, we were all in first year
Y: He failed first year, by the way
C: It’s a small world
Y: the year after that, ja. So: uhm, we kind of stick together. You know (.) lunch time you found all of us sitting and eating together. You know, it was <li:ke drawing li:ke>
C: Ja(h) a
Y: So, uhm the others were like all on their own. JA, THEY’LL TALK TO YOU, but that’s where it ends.
C: Ja
Y: You know. >It was not as if they were fighting for your cause. You had to get in there and fight for your own cause<
C: Right
Y: >No, in fact they weren’t aware, or couldn’t really be bothered how did you get to class in the morning, whether you got up at five o’clock to be there at eight o’clock<
Ummm
C: Just get on with it
Y: Ja, ja, you’re here, that’s okay, that’s good for you (1) Uh, NOBODY WAS REALLY should I say, conscience, conscious
C: Uhm
Y: or aware. >Particularly at Dental School at that time, even though they had all <these riots and (.) uprising and on campus,
Y: the Dental school students never (. ) participated
C: Why is that?
Y: UHM, I (. ) THINK IT WAS ALSO REALLY that it didn’t count in your stead (. ) to really be politically active. And, perhaps they had the same objective as mine. Don’t get involved, just get in there and finish!
C: Ja
Y: You’re here for a purpose, you know. Uhm, at that time, they had these, this Black (. ) Students’ (. ) Society, the BSS
C: Right
Y: and Black Consciousness Movement, uhm . We were, a few, a handful of non-whites, black students. Uhm and jeez, everybody kinda knew everybody. They saw you using facilities on campus, like playing squash or stuff like that. It’s like ooh, major sell –out kind of thing, you know
C: Hmm
Y: (there were the encouragement). You don’t buy anything on campus, you don’t (. ) you just basically boycott campus. You ‘re just here to get your academic degree and that’s it
C: Ja
Y: Ja
C: So, now getting back to your home relationships. You said your mother; she was basically the main disciplinarian
Y: Ja
C: But now what kind of things would elicit conflict in your household? If she was the one who decided, who made the major decisions, to argue about, what would it be? Or were there arguments?
Y: I think it was basically <when you disagreed. > When (. ) you (. ) there was an uprising within you. Uhm wanting to (. ) >sort of do your own thing, in terms of uh < going with fri:ends, or, (. ) be politi:cal activity > Uhmm, things that got you into trouble<
C: Ja
Y: that were against whatever she thought. Disrespect.
C: Was that, ja?
Y: Disrespect, Disrespect and lies. <My mother hated lies>. Uhm. DISOBEDIENCE
C: And your brothers, how did they handle that?
Y: Well, my brothers, because in Klerksdorp, uhm, we were only the second group of Matrics. So when they got to standard eight, the school only went to standard eight.
C: Okay
Y: So, they had to (. ) leave town to go and do Matric. They both went to ( )
C: Okay
Y: ( ) was a good school at the time, so my mother sent them there (. ) to do Matric. <So, because they were there boarding with people, they met fri:ends, and they started you know smo:king and dri:nking, and all kinds of things, as, as per normal.> Uhm
C: And how was that handled by your parents?
Y: >Oh no, she, she had conflict about it<
C: Ja
Y: >ºShe had conflict about it but on the other hand, life teaches, you have to grow upº<
C: Hmm
Y: > you have to say, well, that’s, that’s going to happen, and uh. She, because she was such a firm believer. (1) She just (.) always still maintained, you know what I believe in. Uh, certainly your choices are no good for you.

C: J(h)ajà

Y: Uhm,> “but then again, there’s nothing I can do about it. I can’t very well murder you or something. Uhm, but she made it very clear that she was not accepting of it”<

C: Ja

Y: “and she stood firm on it”

C: Can I ask you, and, in your personal life, when you got married, uhm how long was that after you qualified?

Y: I got married the year I qualified.

C: Okay

Y: Yeah, I graduated the 6th of June, I got married the 5th of July.

C: That’s amazing

Y: “Ja, I got engaged in my fourth year, fourth year. °I met D in my first year

C: Okay

Y: Ja, uhm. But (1) you now he was very considerate. (I mean, I studied, uhm, you know he used to sit here and read on the week-end and such), uhm

C: Could you tell me

Y: YOU KNOW WITH A VERY SORT OF, VERY STRICT UPBRINGING

C: Hmm

Y: uh the whole belief of uh, relationships, uh and, living together and uh, >things like that< were “totally out of the question”

C: Ja

Y: it was really (.) not (.) on. Uhm, AND THAT’S WHAT I, I, UH, I BECAME FIRM IN MY BELIEFS TOO

C: Hmm

Y: uh, in terms of what I wanted in life and I made it very clear and there was >LOTS OF RESPECT. Lots of respect. Uhm and we just maintained it, lots of respect, lots of loyalty< ( )

C: And what does, if you go, uhm, what does he do for a living?

Y: D?

C: Ja

Y: At the moment?

C: Ja

Y: >Uhm, D is ma, managing the practice for me at the moment<

C: That’s amazing.

Y: He did some management courses. He is a, he actually is a draughtsman by ORIGINAL (trade)

C: Ja, and was he a draughtman then?

Y: Ja, when I met him. Uhm, JA, NOW OF LATE, he’s done lots of courses, management courses, which I have no doubt, is probably also, just an influence on my part because I have been studying. So, he’s had to (.) fill his time as well. So: we just become a family (.) of on-going (.) development.

C: Ja, that’s wonderful. And uhm, who makes the major decisions in your household?

Y: Both of us ( )
C: Hmm and concerning the practice

Y: <PRACTICE, I WOULD SAY I WOULD PROBABLY BRING OUT PERTINENT ISSUES and then we would consult about it>

C: Ja

Y: <and I would say well, this is what I want, it’s very objective based, very objective-based. And decisions are made, with, with time, lots of strategy>

C: Ja

Y: < lots of thinking about it, weighing up pro’s and cons. Lots of planning, lots of praying, (lots of praying)>

C: Ja. That’s lovely

Y: Hmmm

C: And when there’s conflict about something, how do you resolve issues?

Y: ° We talk. We communicate. We talk, lots of talking°

C: Ja

Y: >° We have lots of coffee times. Coffee time is talking time°<

C: Can I ask you, your, to tell me a bit about your ongoing studies.

Y: Hmm

C: What motivated you to do that?

Y: Uhm, you mean after the MAP?

C: That’s right

Y: or going on to the MAP? Well, as you know I was full-time at Wits after I (.)

C: Graduated as a specialist. And I stayed on, ( ) from 1993 up to 1999. Now I had been doing private practice, limited private practice, after the MAP in, in Florida

C: Ja

Y: And uh, now, I I mustn’t probably forget to mention ( )< that L had been pursuing me since I graduated>

C: Haha

Y: He always used to say to me, don’t waste your time here, you know, you’ve got good hands and all of these things. BECAUSE WHEN I GRADUATED I got the Prossa prize, (. ) for fixed and removeable

C: Wonderful

Y: Not because you ( ),

C: Ja

Y: but because I HAVE GOOD HANDS

C: Ja

Y: YOU COULD GIVE ME ANYTHING,

C: Ja

Y: I COULD DO IT. Uhm (.) and like L always will tell you: “The hands, I don’t know.

C: Haha

Y: Haha. Nothing else. Just the hands

C: Haha

Y: Haha. Not the brains, nothing else, just give me those hands.

C: Ja

Y: Uhm and that was just. I have just been blessed with very good hands

C: Hmm
Y: Uhm and then, you know, you develop. It’s like a **computer**. You have all this **input**, and then you **align** the hands with the brain and

C: Hmm

Y: you know you can have some good outcomes

C: Ja

Y: Uhm, I stayed on till (.) ’99. The year ’99. I was practicing at, uhm, at, in Florida

Just sharing some rooms with DF and them

C: So you, you lectured part-time and you practiced part-time?

Y: No, I didn’t work there. I was at Wits full-time

C: Ja

Y: and I **let** there part-time, I was renting there.

C: Okay

Y: I rented a surgery and, ‘cause they gave us limited private practice time

C: all right

Y: but then. Gee, (.) this government came to make lots of ridiculous decisions (.) and rulings (.) and stuff. You know there was, there were a lot of irregularities associated with the overtime issue and how they were **paying** and (.) what they did, you know

C: Hmm

Y: lowering standards and all kinds of things and I thought ag, no what ,you know, I **REALLY AND TRULY** cannot (.) take part in this

C: Ja

Y: **lots of bickering, backstabbing**

C: Hmm

Y: and that really wasn’t part of my make up ( )

C: Was that after the change of the government, before the change?

Y: after

C: after

Y: Yeah and uh, I thought no, what am I doing here? .hh And I really ( had been praying and questioning about, you know) Can I **leave**, what do I do, **where** do I go? And I explored all avenues

C: Hmm

Y: **including joining** another practice

C: Right

Y: working (with R), to find out where can I go in and just start working , ‘cause I didn’t have the capital to go in (.) and open up a practice

C: Ja

Y: for that matter. In fact, even at, **pre-1994 (2)**, I mean, really, you (.) as another **colour** ,walked into one of the practices here, you’d really be frowned upon. Okay. Uhm, in terms of your **youth**, in terms of your **gender**, in terms of your **race**

C: Right

Y: it was really, **totally premature**. You know that really, >that took time to build up and it’s really because of the **conditioning** because of the **culture of the**<

C: Ja

Y: >of the whole city as such, the area, considering that prosthodontics **really** is for upmarket areas<

C: Yes
Y: You know, you don’t go and practice prosthodontics in the West Rand
C: Ja
Y: or the South so to speak. And well, you know, I just waited my time out uhm, and
then in 2000 I was driving one afternoon back to, back home in my car. And I, you
know I just thought, this (place) is irritating me because things are leaking and I can’t
work the way I want to work, this is irritating me and I just, “you know I just prayed. I
said God, you (know, you’re just going to have to do) something for me, ’cause I am now
tired of this. “You know, this is ( ). D had lost his job at CNA at the time. He was out
of his job for about 16 months. And I couldn’t move
C: Ja
Y: Couldn’t do a THING, you know ( ) I had my salary at Wits, I was burning the
candle at both ends, to make ends meet
C: I’m sure
Y: working Saturdays and late nights ( ). Uhm THANK GOD, he had given the ability to
do that. And uhm, well, things happened. I was sitting there. By some divine
intervention I was sitting there in a coffee shop (one day here, in Rosebank I met D in
Rosebank. I had a bit of time, I said let’s go have a bit of a chat). L*** walked past
C: Ja
Y: and he looked at me and he said “AAH, JUST THE PERSON I WANNA SEE”
C: Isn’t that amazing!
Y: and he says to me: “When are you going to see me?” I said, “For what?” He says, “No,
I told you I would really like, I am tired, man. I really want you to come and see me. It
won’t hurt you, both of you, just come and see me”.
C: Ja
Y: ( ) Uhm, but (I said): “How much do you want?” I made a joke
C: Ha
Y: I said, “How much do you want?” “He said, ”No, man, that’s not important.” I said
“No, just give me an idea“ and he mentioned it, and I said, “Oh, catch me, I’m
fainting!”<
C: Haha
Y: It was so funny. A(h)nd uh, we left it at that
C: Yes
Y: >Three weeks later I’m sitting in my office, it was late afternoon, at, at W***< I
thought, ag well ( ). “Hi L***, how’s it? Are you still looking for somebody?” He says
to me: “<You know what? Your call is so timeous, I’m supposed to respond tonight ( )
to somebody ( ) to say I’m coming for an interview (in London).>”
C: Amazing
Y: I said (to him), “Okay L***, I’ll come and see you”. We made a date. ( ) >He said,
“Please don’t say anything, I don’t want my patients to know, (not my receptionist)”
C: Right
Y: I don’t want nobody to know about it, not even at School.< NEITHER DID I KNOW,
at that time, he had phoned L and spoke to L and asked L is he doing the right thing,
you know, because L had been my head of department at that time, we had a major fight
in the Department. Uhm ( ) and I was one of the people that was instrumental in this,
because ( ) he was head of department
C: Hmm
Y: and he had (. ) uh, continuously focused on my culture, telling me I don’t know how to talk because of my culture and that I had a black identity and ooh, he CLIMBED INTO MY CULTURE
C: Yes
Y: at which point I resisted
C: Ja
Y: I said to him, “I find it totally unacceptable and NOBODY (. ) looks down upon me,
C: Ja
Y: unless I allow it. > I’m nobody’s doormat< You are a head of the department and I will keep you accountable. If you give me instructions that I don’t wanna carry out I’m NOT gonna do it”.
C: How did he handle that?
Y: Uhm (2) well, there was a major ( ). We, it eventually ended up in M P’s office
C: Good grief
Y: there was a major disagreement. He had (. ) like selective CV building, he would like add stuff, J***’s stuff, PROMOTE them like you can’t believe. Uhm, books to review
C: Ja
Y: because you know for your CV you have to review books, you have to do certain things
C: Right
Y: (1)> remember R was there one afternoon, where you were on duty and, uhm, I had to go an arrange to fly. And I ( ) I was busy (.) on the floor (.) and they phoned me to tell me: “Please just come and sign quickly for your, for your, for your visa<”
C: Ja
Y: and I told R, I said, R, “I am coming NOW, just running up the road quickly to sign, I’ll be back”, “Okay don’t worry, I am here”. When I came back, he was down there and he had discovered that I had run off quickly. >Never mind that they all do it< <He (.) went off (.) at a tangent and in front of R and them, screamed and shouted at me and said: “I want you (.) out of my department (.) now. GO! GET!” he says to me>
C: Like a dog
Y: I said, that’s okay. I cried like you can’t believe. R just said to me, “Sorry, Y.” All of them: “ Sorry”. And (. ) I left. Uhm, I went home that afternoon (.) and I went to work the next morning. Uhm because I thought to myself, you had absolutely NO RIGHT and NO authority to tell me you want me out of your department
C: Ja
Y: It’s not your department.
C: Ja
Y: this is department of health.
C: What was his position there?
Y: > he was head of department<
C: Okay
Y: > he was head of department, but obviously kind of, just overriding his authority<
C: Ja
Y: as I walked in, there was a notice on my door: Please see me urgently. I didn’t go, I stayed in my office. He came to my office. He must have (been waiting for me)
C: Hmm
Y: and he said to me (“Please come to my office”) and he said to me, “I’m NOT withdrawing what I said yesterday, but”. Uuh, no. He said “I am not apologizing, but I am withdrawing what I said yesterday. Apparently I made a BIG mistake, your colleagues came in to tell me that I made the mistake of my life. (That they want you in the department)”

C: So they spoke up for you

Y: Yes, that was J (.) S in particular

C: Ja

Y: and uhm, then he said to me: “Look, I’m sorry, this that, but I am not apologizing. And this is what you’ve done”. And he’s prepared to do that and prepared to do that, uhm, Ja, I listened to him. (I carried on). We, in actual fact, became the best of friends.

C: So, how did you manage to resolve that issue?

Y: I WOULD SAY TO YOU WHAT’S BEEN INSTRUMENTAL IN THAT IS JUST UHM, MY: FEAR OF GOD

C: Hmm

Y: My honouring the word of God

C: Hmm

Y: I made my choices based on how God’s word and how He has changed me. In terms of I didn’t do it in the flesh

C: Hmm

Y: I definitely did it in the spirit (with His spirit)

C: Hmm

Y: If I had to respond in the flesh I would have been totally resistant, uh, I probably would have, could have, probably caused more damage.

C: Ja

Y: Uh, a few weeks later I went to him. >In fact, he just totally withdrew from the department. And one day I went to speak to him and I said: >“You know what, it’s not conducive to carry on. You’ve actually got to put behind what’s behind and we’ll get at least to work together. We’re forced to work together<

C: Ja

Y: > so we have to work together to make it work< Uhm, as long as there’s respect I want you to know that respect begets respect. <I will give respect where I get respect.>

C: Correct

Y: and uhm, <you MAY be the person in authority but you are just occupying the position of authority. The only person, I bow down to, I want you to know, is God>

C: Ja

Y: >“I don’t bow down to anybody”.<”

C: What did he say to that?

Y: So, uhm I THINK AFTER A LOT OF COUNSELING, because he went <back and fro and he spoke to his very religious daughter (.) and so forth>. And uh, apparently his daughter, he spoke me; he confessed all of this afterwards. His daughter just said to him, “Daddy, uhm, this girl has got a firm belief in God you’re really, you’re really barking up the wrong tree”. (1) So, uhm, there was a MAJOR TURN-AROUND, (I think there was a change of attitude)

C: In him?

Y: Ja
C: That’s amazing

Y: (a change of attitude on everybody’s behalf) because he told me (. ) my colleagues (. ) hates me

C: Oh

Y: and they want me OUT. Because I’m assertive, I don’t know how to talk because of my culture, and they’re scared of me and uh, I mustn’t DARE to go back to go ask them.

> I went to each one of them I said, you know this is what I’ve been presented with and, I’d like to find out from you guys: WHAT is the PROBLEM? They said, (they said) we don’t have a problem with you, you know<

C: Ja

Y: We’ve got, that is how you talk, it’s not as if you (1) have a problem with it. That’s what HE thought that I had a major (. ) attitude problem ( from his point of view)

C: Okay, so not an accent problem. An attitude problem

Y: NO, ACCENT was a part of it. That I did not know how to talk, that I don’t know how to write, I don’t, I don’t speak the Queen’s English and all of that. REALLY CLIMBED INTO ONE’S CHARACTER, you know. And I said to him> “It takes one to see one<

C: Right

Y: you know, and we always accuse other people of the things that we are guilty of”.

C: Correct.

Y: That is how it works. Uhm I ACTUALLY EVENTUALLY felt very sorry for him, because (. ) he had been conditioned in a totally different way. > Because in actual fact, he didn’t know me<

C: Ja

Y: You know ( )

C: He was making assumptions

Y: <and I said to him: “The fact that I stand up against something, must tell you that I don’t appreciate it>

C: Ja

Y: I resist it. I have all the right to resist it.

C: Ja

Y: I have all the right to resist (1) and I have all the right to question. If I see something I’ll question it.

C: Ja

Y: uhm, whether you like it or not, I’m gonna hold you accountable”. So, uhm, well, ja, all (. ) that aside, we one day, we went on a trip together (. ) to (. )Stockholm, because I had a (. ) very good liaison with NBC, implant company

C: Hmm

Y: they sponsored my trip to Stockholm and he: wanted to go with as well. So, he ended up going and we ended up travelling together. A LOT OF TIME to talk about and lots of things and I. >There was also an opportunity to make it very clear to him, why I resisted it<

C: Ja

Y: >and I actually opened up and I told him ALL THE THINGS THAT HE’D DONE (1) and <he (1) didn’t realize (. ) what an impact it had>. And I said you know, there are not very many of us, we’re very few non-whites, just R and myself

C: Ja
Y: okay and uh, harassments is in the eyes of the victim. It’s not in the eyes of the harasser. As a victim, imagine you’re shouting to your harasser: >”Ag, please stop raping me, please stop raping me”. ((said in a small, pathetic voice)). It doesn’t help<

C: Ja

Y: you know. So: at that time () I had joined the uh, the sexual, racial harassment panel. Wits wanted to rewrite their () whole mission statement.

C: That’s interesting.

Y: Ja, so I got involved with that

C: Because of this whole () thing?

Y: Yes.

C: Ja

Y: That really stimulated because I RECOGNIZED that this is what’s happening, you know,

C: Ja.

Y: because Wits is predominantly male, white male for that matter and >boy if you resisted, he’d always tell me what L thought about me and what (doctor) J told about me and everything and I said: “Well, that’s really very strange that they’ve never had an opportunity to come to me personally to tell me,<

C: Ja

Y:> but thank you for communicating on their behalf<”. Uhm but anyway, I actually said to him: “You know what, I know and my belief in God’s word is certain; I am beautifully and wonderfully created and I, that is how I’m gonna walk in life

C: Hmmm

Y: I got my abilities and I’ll do my best and I am gonna be the best that I can be. IF YOU HAVE A PROBLEM WITH THAT, I’m not gonna make your problem mine. (2) Uhm, <NO DOUBT () THAT ONE’S EXPERIENCES () MAKES YOU RESPOND () LIKE THAT>

C: Correct

Y: Okay, that every time someone climbs into your character or your culture, you respond.

C: Ja

Y: Okay. It’s like, > it’s almost as if it’s a trigger point<

C: But rightfully so

Y: It’s a trigger point that just sets it off, because then all that anger

C: Hmm

Y: of years and years comes along. You know, ((clicking sound made with fingers))

C: Ja

Y: it gets triggered () and it just sort of explodes. But () <amazingly when L phoned him to ask him, he just said to L (1) > and HE TOLD ME THE NEXT DAY, L called him and he just said:"Uhm >I want you to know that L spoke to me and so forth and so forth. I want you to know that () it’s not because I want to get rid of you, I would really regret it if you leave

C: Hmmm

Y: to take L’s practice to go and work there >, but I told him, I could think of no ()

better person, no ( )”

C: That’s incredible!
Anyway, the negotiations went on with L****, we started chatting. I said, “L, I’m very scared I don’t know whether your patients are gonna take to me, predominantly Jewish. <Ag genade, the house> (where am I gonna get the money and all of these things?)”

Y: ( )

C: Ja ( )

Y: ( ) Ja, when I left that time

C: Hmm. What year was this? 2000?

Y: Ja, just before.

C: Ja

Y: Ja, 2000, 2000. Uhm beginning 2000, we were negotiating. Lots of praying, I’m part of a (couple of membership groups) at church and .hh

C: Hmm

Y: there were just (.) just lots of issues on each of ( )

C: Hmmm

Y: There were a couple of couples

C: Hmm

Y: in the, in the (.) group and all of us were facing crossroads. Where we had to make decisions in terms of gosh, where am I going (you know)? What’s my destiny?

C: Ja

Y: Where, what’s happening? ( ) where do you see yourself in five years time? Because I’m still at Wits and I thought, well I’ve been here now seven years. If I create for three to five years where am I gonna BE? I am gonna be in exactly the same place where I am now,

C: Ja

Y: you know. There’s absolutely, with the way they set up, or their whole structure, very flat structure, sort of thing

C: Hmm

Y: Or very hierarchial.

C: Ja

Y: Where am I gonna be, you know. And I thought ( ). No ways. It’s ( gonna take some time to change) I’d better go out there and do something “for myself and for my children,” give it a go. Uhm, things happened (.) and I negotiated with L and I (.) took over L’s practice, the first of September

C: Hmm

Y: “I first worked for (L for about three months) and he introduced me. It was a very, sort of slow, subtle, soft, gentle (.) take-over”

C: Ja

Y: Uhm and he had left. (1)He was very accommodating (in the sense when I said, “Look I can’t (come up with (.)”) I can first work there and see, at the time the banks wouldn’t even accommodate me because my husband wasn’t working, I was the only one working.

C: But even though you’re a professional woman?

Y: Hmm. AND OUR HOUSE WASN’T SOLD. OH, NO THAT THEY DON’T TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION, PLEASE

C: But that’s incredible

Y: Uhm, the house wasn’t sold. >Never mind, when I went to apply for my first overdraft with the bank manager, he like kind of laughed at me, you know. It wasn’t (kind of
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taken) seriously. Uhm, our house wasn’t sold. I said to L: “Look I’ll go out and I’ll put my
house in the market”. I put my house in the market, (1)Sun:day. The next Sunday I signed
( )
C: So it just fell into place
Y: Just fell into place
C: And how did you-
Y: The TIMING WAS PERFECT
C: Ja, how did people here accept you?
Y: Uhm, GENERALLY (1) SURPRISINGLY WELL. Surprisingly well.
C: Hmm
Y: Uhm, I started working with N. N (was still kind of very, just shall I say, lots of
anxiety)
C: Ja,
Y: uh, it’s new person, it’s a female ( )
C: Ja. Is that your assistant now?
Y: that’s N, ja
C: Ja
Y: <been working for L for fourteen years. No:w (.) this kind of thing, lots of change.
What’s gonna happen? Insecurities, anxieties and so forth. So she stayed in the practice.
I believe that made (.) a big difference.>
C: Ja, continuity.
Y: Ja, you just basically. I just basically had to come with my competence
C: Hmm
Y: and (.) perhaps a lot of uhm (. ) professional acumen
C: Ja
Y: Okay, and to actually just maintain it.
C: So your fears of not being accepted, were actually not grounded
Y: JA, PROBABLY NOT. BUT THEN I THINK, I had gained a lot of experience.
C: Hmm
Y: I had had a lot of preparation time in academia, having had a practice, even though it
was part-time. But it dealt with the management,
C: Oh yes
Y: <knowing how patients respond, (how you deal with). How you write letters. ’Cause I
had been involved in post-graduate training>
C: Ja
Y: Ja, that side of training (people). Travelling, going on courses, really did a lot, to give
you the upper edge
C: Hmm
Y: So, you, you could develop. I had ti:me (1) to develop >that competitive advantage<
C: Ja
Y: Uhm, that could give a different edge to it. The fact that I was female, uhm you know.
People came here and I think at first, they were sceptical and I had to first establish a
rapport,
C: Ja
Y: with most of them .Two, two, I know of three patients who (1) chose to leave (1)
straight away, even though before I had interacted with them.
C: Ja
Y: They just phoned N, they’d want the X-rays, they’re going somewhere else. And they went, they came back,
C: That’s incredible!
Y: came back. Uhm, after (. ) speaking to people and so forth. <Uh, I SUPPOSE YOUR NAME THEN, GOES AHEAD OF YOU>
C: Ja
Y: <by virtue of the fact that you had been teaching, been involved in (1) training at different universities, sort of run a lot of courses, training courses, (involved in implantology )>
C: Hmm
Y: Uhm, "so I taught a lot of people, lots of dentists and so forth." BUT PEOPLE. IT’S AMAZING THAT YOU ALWAYS KNOW. THAT YOU DON’T KNOW, BUT THAT YOUR INTEGRITY WALKS AHEAD OF YOU
C: Ja
Y: It definitely does. And I think that the other thing that I can never omit is the fact that I had God’s favour on me.
C: Ja
Y: That’s really God’s favour on my life. That (. ) every time that I’ll wait to apply for something, there was an open door, there was an opportunity. There had been certain instances that I had to (. ) work (. ) hard, that I had to fight
C: Ja
Y: Uhm, it didn’t come easy. But, boy, oh, boy, if you brought your efforts,
C: Hmmm
Y: <uhm and you combined that with what was available. If your objective was (1) to achieve something, you could achieve it. You know, if you had to, sort of blind yourself to the other niggly aspects of something
C: Ja
Y: (something like) the negative things that discourage you, like the fear
C: Ja
Y: IF I HAD TO KIND OF DWELL on the fear, I could never have done this.
C: Hmm
Y: but (. ) I : said, “Well, I’m here for a reason. Uhm, I’ll do it and >God, it’s in your hands< ” I, all I have, I bring my effort, I bring my competence, I bring everything and my willingness and uhm, I can only do that, can only grow. WHEN I DID COME HERE, why I chose to do the MAP programme, was, gee I have always been, I have always been aware that (. ) the medical (. ) professions kind of train you so much in academia, lots of research and science but in terms of management,
C: Hmmm
Y: <in terms of, of, dealing with people, you know, strategy, operation all of those things. (sound of phone ringing in the background)) .We’re not skilled in it, at all>
C: Correct
Y: We just have to look at the professors and see how they mess up things
C: Ja
Y: because they don’t know
C: How to manage money
Y: Yes. Manage money, manage people.
C: Hmm
Y: manage their own lives, for that matter. <And I have always been someone that’s been very interested in decision-making, you know. How to go about, logically exploring.
When you have to make a decision in everything> Ask the RIGHT QUESTIONS, you get THE RIGHT ANSWERS and make your decisions that way,
C: Ja
Y: teaching the students that way. Treatment planning, how do you treatment plan? Do you just tell a patient, take a treatment out of a hat and say well, that’s for you?,
C: Hmm
Y: you know, no. Uhm and that’s when I explored and I wanted to do,> and I thought, now do I do the, the post-graduate diploma in management or other courses or the MBA<
C: Ja
Y: ’cause I certainly do not want to do a PhD. Too academic, you have to stay at the university for it to benefit you.
C: So it’s a bit restrictive
Y: Yeah, what am I gonna get a PhD for, I thought,
C: Exactly
Y: > you know what I wanna go do it for, unless I want to go back to university afterwards<
C: And be more academic, ja
Y: So, and besides, certainly
C: Hmm
Y: the way government is going now, >Heer, you don’t need a PhD to do that<. You know
C: Ja
Y: You know, and you will be so highly above everybody else, this is what you’re doing with yourself
C: Ja
Y: You’ll just irritate yourself
C: Ja
Y: You know, go abroad, that’s fine, okay. Uhm, and it has crossed my mind to probably considering going to other schools. (But having) travelled, visited schools and stuff, I became like Abraham, again saying that I would really, ( ) I’m a very strong believer. I believe in God governing my life. And I believe if I have to be in a place, he will tell me
C: Ja
Y: and he will show me but I had not had any ( ) you gotta go , pack your goodie.
C: So-
Y: So where? I KNOW THAT I KNOW THAT I KNOW THAT I’m NEEDED HERE.
C: Ja, that’s exactly what’s going to be my final question to you, Y. Uhm, what do you see your role, in this country. I mean in this changing country, as a, as a, female prosthodontist? ((sound of falling lid)). How are you contributing, how have things have changed perhaps?
Y: Uhm (1) things have changed a great deal, I think, in terms of patients’ acceptance.
C: Hmm
C: Patients have been. Uhm there’s a raised awareness that (. ) you know, you look at people and that you can judge people (. ) based on their abilities, their competence and their skills.
C: Ja
Y: and what they, what they bring with them. YES, WITH THAT COMES A CERTAIN DEGREE OF STYLE and uh, the edge, the upper edge and so forth.
C: Hmm
Y: Uhm, CLASS comes a lot with it. Uhm, NO DOUBT THAT, jeez I had to work for it
C: That’s right
Y: it didn’t come overnight. <Uh, it’s something that I see with the younger generation, particularly with the, the (. ) previously disadvantaged>
C: Right
Y: <is that there is an (. ) attitude of expectation and of entitlement. Uhm that, because I was previously disadvantaged-
C: But is it even amongst professionals?
Y: I: certainly think so
C: Okay
Y: that I should just leap into
C: Very interesting
Y: <into a (. ) preferential position .Uhm, never mind whether they have been trained
C: Hmm
Y: never mind whether they have the actual a, a appropriate relevant skills for that particular positions. Can they carry the responsibility? >
C: Hmm
Y: .hh Because it’s okay to have a high position, but you must never lose sight of the fact that it brings with it (. ) LOTS of responsibility
C: Ja
Y: Uhm and (then to have to be) able to fulfill that. Okay. <Uh there’s been lots of preparation time, on my behalf . And perhaps, I need to perhaps say, thank (. ) God for (. ) guiding me that I WAS along the road, that I HAD all this experience. I think if I ended up here in Rosebank or wherever (1) at the wrong time>
C: Hmm
Y: it probably wouldn’t have been the right thing.
C: So you had to wait and you had to learn.
Y: I had to wait and I had to learn
C: Thank you so much for your time. It was very interesting.
INTERVIEW 7.
C: M, thank you for doing this interview with me today. I'd like to ask you a bit about your background, starting as far back as you can remember, maybe even as a child.

M: Okay. Uhm (2) I was born and raised in Diepkloof, I’m the first child in a family of five. (2) I: went to a: (1) Catholic School which was (. ) you know, privileged at that time to go to that school.

C: Right.

M: I: spent most of my years in that school. All of my primary (. ) schooling there because I (. ) even did my Matric at that school. Uhm, my Matric, I finished my Matric in 1987. But, I had to write my Matric in 1988 because of (. ) the uprisings. Uh, and then for a year, I worked with my mom. Uh, thereafter, after my completion of Matric I went to Khanya College,

C: Right.

M: a bridging university (. ) for (. ) people who are from underprivileged schools. (1) U:hm, after Khanya College I went to Wits university.

C: Why, just tell me again why you went to Khanya College?

M: Because (1) it has been perceived. >Not perceived, it was like that < if I’m from a, a black school

C: Ja

M: to a white university, >there’s a vast difference, there, there’s a transition, you, you cannot cope<

C: Ja.

M: as such

C: Did you feel that, yourself personally?

M: Yes, yes, yes, yes.

C: So that year helped you?

M: Going to Khanya College, it, it, it very much helped me because, I couldn’t have coped at all .hh

C: Ja.

M: Because, it, it was a different thing altogether the university. It was totally, totally different.

C: How would you say it was different?

M: We were not (. ) prepared to, for, for that kind of environment,

C: Ja.

M: also, the, the, the work, workload and everything, it was different. .hh You, you, when you got there, you got your own you know, room in a (1)a, communal whatever, university residence etcetera

C: Ja.

M: You got carried away, it’s for the first time, you are out of, you know out of home, .hh, for the first time you get your independence,

C: Yes.

M: for the first time nobody’s asking you that have you studied, have you done this have you done that. It was, it, it really helped, Khanya College.

C: Ja.

M: Because, really, I don’t think I would have made it if I have gone straight to varsity at that moment. And uhm, okay, I started with my BSc in Genetics

C: Mmm.

M: For four years I did that, I finished that. I: in 1992 (. ) I worked for a year also, I worked with the Institute of Medical Research.

C: Did you enjoy that?

M: Mmm, I enjoyed it but (1) there, there was no money.
C: Ja, I believe so.
M: The salary was like, you know. It was a joke. But it was nice working there. It was nice working for them.
C: Ja, was it mentally stimulating at least?
M: Yes.
C: Ja.
M: Yes, 'cause I was doing research there, you know, genetic mapping you know.
C: Ja.
M: All sorts of things, interesting things. It was nice, really, I could go back there if (.) you know, anything else goes wrong with what I’m doing.
C: Yes.
M: I'll, I'll go there.
C: Ja.
M: But also the factor of (.) salary etcetera, I don’t know. I don’t know how is it at the moment.
C: Hmm
M: But yes, it was a,a,a, wonderful thing to do and then, uh, thereafter, I worked for, I worked, I worked, you know, part-time there and there. Even at the (. ) Edgars stores, I worked uh, everywhere. 1993, then I enrolled for (. ) my (. ) BSc, my BDS.
C: Right.
M: Yes, and then-
C: so have you always had an interest in dentistry?
M: I- C: that you suddenly changed?
M: I: had an interest (.) while I was doing my BSc and >also the main factor that made me to go into dentistry was, at that time, perceived as a paying, you know.<
C: right
M: Kind of profession and also there were no jobs you know. So: I: looked at something that I could (1) be, become self-em, em, employed and (. ) I could self-empower myself. hh
C: Correct
M: So that, I did BDS and that was the profession that I wanted to do
C: Ja
M: because of those rea. reasons
C: Ja
M: No jobs.
C: Ja.
M: No money, you, no self-determination in wherever you know. You have to be: answering to:
C: Somebody else
M: somebody and I don’t like that.
C: Ja
M: I don’t like it. That’s why I went back. But, obviously, I’m there now and it’s all for the wrong reasons that I’m he(h)re. Haha
C: Ja
M: It’s not like that anymore. There is no money, there is hassles, there is problems there is anything you can think of.
C: Could you explain to me when you say hassles and problems?
M: Uhh
C: Be a bit more specific?
M: First of all, uh, the medical aids .hh We, we, I work with medical aids.
M: I’m contracted with Medical Aids. So, I don’t charge the patients, I claim the money from the Medical Aid. They take forever to pay.

M: They don’t pay at all. It’s, It’s .hh I don’t know, I don’t know what to say. But I’ve had it.

M: I’ve had it with the medical aids. Okay, uhm (2) that was the main reason, that, that, that. The main reason that’s making me so sad now

M: I've had it with the medical aids. Okay, uhm (2) that was the main reason, that, that. The main reason that’s making me so sad now

C: Ja.

C: Ja.

M: with this whole profession.° And then, uhm in 2002, I came here. U;h, I don’t know if I, >I must say, white suburb<

C: Ja, I believe so.

M: Okay, maybe I should call it (.) a (.) a white suburb

C: Ja.

M: .hh Uhm, I’m still doing the medical aids, etcetera and uhm, the transition from treating my own people, my black people

C: Ja.

M: to treating white people, that’s also a vast difference.

C: Ja.

M: When they come, they come, you know, they expect, I don’t know, heaven and earth from me.

C: Ja.

M: Uhm, I don’t know if (it’s because ) –

C: Give me an example?

M: uhhh

C: When you say that-

M: Okay, when they come, they’ll want to know. They’ll want me to show them, uh, the, my sterilising room, my autoclave. Some of them phone and ask if I use gloves, haha.

C: So, they question your integrity?

M: Exa(h)xtly. .hh Some of them will ask if I’m using gloves. Some of them will ask if I dispose my needles. Can I show them where I dispose my needles. .hh Okay,I ,I don’t have a problem with that, I mean, it’s, it’s, it’s my health also.

C: Yes, I agree.

M: Maybe I would ask .hh,

C: Ja.

M: but then uhm, >I find, I find, that they (. ) expect too much from me<.

C: Do you? Do your black patients ask you those questions?

M: No:, no: >it’s for the first time, I hear these things<.

C: Ja

M: It’s for the first ti:me. And uhm, I don’t get offended, because. I know. I don’t know, I don’t know, the mind-set of people.

C: Ja

M: I DON’T KNOW HOW THE MIND WORKS, YOU KNOW. WE, ARE ALL INDIVIDUALS, WE ARE ALL DIFFERENT, BUT I’VE NEVER HAD THOSE QUESTIONS IN TOWN ( ) -

C: And then do you, do you show them all these things?

M: °Ye:s°

C: Do you oblige them?
M: °Ja.°
C: Are they then okay with it?
M:°Yes, ja, ja°
C: Have you ever had any arguments or, things because of that?
M: No, no, no, no, no. After I show them the whole thing, they are happy, ja.
C: Ja.
M: Ja, no, after I show them everything they are happy and uh, uh, ja. You know, but> it’s something that I DIDN’T EXPECT, YOU KNOW, WHEN I CAME HERE<.
C: No.
M: >I didn’t expect it all. I mean, it was a shock, it’s still a shock to me that sometimes I have to show people .hh uh, where I dispose my needles, I mean, I’m a professional. <I could lose my profession, I could (.)
C: Yes.
M: you know, I could be in danger if I do, I, I don’t do all those things.
C: Your own life-
M: and I don’t do, I, I, I, I’ve been do, I’ve been practicing it since I left school. That’s what I was taught, you know. In. infection controllo;
C: Right.
M: etcetera, etcetera. So:
C: Did, were you taught at university that things might be different in different practices or different areas?
M: No, no, no, no, no, hhmhm.
C: So you had to discover that for yourself?
M: °<Yes, I had to discover that for myself. .hh Because I: ° With >the, the new South Africa<, that is why I (. ) wasn’t (. ) even (. ) scared to come and, and open here, you know.
M: My:(2) MY MIND was telling me that everything is fine. We are one, you know, people will come etcetera. It will be like, .hh you know (1) as, as I’ve been doing there. But, although they come but (2), they still have reservations I, I must say.
C: Ja. And you would say, basically, about your professionalism?
M: Mmmm.
C: That’s the main question.
M: Mmmm.
C: That’s very unusual, very, very unusual. Can I ask you something about your personal life? Going back to your childhood. You said that you worked a while for your mother. What does your mother, what does your mother do?
M: Uhm I never had a father.
C: Okay.
M: >So, uh, that person, the boss hired me for that six months or so to come and help my mother with whatever she was doing. <
C: Right.
M: >She was a receptionist and she was working for a: insurance broker<
C: Right.
M: Ja. That’s how I helped her.
C: Uhmm, now getting back to your, your household, your family. In your household, uhmm who made, who made the major decisions? Your mother or your father? How did things work?
M: Uhmm I never had a father.
C: Right
M: I never knew my father. Uhm, I only knew him. I, I, I only heard about my father when he died.

C: Right.

M: About four, five years ago. My mother never told me anything about and I never questioned, you know.<

C: Hmm

M: But she TOLD me the day that sh. Uh, he died, uh, that there’s somebody and he’s supposedly your father he died, and that’s it. SO, I don’t even know him, I don’t even know his face< I was, I was (.) raised by my mother.( )

C: Yes, actually – ( )

M: ( ) by my grandmother.

C: Ja.

M: And my mother came in later because (.) most of the years (.) she was at school, you know, because my mother is very young.

C: Yes.

M: She got me when she was only seventeen. So: she had to go back to school, so I was with my grand(, )mother for a very long time<

C: Tell me and how, the fact that you never discussed your father. Did you ever question that?

M: Hmm

C: or did you just let it be?

M: I just (.) forgot about it

C: Ja

M: °even now, I just forgot about it°.

C: and, uhm you are yourself married, and I mean your children’s lives are so very different.

M: Yes.

C: I mean your life is so different.

M: °Yes,yes,yes,yes°.

C: How would you say your life is different to your mother’s from your point of view?

M: Uhm, °it’s different from my mother’s, because (.) I’m married, I have got my (.) own house

C: That’s right

((background noise))

M: <My children are raised by both parents. Uhh, my children are, I would say that (.) they are the most fortunate children, because of (.) the way that they are being raised>

C: Yes.

M: The schools they go to: no. >The things they get, the things they want, you know<

C: Ja, they’re privileged.

M: <Exactly> ja.

C: Ja. And I mean, does your, is your mother able, does she have her own car?

M: °No.°

C: Can she drive?

M: °No°

C: So, I mean there’s that vast difference as well.

M: Yes (a very big difference )

C: And how does she, how does she feel about you having succeeded so much in life?

M: °Oh, she’s so: happy (for me). She is so, so happy°. >Actually, she can’t believe it. Every time she looks at me, she says: “.hh You know, I always thank God that (.), you know, you are what you are today”.
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C: Ja, does feel she’s played a role in that?
M: Uhhh, ye:s, but (. ) you know. I was, I was (. ) very independent
C: Hmm
M: since from when I was young. So, most of the things, > I did them myself.<
C: Ja.
M: Most of the things. Even the Khanya Colleges, the, etcetera. > had to discover them myself<.
C: Ja
M: hh. Bursaries, etcetera, at school, I had to get them myself. I had to do (. ) everything (. ) myself. So: YES, I mean (. ) she did guide me in a way, but she knows, that everything, I did it for myself.
C: So you’re very independent and a very strong person?
M: Ja: when I want something, I, I get it.
C: And what made you decide to, to do genetics or dentistry? Who was your role model to go and study those courses?
M: Uhm
C: Would you say, who influenced you?
M: Uhm (4). I went to career counselling. They told me about genetics. I loved genetics. (2) From, you know the presentation and everything. Nobody influenced me. I didn’t know anybody who was doing genetics who was a geneticist, or something.
C: Right.
M: <Uh, just from the career guidance, I just loved it. And then the BSc, the BDS like I told you. While was doing the BSc, uh, BSC Genetics, uhm, you know, I used to go to different faculties and look around, etcetera and then (. ) it took my fancy. And then uh, it, it got emphasised after I, I realised that there are no jobs in Genetics>
M: Okay, I had a job, but hh (1) a non-paying job at all,
C: Ja
M: so that’s why I said “No”.
C: Ja, and you, you pointed out that’s why you wanted to be self-sufficient.
M: Ye:s
C: What drives you to be self-sufficient?
M: Uhm, what drives me? I am not a person who (. ) who likes to be (. ) ordered around, to be told that, uhm, can you could do that for me, you know
C: Ja.
M: all that, all those things. I’m not a person who likes asking (. ) you know.
C: Ja.
M: hh I have to have everything myself. I have to have everything that I want.
C: Ja.
M: That’s why (1) I am where I am today.
C: So that brings me to your marriage specifically. Uhm, you husband is self-employed,
M: Mmm.
C: and you are self-employed. Now, who makes the major decisions in your household?
M: Uhhm (2). It’s funny, I make the decisions, but the mo(h)ney doesn’t co(h)me . co(h)me from me. Hahaha.
C: Hahaha. So, you have the say.
M: I HAVE THE SAY. I SAY I WANT THIS AND THIS HAPPENS. I WANT THIS AND THIS HAPPENS YOU KNOW.
C: Ja.
M: But, although I’m not contributing to tha-h-a-t, but I make the decisions.
C: How does that come about, that you actually have so much say in your marriage?
M: Hmmm. I think (.) because ((background noise)) >I think, he believes in me. He believes
in what I do, he believes in my vision, you know<.
C: Ja.
M:> That’s why he lets me. I mean, he, he’s a builder, he’s a, he’s an everything but (.) .hh
most of the things in the house I’m the one who changes them. I’m the one who tells him I
want to build this there and there, I want you to change this and that and that<
C: Ja.
M: and yet, when he’s at his own place, he’s the one who’s doing all the things.
C: Ja.
M:.hh but when he comes at home, then everything has to change.
C: So, at his, his place of work. He’s the boss.
M: He’s the boss.
C: But at home, he, he, he believes in you,
M: Ja.
C: and you make the decisions.
M: Ja.
C: and when there’s conflict, when you have arguments, how does that work out?
You know if there are disagreements?
M: Hmmm
C: What do you argue about, for example?
M: Uhm, hey, what do we argue about? About everything! Hahaha!
C: Hahaha
M: O(h)h well, uh, we argue about a lot of things. We can argue about him coming late at
home. We argue about me going (.) to shopping, you know
C: Ja.
M: about me spending money on shopping. We can argue about taking the kids to school in
the mo(h)rning.Hahaha.
C: Yes, haha.
M: and fetching them. We can argue about (2) uhm, °what°, sometimes about food, you
know.
C: Ja.
M: Sometimes I have co:oked and then he doesn’t like that food and I get upset.
C: Ja
M: ( )
C: Ja. How do you resolve your arguments?
M: Mmm. Ai, (4) we’ve got pride, me and my husband. So: i.i. it takes a,a,a bit of a while to
resolve the. We go for two, three days not talking to each other in the house until it gets to us,
you know.
C: Ja.
M: One of us will come and say .hh when is this going to, to end, when are we going to start
talking, you know.
C: Ja.
M: And then we go and start talking about the thing and then (it ends that way).
C: So, there’s normal, normally there’s like silence.
M: Yes.
C: And then, who do you think is the one that asks the, the first, whose the one who gives in
the first? Like, who starts talking?
M: It’s me.
C: You? Why is that, do you think?
M: Uhm, because I can’t take the, the, the, the atmosphere in the house
C: Ja.
M: I can’t take it, when we’re not talking to each other. hh and also (. ) uhh, my kids (. ) can pick it up, very quickly.
C: Yes
M: in the house when we’re not talking, when it’s not ni:ce. When it’s (. ) and then (. ) when I see them, like that:
C: Mmmm
M: it gets to me and then I, (1) I start talking
C: Ja
M: But, he does also start, but most of the time, it’s me
C: It’s you. Ja, okay, then I also would like to ask you. Now, you say that you were raised by your grandmother.
M: Mmmm
C: Can you describe me a bit about, the environment that you grew up in your grandmother’s house.
M: Okay.° My grandmother wasssss married, uhm, but it’s, it’s (such a pretty story).° But the, the, the, the husband that she was living with, he was not the, the father of my mother.
C: Right
M: And, and then, uhm, (1), so: there was a conflict between my mother and that man all the time, that’s why she was always at school and always, you know, with friends.
C: Ja
M: .hh She was never at home you know. U:hh my mother used to work as a hmm, tea girl for A****, it was in Doornfontein at that time
C: Ja
M: And then, >she used to be the breadwinner. She used to do everything for me< She, she was, she was really, really, really a, (1) a strong lady that one. Uhm, she: My primary school, she was the one responsible for it. ( )
C: Is this your Granny?
M: Ja, you know because my mother was at school at that time.
C: Of course, being so young.
M: So she was responsible for both of us, because my mother was in boarding and I was uhh, uhhh, living with her. And then, uhm, ja: she used to, do everything for me.
C: Who do you think you take after the most, your Gran or your Mom?
M: I think I take for my Gran.
C: In which way, if you can give me some example?
M: The independence. The: ja, she was very independent.
C: And how did you get on with her husband because you were living in the house, with him as well?
M: >No, I didn’t have any problems, I didn’t. They had problems, I didn’t have any. He didn’t have any problem with me, so I didn’t have any problem with him<
C: But he had a problem with your mother, though?
M: °Ja.°
C: Why is that, do you know?
M: >(1) I, I wouldn’t know. I, I wouldn’t know.
C: Ja.
M: I, I, pfoo, I, I was still too very young
C: Ja
M: to understand (. ) the situation, what was happening .hh
C: Ja
M: But I could see that. hh she is not THERE because if him, you know, yes.

C: And your grandmother how does she feel about your career success?

M: Oooh, I think she is turning in her grave now, because really, she was going. She died long time ago. She died in (.) 1978.

C: Okay, so she never knew

M: She never knew. She, she died when I was still very young.

C: And who raised you then?

M: I had to go, uh, my mother got married, so I went to (.) live with her, after (.) 1978.

C: So, you spent your, your senior school years with your mom

M: with

C: and her husband?

M: Yes.

C: And: could you tell me a bit about their marriage. How they got on and how you got on with your stepfather?

M: Uhhmm, my mother, they, they get on very well.

C: Hmm.

M: <They love each other. And then my mother got two kids with (.). Uhm, and then, my sister’s mother (.), died, at a very, uhh, young age>

C: Right.

M: <and she left those kids. So, my mother took those kids and then, uhm, she raised those kids with us> so we were five

C: Five, yes.

M: Five kids.

C: Yes.

C: Five kids.

M: That’s why I said I was the first of the five.

C: I understand.

M: Ja. And then, uhm (2). Ye:s (.). she raised us all since then and uhm, she used to work like I told you, with this insurance company and the: husband used to work for E*****.

C: Right.

M: And then, uhm, ja:, I could say (2), he, he: also contributed. I mean, we were living in his house.

C: Yes

M: hh He used to, you know, buy the groceries and everything. Pay for everything. Ja, he, they did contribute a lot also.

C: Right. Uhm, then I want to ask you. Now you have 2 daughters, what would you like for them? If you think how different your life is to your mother’s and your grandmother’s. What would you want for your two daughters?

M: I, I, I pray every day that .hh they must achieve even more than I achieved. If they can achieve even more than I achieved. I’ll be very much glad.

C: Ja

M: Ja.

C: Achieving which way, do you mean?

M: Uhhh

C: Intellectually?

M: Intellectually, socially, you know. Everything, everything, ja

C: And, do you, do you think that you’re a good role-model to them?

M: "I think so" ((background noise))

C: Then I want to ask you a bit more, broader question. This country, now you thought, you said, yes, we were one, but you found that it was very different. How would you like to see that kind of thing change?
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M: Hmm
C: Do you think it’s possible?
M: "I don’t think it’s possible. It can be done but I don’t think it’s, it’s taken very seriously." Uhmm, (1) you know, to me, a human being is a human being, regardless of colour or what. So, if, if we can achieve that thing, it will be great. If we can look at a person as a human being.
C: Ja.
M: >If we can start looking at each other as human beings and forgetting about my hh surname and everything. This will be a great, great, great, uhuh, country that we live in. <
C: Ja.
M: But, it’s, it’s, it’s not. I don’t know. If it’s happening, I don’t see it. If it’s happening it’s very minimal.
C: Ja.
M: Ja
C: Yet, if you think about where you have come from, what you have achieved. Do you feel that other black women are getting there as well?
M: Yes, sure. Hmm, hmmm.
C: And how do you. How, when you speak to some of your colleagues, do they see any changes?
M: "No, uhm, in terms of, of, of the race and everything, the, the, the way we, we, we still treat each other and the way that we still look at each other. hh They also think that it’s far-fetched."
C: Ja.
M: That it cannot, it can never be, it can never, it, it, it can never be achieved. hh Uhm, people are still, you know, they are still stereotyped, they are still whatever they are. You know when they grew up whatever they were taught, when they, they grew up. It’s still instilled in their minds and everything. hh And, unfortunately it’s like that, I don’t know.
C: Do you think that your daughter, going to the school which she does go to, will there be a change maybe in her generation-
M: Definitely,
C: or do you think it will be the same?
M: definitely, definitely. My kids, >they don’t, they don’t know what is white, they don’t know what is black, they don’t know anything<
C: Ja.
M: "I mean, i.i. >You talk about those things. I don’t, I don’t ( . ) talk about them. But I think if you can even ( . ) start talking about them"
C: Ja.
M: "it will be a taboo to them, they don’t know even what you are talking about. hh They are going to have, a, a, a, wonderful life, you know."
C: Ja.
M: Ja.
C: So-
M: by the time that they grow up and become parents and everything. It will be so nice.
C: Because you feel that we are stuck in what we have been taught,
M: Yes.
C: how we’ve been raised?
M: how we’ve been raised, you know
C: Ja, and it’s different with our children.
M: Yes, ja. They are getting it from the root, you know. They are getting it, you know. They are raised, they don’t knowwww. THEY DON’T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT COLOUR.
those kids. It’s so amazing, it’s so amazing, the way they interact. The way, it’s so nice. It’s so nice.

C: But don’t you think you’re teaching her that?
M: Uhuh. I, I, I,
C: How does she, how does she get that knowledge?
M: <I, I can say I AM TEACHING HER BUT NOT DIRECTLY, you know>- C: Ja.
M: Not directly, indirectly
C: Explain, explain that to me.
M: Uh, my actions, you know. The way (1) when they, they, they portray, they, they talk or they play or they por. hh I will, I get involved in a way.
C: Hmmm
M: I, I’m with them, you know
C: Ja.
M: You know, but I think most of the guidance they get it from (. ) their interaction at school. They spend most of their time at school, and everything hh
C: Ja.
M: and when they come at home, they don’t hear us talking about (. ) a, a, white person and a what, what, what
C: Hmm
M: indirectly
C: Ja
M: I, I am also involved in a way
C: So there’s quite a difference between your generation and that generation
M: °A vast difference, huge one°
C: Ja, and that is achieved by her interaction at school. But you don’t feel it’s achievable right now?
M: No. No. In my, in, in, at the moment I don’t think it’s achievable. But (. ) their generation, it, it, it, it doesn’t even need to be achieved. ((sound of phone ringing in the background))
C: Hmmm
M: IT’S ALREADY THERE, THEY ARE, THEY ARE ALREADY BUILDING IT. THEY ARE HH ALREADY BUILDING THEIR OWN (. ) EMPIRE, ETCETERA. OF, OF HUMANITY, OF HUMAN KIND
C: Ja.
M: OF EVERYTHING. THEY ARE ALREADY BUILDING IT. SO, (1) THERE’S NO, THERE ISN’T GOING TO BE ANY TRANSITIONS TO BE MADE OR,
C: Mmm
M: you know, with them.
C: Because we’re struggling for it?
M: Exactly, ja.
C: Thank you so much for your input. It was lovely talking to you.
M: My pleasure.
INTERVIEW 8.
C: T, thank you for agreeing to the interview today
T: Sure
C: Uhm, what I’d like you to do is tell me a bit about yourself, your personal life, where you come from and your family life as a child and now.
T: Okay. Uhm, where do I begin? Hah. Okay, uhm I’m a first-born child. We are three, a younger brother and a younger sister and my mom has actually brought us up single-handedly until she got married later, when I was about sixteen
C: Right
T: >and uhm, unfortunately the gentleman passed away<. But ever since then hh, I mean, she has been this single handed woman doing things by herself seeing to it that every one of us gets a bit of education, and uhm , I’m glad to say that she has been very strong for me. And my grandmother as well, < she has been a very good role model>. I mean, my grandmother, is seventy two years old
C: That’s lovely
T: >she got married when she was nineteen, the husband passed away when she was twenty nine, never remarried< she took care after her six kids,
C: Wow
T: single-handedly and TILL NOW she, she, she just feels that she is there for her kids
C: That’s her major role in life
T: Yes, and she only. She always tells me “You only love once”
C: Oh, isn’t that lovely
T: Yes a(h)nd >my grandfather was, ºwas just a normal gentleman, who worked very hard for his family but he just passed away at a very early ageº<.
C: What did your grandmother do for a living?
T: Well, she worked at the printers
C: Okay
T: Yes, she was collating, you know, papers to make prints for various companies. She worked there for a number of years up until she retired and she, >she knows no better<, you know
C: Ja, tell me when you say that she is a strong role model, what did you mean by that specifically?
T: I mean because you know what, I mean, she, despite ALL that, she made it, you know
C: Hmm
T: She has, she looks up to us and she tells us what, how, how life has been, how HARD life is and how we should appreciate life it doesn’t matter which way it deals you.
C: Ja
T: You have to appreciate that you are alive,> you here for a certain moment and you must make it stay, stay, you know .hh and, and she didn’t have much money
C: Ja
T: but you know what, and >yet she lived<. Day in day out she has so much love
C: So, she has embraced life
T: Ja
C: In spite of hardship
T: Exactly. She is one strong woman, I mean she goes to church, she loves church, she watches TV. She reads a lot .hh and she is so up to date with what ever happens. And everyti(h)me when I know something when I was young I used to go to her and say: “Grandma, uhm >if something is like this, is said like
this, what do they mean?" Grandma (1) speaks polish English, I mean

( ) she is so - she sounds like a well educated woman

early age,

C: Hmm

T: "although she never saw herself through school because she got married on

now, what could we have done. “She always tells me I could have gone to school”

C: But she, she made her decision

T: Ja

C: or, was it made for her

T: <you know ( .) back in the days ( 1) the, the elders took much more supreme

role

C: that’s right

T: Ja, in your, in your decision making

C: Ja

T: because you, you just don’t make decisions. hh These days we are

independent

C: Hmm

T: >we don’t REALLY care if, if, haha you know< if, my parents don’t like it. I

always say: “You know what Ma, I uhm, I know you not comfortable with this,

“but this I am doing this for T*** .hh and if T*** is happy, you have to be

happy for me”

C: And, how does she respond to that?

T: <Well you know, she, she > - it was a struggle at first

C: Ja

T: because she would always refer to: “ >I never used to talk like that to my

mother<”

C: That’s lovely

T: Hah, Ja, but now she realises we are independent

C: Hmm

T: We in a different era, it’s a new millennium. I mean things have changed so

much

C: Hmmm

T: as compared to ( . ) in the Sixties

C: Yes

T: I mean this is the twentieth century .hh

C: Ja

T: I mean, if you ( 1) compare that to (1) this VAST difference . I mean

( . ) things, the technology we have now, things that happened then ( 1) the

money everything . You know everything has changed, the economy, who is in

the government and all those things have got so much to do with how we live

right now. And, you know ( . ) she had understood and you know, realised that

( . ), you know, what , I have to let go at some point ( 1 ) because I, I, I, I, became

independent very early

C: Uhm

T: because uhm I realised that I, I hadn’t met my dad then

C: Why?

T: I only met my dad when I was sixteen and when did, it ma- , had an impact in

my life
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C: Could you
T: Yes
C: tell me more about that?
T: It had an impact on my life because you know what, I opened my eyes and I
said: “Oh I do have a dad<”
C: Ja
T: which, you know, whatever (. ) reasons he had (. ) for not going (. ) on with
my mother
C: Hmm
T: it, it, it has nothing to do with me.
C: Okay
T: Okay, I am a child I am born from that relationship .hh and I see myself as
uhm, a gift
C: Hmm
T: not a mistake (1) a gift.
C: Hmm
T: Although lot of people they say a first-born children are, are mistakes.
C: Oh that’s interesting.
T: Jaa, but uhm, in my case, I always when I speak to him, he. I mean, he loves
me. He tells me how much he loves me all the time,
C: Hmmm
T: he, I, I was never a mistake.
C: So are you in a good relationship with your father.
T: Very, very, very much.
C: But you didn’t know him
T: Ja
C: for sixteen years,
T: Yes, ja, I never knew him for sixteen-
C: Why is that?
T: Well, you know what uhm (2). <He went to school, he furthered his studies
he was away from Soweto, and he was from a high profile family,
C: Hmmm
T: and my mom tried out and you know. But (1) .hh they do
talk
C: Hmmm
T: they have a good relationship and you know if I want something .hh he will
have to confirm with my mother first
C: Okay, that’s lovely,haha
T: Hah ( ) but, uhm, what can I say that’s the way they wanna deal with things,
that’s fine, but (. ) I know that if I sit down with him, I can talk to him on one on
one. “He has the time and he has the love and he shows it”.
C: Tell me
T: He has, he has remarried
C: Ja?
T: He’s got other kids, I know the kids, I know the wife, the wife is fine. I, you
know, we talk and I do tell her that: “You what .hh you are my father father’s
wife and (1 ) I’m the daughter. Those two things,YOU may change but my,
my role does not change in his life,
C: That’s interesting
151. T: because I am the daughter, I’m the blood, you are the wife”.
152. C: And how is, what do you talk to your father about
153. T: We talk about business. Because he is a businessman.
154. C: Okay
155. T: Ja, we talk about business and I, I he is got business. I ask him the other day if
156. he could be my mentor, because (1) he has risen through the ranks.
157. C: ( )
158. T: He is an educated person, he has seen everything (1), the processes, the
159. political era, everything go
160. C: Hmmm
161. T: from what it was back then, to what it is now.
162. C: Right
163. T: And (.) his father was a secretary general of the ANC
164. C: Okay
165. T: back in the day, and (.) he died in sixty nine. So this is (2) uhm, (.) a whole
166. new era, a generation you know.
167. C: Hmmm
168. T: So, to me it caught my attention it did, and (1) at school they used to tell me
169. you are a very intelligent girl
170. C: Hmm
171. T: you must make something of yourself.
172. C: Right
173. T: >A lot of teachers used to say that< but you know because of (1) what goes on
174. in life you don’t get (1) mentored, all the time
175. C: Oh, that’s true
176. T: you don’t know about these things
177. C: Ja
178. T: up until you much, much older.
179. C: You are ignorant.
180. T: Ja, you’re ignorant in, in so many things
181. C: Hmm
182. T: and when you WAKE UP, its either you wake up and smell the coffee (1)or(2)
183. you (.) just (.) rot, you know
184. C: Ja
185. T: So, now I realised that uhm, that (1) after getting married, getting divorced
186. (2), you know what? Life goes on.
187. C: How did your father react to your divorce?
188. T: .hh Well, uhm .hh > being a divorcee himself, he’s in a second marriage
189. C: ( )
190. T: Uhm, he said to me “You know (2) the only person (1) that makes the
191. decisions finally (1)
192. C: Hmmm
193. T: is the individual (2) person”. That was hi-
194. C: That was he, he is quite progressive
195. T: Ja, ja
196. C: in his thinking.
197. T: Ja, he was (1) very supportive
198. C: Ja
199. T: He didn’t say (2) “Why you didn’t tell me?” >or fight with me or anything, he
200. said: “You know what < to the outsiders, we’d say, (2) take care of the
201. relationship
202. C: Ja
203. T: make it work but you are the person that stays with the man, you know the hardships that you go through, so whatever decision you take I will be supportive of it
204. C: Hmm
205. T: and (1) that (1) coming from a male figure,
206. C: YES
207. T: it (.) was like (1) an eye opener.
208. C: But would you say he is traditionally male or is it he
209. T: you know what
210. C: more progressive?
211. T: > there are things that he is traditional about. He becomes primitive sometimes
212. C: Ja
213. T: and (1) coming from a male figure,
214. C: YES
215. T: and sometimes when you ask him a question you must always expect the unexpected.
216. C: Oh really, hah
217. T: Yes, < because he is so broadminded
218. C: Ja
219. T: so open minded, so intelligent and that (1) in itself its something that (2) doesn’t come (2) with everyone you know. You don’t, I don’t, I think I am
220. C: Hmm
221. T: to have a mom, a dad, a grandmother you know
222. C: Hmm
223. T: and having met his mother as well
224. C: Right
225. T: who was (.) a very high-powered woman, you know, who has who, who has been in the White House .hh and met few presidents
226. C: How wonderful!
227. T: and you know she, she lived a full life,
228. C: Ja
229. T: She, she passed away when she was eighty two (1) and I mean <for her (.) to have gone through that kind of life (1) and be strong as she was (1) having lost her husband in sixty nine >
230. C: Hmm
231. T: <and also (1) having not REMARRIED that (3) was something for me >
232. C: Ja
233. T: they JUMP into second marriage just like <that but the, the strong, and the strong morality
234. C: Hmmm
235. T: that they had about family
236. C: Being there for the family
237. T: Ja
238. C: Because the husband has passed away.
239. T: Exactly ( )
C: But also, the burden of carrying it all on their own (   )
T: Imagine, my grandmother from my ma, maternal side
C: Hmm
T: had six, had six, six children and my grandmother from the paternal side
C: Hmm
T: had twelve children.
C: Hmm
T: it’s from one extreme
C: I know that, I know
T: to the other extreme. So you, you tend to think, you must sit down and think
about it, you know
C: Marvellous, what a huge family!
T: and ask yourself, if a grandma went through this with twelve kids and not
remarry (1) what is this, what does it say to me? What does it say to me’ NOW,
C: Right
T: you know?
C: Hmm
T: And, I am glad I having met her at eighty six, we’ve spoke (1) so many
things,
C: Ja
T: she gave me so many advices (1) about me(h)n>>
C: Mmm
T: She was very open, she will tell you: “>Men will play you
C: Hah
T: men will ring your neck, men will do all these things”.I mean, she will, she will
explain things about, from sex to politics> She didn’t shy out<
C: Ja
T: So, she was very open-minded.
C: Hmm
T: She was very open-minded. I mean she will tell you, “No (1) if you sleep
around you will get sick
C: Ja
T: it’s not only the AIDS that’s out there
C: Ja
T: there so many other diseases
C: Ja
T: and plus your body (2) is your temple.” (1) you know and being a God fearing
woman (1)and, you know, when she talks to you she always relates to the Bible
C: Ja
T: that you pray, she tells you every night you must pray, thank God for the day
and thank, and ask God .hh you know, to give you extra years, pray for your
health, and pray for others, you know people in jail and hospitals. .hh The four
corners of the world, the president EVERY ONE, pray for everybody.
C: Did she have an education a formal education?
T: .hh She was an educated woman
C: Hmm
T: because by (1) profession she was a nursing sister,
C: Okay
T: and she had that nurturing
C: Yes
T: thing about her and. hh it just came up. And for me to have such powerful
women in my life, I had three most powerful women
C: Hmm
T: the two grandmothers and my mother
C: Hmm
T: and they all (1) are fine (1), you know. They are happy, they smile
C: Hmm
T: and I think (2) >it’s not easy for people to smile these days <
C: No
T: you find people walking with a stray, like they are in a straightjacket or
something. Uhhmm . hh and that (2) has made such a big impact in my life and
now when I raise my girls I tell them that: “Babies you must understand , I don’t
hate your daddy, . hh the thing is that things never worked out more especially for
the eleven year old,
C: Right
T: I tell her that: “ “You know what if your daddy wants to make contact with you
C: Yes
T: it’s up to him ( )”
C: Like your father did
T: Yes, he must take the initiative, and and see to it that you are taken care of.
But maybe in time (1) he will wake up and do that.
C: Right
T: “So don’t crucify him, wait up until you are a little bit older
C: Right
T: where you can understand things much better, where you can go to him and
ask him questions if you need to, but don’t think that I am holding you back, you
shouldn’t see your dad or I bad mouth him”, I don’t ”
C: So the ball is in his court
T: Ja, the ball is in his court because (1) after the divorce he was like he didn’t
care (1) you know and I just told myself that when I told the magistrate I said to
the magistrate: “I don’t want anything”
C: Mmm
T: “I just want my kids, and she said to me: “Do you realize that there is an
estate involved here?” , I said “Yes I do, >it’s not about money, it’s not about
material, material is something that you can have again<”
C: What was it about for you?
T: For me it was my freedom,
C: Right
T: it was being with my kids
C: Yes
T: the way <I wanted to be>, you know, I, it was more about my (1) way of life. I
wanted to be my own woman.
C: Hmm
T: I didn’t want to be someone’s subject.
C: Right
T: or submissive to anybody
C: Right
T: I didn’t want the abuse,
C: Yes
350. T: I was tired of it, okay
351. C: I want to ask you T* just go back I want to go back to your mother and your
352. stepfather’s relationship. How would you say that relationship worked in
353. comparison to your relationship with your ex-husband?
354. T: Well you know what, uhm, my stepdad didn’t …stepdads don’t really like step
355. kids very much
356. C: Ja
357. T: So (2) I, I played my own game,
358. C: Right
359. T: I do(h)n’t mind , I had my o(h)wn game going so, hah what I used to do is if
360. you tell me “You’re back late at 5 o’ clock”
361. C: Ja
362. T: I would come back at 4:30 >then he won’t have anything to say<
363. C: That’s right
364. T: You know I.I played him at his game and I played him (1) so well
365. C: What was his game according to you?
366. T: hh <He wanted to be this strict
367. C: and you know everything should be very strict>
368. T: Hmm
369. T: >so that I’d feel very uncomfortable< but (1) with all that he did
370. C: Hmm
371. T: as intelligent that, as I was then
372. C: Mmm
373. T: I, I played him
374. C: Mmm
375. T: I
376. C: Okay,
377. T: as intelligent that, as I was then
378. C: Mmm
379. T: I, I played him ‘cause in his (1) dying days (1)>he became very attached to
380. me<
381. C: Okay,
382. T: <very attached to me .hh>
383. C: So he respected your sense of identity or strength?
384. T: Yes and you know () the funniest thing is uhmmm, after his funeral ()’one of
385. his friends came to me and said:< “Do you know how much that man loved
386. you?” <
387. C: Isn’t that amazing?
388. T: I said: “You talking to me?
389. C: Hah
390. T: He said “Yes, T* you”, I said “No you can’t be”, he said:“You know what <he
391. said that you were the most assertive person he’s ever met>
392. C: And did he respect that?
393. T: And I said:“Wow why didn’t he tell me?” He said: “You know men, <men
394. don’t really tel(h)ll you how they feel about things ,women are more on the
395. feelings side than men do. I said “I wish he could have told me, you know”.
396. C: Hmm
397. T: I wish he could have. But (1) during his time at the hospital >he stayed in
398. hospital for three months he couldn’t talk <and do anything but (1) the lip
399. movement.
400. C: Hmm
401. T: I could read lips when he talked.
402. C: Hmm
403. T: He talked most of the time and when he, he wanted to speak to anybody
C: Hmm
T: he would just say (gesturing with hands), you know like
C: He wanted you
T: You could see like, ja, he wanted me and if I wasn’t there (.) say he
C: wouldn’t (.) say anything
T: Hmm
C: Hey, he would just keep his mouth tight<
T: and I’m thinking <what kind of a man is he>?.
C: Hmm
T: Why, why didn’t he come out when he was alive, why did he have to do that
C: Ja, tell me did he make most of the decisions in your household then when you
T: when he was in his dying moment, you know? hh
C: were children?
T: No, you know, funny enough they, hmm hh >He loved my mother <<, he
C: loved my mother so much>.
T: My mom was like (1) ten years younger
C: Hmm
T: and this beautiful woman and my, my > stepdad wasn’t a good looking man<
C: Hmm
T: >No, he wasn’t and he used tell me: “You know what, I’m not a good looking
C: man<< but I have a drop dead gorgeous wife >
T: Isn’t that lovely? Hah
C: Hmm
T: <and every man wants her and they will not get her ‘cause>
C: Hah, ja
T: because I take care of her. So if you don’t want your woman to disappear in
C: your life you take care of her.
T: And you know (1) he did everything.
C: Hmm
T: I mean, every month we used to go out for dinner,
C: Hmm
T: dinner at a hotel. We’d sit there as a little family and have this dinner and you
C: know one you, once you are int(h)o, uhm if you’re older
C: Hmm
T: over 16,
C: That’s right
T: they let you have a sip of wine just to find out how it is
C: Hmm
T: >and introduce you to so many things <and <yet he turns again and remembers
C: he’s a stepdad
T: Ja
C: I think that tormented him>
C: Okay, that you, that you. Was it his first marriage?
T: in fact > it was his second marriage<
C: Okay
T: it was his second marriage but he never had kids with the first wife<,
C: Okay
T: he only had kids with my mother.
449. C: But who made the major decisions in that, in that fact
450. T: No, they sat down together to the bedroom or they would go to the bedroom and you’d hear a bit of a shout
451. C: That’s wonderful!
452. T: ALL the time, all the time
453. C: And when they fought who sorted out the battles?
454. T: Funny, they never, wanted us to hear anything so they sent us to the bedroom or they would go to the bedroom and you’d hear a bit of a shout and then it dies down a bit and then they come out, then they’re smiling again, you know
455. C: So, why was that do you think?
456. T: Ulm, one, is it out of respect, two, it was mutual understanding
457. C: Right
458. T: and three: I think it was about showing us that they are matured people.
459. C: Right
460. T: you know, they can come to an amicable decision and smile about it afterwards
461. C: Hmm
462. T: you know, they, they were very into each other
463. C: Hmm
464. T: They, they would fight about, you know, everyday things, but
465. C: Ja
466. T: it wouldn’t cause them to think about divorce
467. C: Right
468. T: and things like that, never in all the years that they’ve been married they wanted to get divorced
469. C: Right
470. T: You know, to them it was like the last, last, last resort
471. C: Ja
472. T: hh and he was a God fearing man too you know
473. C: Hmm
474. T: and (1) I think being Catholic as well for his side, he always remembered that he divorced
475. C: Hmm
476. T: and he wasn’t supposed to divorce the first time
477. C: Ja
478. T: the first marriage
479. C: Ja
480. T: So he had strong values and morals
481. C: Ja
482. T: you know and he grew from that point and I think he, he, he had a lot to think about
483. C: Ja
484. T: He thought about it and most of the time he was very ok
485. C: Hah
486. T: (smiles) and he says: “Really? Okay,
487. C: Ja
488. T: you can have the house, I’m going.
489. C: Yes
490. T: I’ll go to Sun City for the week-end
491. C: Ja
492. T: I don’t want to see anything, I said: “Okay, then-
498. C: When he says: “I don’t want see anything”, what does he mean?
499. T: No, by that he meant: “I don’t wanna hear the noise,
500. C: Mmm
501. T: I don’t wanna see who is in my house,”
502. C: Hmm
503. T: and all those things
504. C: What’s going on…
505. T: Ja, what’s gonna happen, the fights, everything. I don’t want to be part
506. of, okay. And fu(h)ny enough “my mom was there, very helpful we cooked
507. together we did everything, my friends came over it was a nice party. People left
508. 2 in the morning.
509. C: Hmm
510. T: It was great, no fights, no nothing. I enjoyed my 21st birthdayº
511. C: Okay, so he was, he gave you your space?
512. T: He did give me my space ‘cause you know from time to time I would go to
513. him and say “Ummm, I, I really need to go the movies may I please have, like
514. C: Hmm
515. T: 20 bucks?” Sure, no problem, he would give me. He, he was strict in his <own
516. way>
517. C: Hmm
518. T: but he would let you
519. C: He wasn’t inhumane
520. T: Ja, he wasn’t inhumane, because there was a time when he taught me that; if
521. you go out on a date,
522. C: Ja
523. T: make sure you have your own money because you don’t know what goes on in
524. that man’s mind.
525. C: Ja
526. T: If he decides to ditch you there you have enough money to come back home.
527. C: Ja
528. T: That’s it.
529. C: That’s true
530. T: Ja, you know and that has taught me so much (1) that if you go out anywhere
531. (1) never ever rely on anybo(h)dy
532. C: Ja, be self supportive
533. T: Yes, exactly. You know, this thing of saying oh no, I’m going out on a date
534. and you just go there with your empty handbag, it doesn’t help
535. C: Hmm
536. T: .hh because what if you order something and the guy is afraid to say “I, I don’t
537. have enough money”
538. C: Yes
539. T: What are you gonna do then, are you ( ) go into the kitchen and wash dishes?
540. C: Yes, so it’s a life lesson that he has taught you
541. T: Ja, yes 'he’s taught me somethingº
542. C: Tell me about your mother, what does she do for a living?
543. T: She’s a dressmaker.
544. C: Oh, that’s interesting, very creative
545. T: Ja, ja <she loves to sew and uhm>
546. C: Ja
547. T: and she, she’s very creative with her hands
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C: Hmm
T: and all of us in the family (we are creative in our own way)
C: And does she sort of run her own business like that?
T: Well .hh she wanted to, you know, but because of the hardships of not having
enough money,
C: That's right
T: She hasn’t worked for like 21 years
C: Right, so her husband supported her
T: Ja, her husband supported her fully, and bought her machines and stuff
C: How lovely
T: From time to time she gets orders
C: Yes
T: and she sews and you know. And I help her out everytime I can
C: And tell me, T*** what does she say about your relationship with your ex-
husband?
T: .hh
C: How did she react when you told her that you were getting a divorce?
T: <Well (1) my mum (.) said to me: “Uh, I’m losing a son here, my mum adored
that boy> I said: “Mum I cannot believe you love this guy so much he is an idiot
you don’t know that”.
C: Yes
T: She says: < “But he’s so sweet every time I ask him for anything he never says
no. > I said: “Ma, he can’t say no, he wants to look good in front of you,
C: Yes
T: you know and “mum never understood it but (.) when time went on I said,
“You know what Ma, with time you’ll understand what I mean
C: And?
T: and right now she says <you know what (2) “I realise, he’s not doing anything
for the kids”> that boy.
C: Yes
T: < If he’s as good as I say he was, he was supposed to be taking care of his
kids>º
C: But initially she was not supportive of your divorce?
T: No, she wasn’t. She thought," I said “Ma you know I want get a divorce”, she
said, “No you can’t get a divorce”, I thought, Okay .hh and I went behind her, I
did everything, got everything ready and went and went. I came back home and I
had the date, uhm, my, my court dateº.
T: >”What court date?” I said “Yes I have a court date, I’m going <to .hh. to the
lawyer’s (1) office (1) in, the Divorce Court (.) in (.)Market Street on the 16th
of (.).August.(clears throat softly)> She said to me: “You’re kidding me,“
C: Mmm
T: I said “Yes, I am” and she wasn’t too pleased with that and I said ““Ma, there
is nothing I can do. I don’t wanna stay in this marriage for too long, I don’t want
stay in this marriage for 20 years and after 20 years I catch a wake up and say I
should have, no…”º
C: Tell me how long were you married for?
T: Hah, you’ll find this very surprising
C: Ja
T: I was with the man for eleven years
C: Okay
T: altogether eleven, eleven and a half years
C: Yes
T: but 6 months was it. We only got married for 6 months.
C: And then?
T: It just didn’t work.
C: What, what about marriage then? What happened?
T: You know, uhm <I think (2) when people start getting, I think there is bad
notion, out
C: Hmm
T: out there uhm, when people got married
C: Hmm
T: they think they own you, you become a property<
C: Yes
T: >because they think they own you, think they can tell you what to do and all
that
C: Yes
T: >“and they forget that you know what you are independent from them and .hh
they cannot, they don’t have the power of telling you what to think, your mind is
your own mind it’s independent from theirs, you know<
C: Yes
T: >ºbecause they think they own you, think they can tell you what to do and all
that
C: So, going back to that relationship, the previous eleven years were they fine?
T: It was FINE you know, problems like any other relationships
C: Hmm
T: and we’d sort them out.
C: Who made the decisions, the major decisions?
T: Well, I, I, I am a born leader, so I, I
C: Ja, you are assertive
T: I’m hah, I become pushy sometimes
C: Yes
T: you know, I know how to (1) push my buttons. So, I think that that
(1) pissed him off a lot.
C: Yes
T: The reason (1) he got so mad is because (1) he always referred to me as: “Oh
you think you’re the most intelligent one”. I’d say:“Yes, I am the more intelligent
than you. It’s just that you don’t wanna admit it, if you admit it, then we’ll fine”.
C: So you basically made the major decisions.
T: YEAH, I made the ma, the major decisions
C: But he didn’t like it.
T: He didn’t like it. I said you know what, we (2) this is how we run (. ) the
household. This what we pay this month, next month, this is what we do, and all
that
C: Yes
T: I said:“Everything will run smoothly, as if do what you want a lot of things
will be, will get left behind”
C: And he didn’t like that.
T: And he didn’t like that,< and the (. ) the old thing about men of the house came
up> I said,” Okay, this is it how it works. Okay, I am the woman of the house, (. )
let me run the household,
C: Yes

T: let me run the household fully, you run everything else let me run the household.

C: And how did he respond to that?

T: you know what, > I didn’t work< because he didn’t pay for the bond on time. “Every time it was in arrears, and I said: “You know what, I gave you the chance and you blew it.”

C: Hmm

T: Now its my turn, let me run the household.

C: What did he say then?

T: And he said: “No, it’s just that you don’t understand, I said, “What don’t I understand?” You know what, he never explained.

C: How, was, was you relation-, I mean what was his education like?

T: He had a Matric, he had, he did diplomas.

C: So, in fact his background was much better because the mother was a principal.

C: Ja

T: He had a Matric, he had, he did diplomas.

C: In, in fact his background was much better because the mother was a principal.

C: Okay

T: The sisters and brothers were teachers and you know, hh well-established people in the community. <He just wasn’t cut out for me>.

C: Hmm

T: Hmm, we were not meant to be together.

C: But you realised that in the last six months when you were man and wife?

T: You know what, uhmm hh during, during the eleven years you realise that, but

C: Ja?

T: the little

C: What made you stay?

T: the little voice in your head says what are people going to say, hh

C: Ja

T: and what is my family going to say, hh I cannot, cannot disgrace my family I cannot uhm embarrass myself, but you know what, <had I not listened to that voice

C: Ja

T: I would have been further in life right now, you know>

C: So you let society and and their values be imposed upon you.

T: Exactly, "but after that I said, “No more, I don’t care what people sa(h)y, this is my life. hh if they think I am stupid for that, it’s fine<.

C: How did you, so you filed for divorce?

T: Yes I filed for divorce.

C: And how did he react to that?

T: Uhm I called him and I said: “You know what, quit running from the sheriff’s office and sign the summons”.

C: So he didn’t want to get the divorce?

T: He said to me:” Okay, I WILL”
697. T: I said, "No you don’t have to be harsh,”
698. C: Hmm
699. T: all you need you just sign (1) your (. ) million dollar signature
700. C: Hah
701. T: that is all I need from you”. .hh And he said (2)“ Fine (1) I’ll go”, and then he
did go (. ) but he never pitched for the (1) court
703. C: And what, have you had any communication with him since?
704. T: Hmm, hmmm, >he never, he never came<
705. C: final date,
706. T: No. NO AND I KNOW PEOPLE that know him that. hh when they ask
707. him, they say: “So where’s T***? He says: “Oh, she’s at home.” Hah
708. C: So he’s in denial?
709. T: hah. “She is at home “. <Can you believe (. ) that? I am thi(h)nking, oh my
go(h)odness this guy is not re(h)al, hey?>
711. C: Why does he say that?
712. T: I don’t know. >Why doesn’t say we are divorced? <
713. C: Do you think he is embarrassed?
714. T: Well .hh, he is embarrassed because (1), uhhmm, you know the friends
715. C: Yes
716. T: Friends are the one know exactly what you made of
717. C: Yes
718. T: because they are with you (. ) twenty-four seven.
719. C: Yes
720. T: They know (1) what you’ve been up to, and .hh if you have got an honest
friend, he will say, “You know what, <don’t play her>”
722. C: Hmm
723. T: “<don’t play her> >because if she does find out she will leave you<”
724. C: When you said don’t play her what do you mean specifically?
725. T: .hh, by
726. C: How did he play you?
727. T: "By having all these women, my goodness he loved (women)".
728. C: Womaniser.
729. T: Ooh, he loved too much women, you know what, there is one thing that God
gave to that boy
730. C: Ja?
731. T: it is a sweet tongue.
732. C: Ja
734. T: That man,
735. C: Lovely, hah!
736. T: My goodness, that man, he will talk to you, he will charm you, he is a
737. charmer
738. C: Yes
739. T: I mean, he managed to charm me TWICE IN MY LIFE. I left him at one point
740. C: Ja
741. T: >and I moved on with my life and he cha(h)rmed me back into his li(h)fe.
742. This is why I back and we got married. I thought everything was good.
743. C: Hmm
744. T: And now, but when I sit down and think about it you know what I realise
745. (1) actually, he was coming back for revenge<
746. C: Okay
T: He was actually coming back for revenge.
C: When you say that can you be more specific.
T: He was coming back for revenge because I still had that one child, I didn’t have children with anybody else.
C: Right
T: I didn’t get married and all that, he just wanted to come back, give me that second child and LEAVE ME.
C: So, because there is a big difference between the two,
T: Ja
C: I mean, a eight years difference.
T: Ja, eight years difference.
C: Wow, so your children I mean how did they react to all of this? I mean
T: You know .hh
C: What do you explain to the part that fact that you are not bitter and twisted about it, and you were over hoping for him to make a move like your father did with you, what are you teaching them?
T: “I teach them that you know what, love people, love them despite what ever they do. He is your daddy; he is your biological father. There is a reason why he is your dad”.
C: So you are teaching them basic respect.
T: Ja, so you know I want, you respect him.
C: What do you teach them as a woman?
T: .hh
C: What do you want them to be?
T: I said you know what, I, most specially the eldest, I tell her, I say: “You know what baby (1) I want you to MAKE something of yourself.”
C: Ja
T: You must NEVER (1) depend on anybody,
C: Ja
T: because you know what you have the mind (.), you have me as your pillar.
C: Hmm
T: I will give you the best education out there and you must go out there and make something of yourself.
C: Ja
T: Don’t wait for anybody to give props or you mustn’t wait for anybody to say, “Oh no, I don’t think you can make it”.
C: That’s right
T: I say, “You must go out there and make a difference. Okay, you must go out there and make a difference. .hh I say “I missed out in so many opportunities because I didn’t know better”.
C: Ja
T: but I am here, I I know what is out there, the little that I know, I will teach you”.
C: Yes
T: And right now she is set on wanting to be an optometrist, and, and I say, “Do you know what, wanting to be an, an optometrist is all about, she said, “Oh yes Mommy, I know.” She says: “First I want to cure your eyes because you can’t see, hah
C: Oh, lovely!
T: Hah, you can’t see and I am going to cure uncle C**. Uncle C** is my boyfr(h)end
C: Yes
T: and I say, “Why?” She says to me, “You know Mommy (2) I want to tell you this. I think ( ) this big person, they gonna be talking about you all over<”. I said, “Why do you say that?” she said, “I see it in you”.
C: How lovely!
T: I said, “My goodness, this child(S) he keeps me (.) going, >she keeps me go<”. I mean you, <I walk into that house, they give me so much love<
C: Hmm
T: she keeps me (. going, >she keeps me go<”. I mean you, <I walk into that house, they give me so much love<
C: Hmm
T: she keeps me (.) going, >she keeps me go<”. I mean you, <I walk into that house, they give me so much love<
C: Hmm
T: she keeps me (. going, >she keeps me go<”. I mean you, <I walk into that house, they give me so much love<
C: Hmm
T: I feel Wow, I’m complete, I don’t need love from anybody else, you kno(h)w.
C: How is that different your relationship with your daughter to your relationship with your mother, if you have to think back?
T: <.hh Mom (.) is a bit, a little bit primitive
C: Ja
T: and (2) she holds back sometimes.
C: Ja
T: Mom is not a huggy person, kissy, kissy person, you know.
C: Is it the way she was raised?
T: Yes, because you know what, uhm, the hug thing is not a black thing, actually.
C: Ja
T: It is a trend (.) because uhm, I realised, everybody is hugging and kissing.
C: Hmm
T: It’s a good thing. Like, at least it brings people closer
C: Ja
T: But with us (.) hugging your mom, you hug her on her birthday, give her a kiss on her birthday and .hh you know you try. I, I at ho(h)me they call me the whitey hah, you know,
C: Hmm
T: because I am more, so modernised with everything.
C: Okay
T: Ja, because I come in, I say, “Hey guys, how are you, I miss you, I love you”.
C: Ja
T: All that and they’re getting. No, they’re used to me now. They are used to it.
C: So because you are, it seems like you are worlds apart from your family.
T: Exactly
C: How else would you describe that difference between you and your family,
T: Well,
C: apart from being more demonstrative?
T: Well, <Mom is very (2) >she wa-, she’s a quiet woman.
C: Ja
T: You know, if she needs to talk >she will tell you<.
C: Hmm
T: If you (.) make her mad, she will let you know that you have made her mad, but (.) she feels that she doesn’t have to say anything. >Most of the time she keeps quiet, she keeps very much to herself<
C: Why is that?
T: <and saying ‘I’m a lady’. A woman is not very loud, you don’t have to be like that, you don’t shout, you don’t do those things, you have to keep your calm, you know (2) >KEEP IT IN,
C: How lovely.
T: you know
C: So its quite, ja, it’s, it’s an older generation,
T: An older-
C: that kind of behaviour.
T: Whereas me, they know (1) I will say anything, I will tell them if I’m not pleased.
C: Hah
T: I will tell them: “Mum I am not happy,
C: The new generation.
T: I don’t like it
C: Ja
T: and I won’t like it and if you don’t like that (2), tough”.
C: It’s your proble.
T: Ja, it’s it’s your baby (.) carry it.
C: Ja
T: They think you’re rude. I say, “No, Ma,< it’s not being rude it’s being open- minded, it’s telling you how I feel, it’s letting you know where I AM (1) right now>”
T: So, you are actually seeing the world through different lenses?
C: Ja, that’s right.
T: It’s my grandmother,
C: Yes
T: it’s my mom, .hh it’s me, it’s my daughters
C: Yes, and it’s quite different.
T: It, it’s different because my daughter now, she, she makes me feel like I’m old,
C: Hah
T: She makes me feel like I’m old. Some questions that she asks me, it’s like
T: mmh what do I say to her now? But I try to be as open as (1) possible, I tell her
T: what I think she should know.
C: Hmm
T: And I consult with various friends and say, “Do you think it’s Okay if I tell her this, you know? Don’t you think she’d be traumatised in any way?”
C: Hmm
T: You know. They say, “No, you don’t know kids today, they are much more mature than we think.”
C: Ja
T: She talks about anything
C: So you want independence and and open-mindedness for your daughter?
T: Yes, I want that because if she shies out she will know no, she will know no better.
C: That’s right
T: Ja, she won’t know anything.
C: And you feel that was a drawback when you grew up?
T: .hh
C: People didn’t talk to you?
T: No, people didn’t talk to you because they were afraid, your, the uncle, my
uncle(h)s would beat them up, if not (1) something would happen to them. ‘Cause
you know, I had three uncles.
C: Ja
T: And having three uncles means you have MUSCLE in the ho(h)use you know.
C: Okay
T: It’s more muscle, you don’t mess with that family
C: What do the uncles do, what is their role in the family?
T: Their role is to protect their nieces,
C: Okay
T: more especially if you don’t have an older brother
C: Yes,
T: (   )
C: And also if the father isn’t there.?
T: If the father isn’t there, they become the father,
C: Ja
T: they protect you all the time
C: So that’s their role
T: Ja, that’s their role. They are the ones that, uhm get the lobola, you know.
C: Okay. They sit down for the whole thing during the lobola process. So you ask yourself,
T: they become the father,
C: Hmm
T: the friend, the brother, you know. They play so many roles in one.
C: Could you speak to them about anything or not really?
T: Well they’re also primitive in a way,
C: Hmm
T: you don’t talk to them much about anything. <You, you must use your own mind, you just hope (1) you have a good he(h)ad on your shoulders.
C: Ja
T: You can think about things. ‘Cause most of the time my decisions is my decisions. .hh
C: Ja
T: .hh I never had to rely on anybody
C: When you say primitive, what specifically do you mean?
T: Um like you know, if you say, mmm. Uhmm you can never say, “I’m having my menstrual, my menstrual cycle”. They are like, “YOU ARE KIDDING!
C: Yes, very conservative
T: DON’T EXPECT ME TO TALK TO YOU ABOUT THAT, WHY DON’T YOU TALK TO YOUR MOTHER?” you know. They freak, they freak out so
C: Okay, hah
T: Um,I think it’s, .hh there are things that they feel that they cannot talk to children about
C: Hmm
T: whereas NOW (. ) I talk to my daughter about everything, it’s a whole, it’s a different thing
C: Big difference
T: There; there’s a big difference. At first (. ) you know you shy away .hh you
know. Hah, back in the days when we were young we, we didn’t know that kids were born
That’s right
we thought they brought in an aeroplane or something
( ) ignorance, ja the stork story
Ja, the stork story exactly,
Hah
and now my daughter knows that, Oh no, she’s having, she’s having a
menstrual pains, oh, she’s having a – “Oh, do know somebody so and so is
pregnant?”
And she’s eleven
I say, “So and so is pregnant, did you know that?” I say (“No”, she said
maybe, maybe uhmm, she’s due in June”. (1) “How do you know that?” She said,
“Mommy, when I count, when you look at her, she looks like she is about five
months”,
Ja, how marvellous
She even knows how to estimate. With US you don’t talk about that,
Ja
you DON’T talk about that because hah.
What does your grandmother say about this this child of yours that knows so
much?
Uhm, grandma says, “She <is gonna be somebody>
Hmm
She is gonna be, she’s gonna make so much difference, she is gonna be
ABOVE”. Grandma says, she says, “That’s where you must watch out, this one
(hah)
Ja
She is very intelligent.
What do they say about you being on your own, well and your career that you
have? What do they feel about that?
“You know they are very pleased”,
Ja
they are very pleased. My grandmother (3), you know uhmm, she sometimes.
Like, I had, I was in an accident (1) couple of years ago, and I DIDN’T GET
HURT but (.) when I called her
Hmm
I said: >“You know I have been in an accident I am fine, you know<” . She
says, “You know, T***” ,even if she, she has had her leg amputated she will still
say she is fine”
Ja
SO SHE MUST BRING HERSELF HERE AND I MUST SEE HER .
Ja
You know seeing is believing, because, mmm I have learned over the years that
you can not startle them, you can not say: >“I have being in an accident <”and (.)
ye they become in a state
Ja
because she is older,
Ja
she panics much more quicker (.)
Ja
T: than (.) everyone of us. And at home I am the one who is strong.

C: Hmm

T: they tell me things, last uhm, two years ago, her last born child (.) passed away, my uncle .hh “and (1) she, she was devastated “and (2) >I, I kept on talking to her< and I say “<Grandma (2) .hh the little that I have, I will help you (2) because I know that my uncle helped you so much you didn’t feel anything, and, and, and I will do everything in my power to make sure that you don’t feel the gap, don’t feel the void (.) and ever since it has been like that> So she always says . hh “You know, it is like a rebirth (2) it’s like a rebirth”.

C: What does she mean by that?

T: She means-

C: Beautiful way of putting it

T: She means uhm (2) my uncle’s passing

C: Ja

T: <has made me take over from him from what he was doing>

C: So it’s interesting that it’s woman taking over the man’s caretaking role

T: Yes, yes, exactly

C: That’s how much things have changed.

T: Ja, that’s my- that’s the way it is.

C: Ja

T: And I mean at home, I take care of everybody. When I have money I buy things for everyone, they call me the extravagant one. Hah

C: Hah

T: If I see(h)e something for somebody I BUY, I don’t (1) hold back.

C: Ja

T: because you know what (1) there is no other way of expressing your love, you’re not with them 24/7.

C: Ja

T: >So (.) whatever little things you bring, you say: “You know what ,I saw this I know you like this, here” and they say “Wow, thank you and each time they wear it”<

C: Ja

T: “Hey, my sister bought this,

C: Ja

T: or (.) my daughter bought this” or, you know, everybody has a little bit of what (.) I,

C: Of your love

T: and, and, and, and they feel good about it, they feel good.

C: That’s wonderful.

T: Ja. And my aunt’s (.) daughter she is nineteen,

C: Hmm

T: she is doing law right now,

C: Wonderful.

T: and she said (2) I inspired her. I said,“How did I do that?” (She said to me)

You are SO STRONG, WITH ALL THE THINGS THAT HAPPENED, HAVE HAPPENED IN YOUR LIFE, YOU STILL (.) ARE HOLDING YOUR HEAD HIGH”. “Really, am I?” Says to me: “ >Yes, you drive a beautiful car, you stay in Sandton, you do all these things< Wow (1) I wanna be like you".
C: Good role model
T: I say: “Wow, so I am a role model” >My daughter thinks that of me too, my grandmother thinks you, hmmm, know what I’ve never done this but I know T** will do will make me do this for me, you know<
C: And has it been easy for you?
T: “Well, hh you know what, it is difficult.” But you know what, when I look at my grandmother’s face,
C: Hmm
T: and when she sees me,
C: Hmm
T: she lights up and that is just enough for me.
C: To overcome any difficulties
T: Ja, <you know, you sit there and you just (1) think back of all the good things that she says>
C: Ja
T: She says, “Hey, how are you (1) I miss you”, if I don’t, IF I DON’T CALL HER IN A DAY, >she’ll call me, she picks up the phone,( she goes), “Are you Okay?” I say, “Yes, I’m fine”, she says, “No, I was just concerned because you haven’t called”. I say, “No grandma, I was in meetings the whole day, and says, “Oh Okay, I was still gonna call you”.
C: Okay, that’s lovely.
T: So, I call, I call them everyday,
C: Ja
T: my aunt, my aunt is my mother’s younger sister
C: Okay
T: my aunt, my mum, my grandmother I call them everyday (1) without fail
C: Hmm
T: THEY HAVE TO KNOW ( )
C: You’ve got a strong maternal link
T: Yes they know that, MY DAD, WELL he can surviv(h)ve
C: Hah
T: I can call him, >I can call him once a week, he’s a man you know he can take care, hah ( )
C: Talking about other men in your life, now you’re in a new relationship?
T: .hhYes, I have been in it almost for 3 years.
C: Can you tell me how is it similar to your past relationships or how is it different?
T: Hmm, doesn’t compare, not at all. <This one (1) he is(1) from .hh a different culture altogether . hh
C: Okay
T: <He is Carribean born,>
C: All right
T: <a naturalised American and (2) he’s different.>
C: Ja
T: <mature about everything>.hh >This is a man who will let you go anywhere in the world< ( )
C: Doesn’t hold you back.
T: JA, >HE DOESN’T HOLD YOU BACK HE SAYS OH YOU WANNA TAKE A TRIP? NO NO PROBLEM. WITH YOUR GIRLFRIENDS? SURE,
C: HOW MUCH DO THEY NEED, DO I NEED TO SIGN ANYTHING, DO I
NEED? <> I say, “Oh, Okay, fine. No hold up, I just was suggesting<”

C: Yes, so he’s very supportive?
T: Ja, he’s very supportive. He loves my kids.
C: That’s wonderful.
T: You know, my youngest daughter said to me uhm, on Sunday,(says to me),
“You know Ma .hh I just wanna tell you, my daddy, my daddy is beautiful.
He cut his hair, ooh he looks nice”
C: Is this the man, hah?
T: Ye(l)ah the man
C: How lovely!
T: She says he looks nice, “Ooh I love his beard, his beard is shiny mmh. I like
it; >Do you think he puts Vaseline on it<?” Hah
C: Oh, isn’t that beautiful
T: And I say, oh my goodness, this child
C: Ja
T: my kids love him.
C: Ja
T: I mean if, when I’m away, <I know I can count on him. >
C: Ja
T: He cares for them, he takes them out (he does )
C: He’s very supportive.
T: He’s VERY SUPPORTIVE. HE’S THE DAD.
C: Ja, and when you make decisions and that kind of thing how does
it work, now because I mean before, your ex husband didn’t like it?
T: He’s like me, he’s a leader as well. So sometimes we are like, at hh
loggerheads,
C: Ja
T: but um you know he says, “Okay, I’ll stand down”
C: Oh does he?
T: Ja,> He says, “I’ll stand down.< What do you have to say?” Then I’ll say
my piece and then he’ll say his piece and then I say, “Oh okay, I agree or
disagree” then we see how we can (.).work around that. <So far you know he’s
made a difference in my life>
C: That’s wonderful
T: <I feel, I feel> > much more confident about myself now<
C: Hmm
T: > I WAS CONFIDENT ALL MY LIFE <,
C: Ja
T: but right now I feel much more confident. I think, I, I KNOW I can take
people on,
C: Ja
T: you know (not in a bad way)
C: Because you’ve got backup,
T: Yes
C: It’s not just you on your own
T: Ja, it is not me on my own
C: Ja
T: “I have got someone I can rely on,” .hh you know, to me he is not only (.). a
boyfriend
C: Ja
T: he is a lifetime partner, you know.
C: That’s lovely.
T: And we have discussed it >we’ve talked about marriage, we have talked
about that<< but we are so comfortable with each other. I don’t do things
without thinking about him first. When, whatever I do , =>I must make sure
that it sits, sits well with him,
C: Hmmm
T: and sometimes I just find out from him<
C: You sound like you’re equal, more equal,
T: Ja, we’re equal, you know
C: compared to the other relationship.
T: Ja, the other relationship:” <Oh my goodness, what is he gonna say?>” But
right now if go and buy myself a pair of shoes, I know he will not freak out.
C: Ja
T: He won’t say,”YOU USED THE LAST MONEY” but, because he knows I
won’t take the last money and go and buy a pair of shoes.
C: Ja
T: He knows I am <much more responsible> than that.
C: Ja
T: °<He knows that the kids are there we do taking care of they’ve got
uniforms, they’ve got things they need to do at school, .hh the nanny needs to
be taken care of, you know (.) the household needs to be taken care of. So, he
feels ( ) very comfortable. .hh Sometimes he is out of the country (.) for three
weeks, for go(h)odness sake, Carita, you don’t know> °!
C: Do you struggle? Hah
T: I stru(h)ggle. I’m used to him, being being here,
C: Haha
T: and I would complain to Ma, I said,”You know, Ma (2) I haven’t spoken to
C** for the past sixteen hours”. My mom says,” There’s a ti.-time difference, I
said: “ > I KNOW THERE IS A TIME DIFFERENCE BUT HE MUSTN’T
CONSIDER THAT, HE MUST CALL ME! <. Hh <Do you think he is up to
something >?
C: Hmm
T: Mom says: “Are you JEALOUS?”
C: Hah
T: And you kno(h)w, i..it becomes so funny, I am so used to him now.
C: Because he is so different.
T: Ja, he is so different. I mean <he plays this major role>,
C: Hmm
T: and he’s made me meet (. ) all these HIGH POWERED people.
C: Wonderful!
T: Just last week .hh after the inauguration (. ) I met (. ) <the Governor (. )
General of the (. ) Caribbean >.
C: Wonderful.
T: We were hosting him the whole week, and the gentleman is
((tape has to be turned over))
C: I would like to, you to reflect on how different your life is, uhm the
difference between you as a school girl and now. I mean, did you ever think
that your life will be so different?
T: N(h)o not at all, actu(h)ally I wanted to be a teacher, hah!
C: Okay
T: .hh I wanted to be (2) my major was gonna be Biology.
C: All right
T: I LOVE BIOLOGY and chemistry. I thought Wow >I’m gonna be a good chemistry teacher, I’m gonna mix those chemicals<
C: Hah
T: I’m gonna impress these kids, I’m gonna instil this knowledge and (1) uhm < because my step dad died and my mom didn’t have much money>,
C: Ja
T: You, those kind of things had to fall away.
C: That’s right
T: That’s when I opted to go to college, do a secretarial course. After that I became a receptionist, >oh ( ) the job was (1)GOOD<,
C: Hmm
T: because everyone was talking to ME first.
C: Hah, that’s lovely!
T: That made feel GOOD and I used to tell my boss: >“You know what ? I am the important person here <”
C: Yes
T: ‘cause everybody when they walk in here, they, you are as beautiful as I am AND HE
C: Yes, hah
T: AND HE SAID TO ME,“MY GO(H)ODNESS, I NEVER, I NEVER THOUGHT OF IT THAT WA(H)Y” and I said, “You know what, when the people walk into your building (.) and they see this receptionist and she acts all funny, they think everybody in the back is the same”
C: That’s true
T: You know, <but here I am, I am smiling, I’m full of life, I’m helpful, I talk to people, I interact >,I’m a communicative person.
C: Yes
T: .hh I said,“Communication is my, is my biggest skill, I mean <that (.) is my strongest (.) point >”.
C: And from there?
T: And, and from there, I moved away to work at, at the Stock Exchange. It was wonderful
C: Hmm
T: I was a PA for this .hh (.) senior manager and wow she was a high powered woman. A strong –willed woman (.) I said, “Wow !” ( )
C: Hah, a good role model
T: And (.) it so happened that I was the only secretary she had that stayed that long.
C: Good grief
T: because everybody else was afraid of her.
C: Ja
T: They couldn’t stand her, they thought, “Oh!”, two months, they go.
C: Ja
T: I stayed with her for two and a half years,
C: Wonderful!
T: .hh then I moved on.
C: So, you’re tenacious as well.
T: Ja, you know.
C: Ja

T: And I thought, wow, this woman. hh <Then I moved into another division, then I left the JSE to come here to C*** A*** and, Wow and when (.) the CEO and the other director they said to me they’re offering me this position to be the HR person, I said to them, “Wow, this is an opportunity!>”

C: You’ve come a long way.
T: I have come a long way, from a school kid, to a receptionist to a PA.
C: Ja
T: to a manager, MAN, I’M A MANAGER, yo(h)u know
C: Exactly
T: Wow, I have risen through the ranks, you know. I have got two kids, I’m a divorcee (1) but I’m a MANAGER, wow, that means I can buy a beautiful car.
C: Hah
T: I can get a house you know, I can start thinking about bigger things.
C: Ja
T: and (1) I can take my kids to a better school.
C: That’s right
T: Wow, and I can talk to my dad about business you know,
C: Ja
T: >I am no longer this little person<
C: Ja
T: and I make a difference in other the people’s lives, because I talk to people.
C: Ja

T: I go to the car wash, I GO TO ALEXANDRA in the location and wash my car there,
C: Ja
T: and sit there (.) with the guys and interact with them, and .hh ask them things. And the other day they told me that, “Hey, you know sister, it’s getting cold. And we haven’t got money to buy jerseys if you’ve something. >So yesterday, I went to a friend of mine who owns the shop in town, and I said you know what, I’m going to buy four jerseys, and you gonna give me a GOOD discount<.
C: Wonderful.
T: And he said me: “Wow, you know what, I’m gonna give you this at 50%”. I said, “Really? COOL”. He says, “No, I can afford to, hah, he can afford to do that”.
C: Ja
T: I bo(h)ught them those jerseys, and I’m going to take them today and I know they gonna be surprised, because when they, when they told me, they told me that in person.
C: Ja. They didn’t expect you to give them something.
T: They don’t expect me to give them something. .hh So I try.
C: Hmm
T: .hh you know, Carita, I try to make a difference in people’s lives.
C: hmm
T: I, I always make it a point that every time a petrol attendant pours petrol in
my car, I gave them something, as well.
C: Hmm
T: Because you know what?
C: Because they don’t earn a lot.
T: The salary is not enough. .hh The lady that cleans our offices
C: Hmm
T: I have clothes that don’t fit me anymore, she’s got sisters,
C: Ja
T: younger sisters. I give them to her.
C: That’s right
T: You know, they don’t have to be ragged,
C: Because you’re privileged.
T: Yes, they don’t have to be ragged. It’s good clothes,
C: Ja, exactly.
T: quality clothes, I give them to her. <I buy shoes like I’m a crazy woman. I
know> I, I give shoes away, I give so many things away because you know
why, God has blessed me
T: <despite all the things that I went, gone through>.
C: Hmm
T: Despite all the hardships I’ve come out this strong (1) and this tall (1) and
this self-assertive (1) and confident and > if I can make a little difference in
other people’s lives, <
C: Hmm
T: so be it.
C: Wonderful.
T: To me it has made such a major difference,
C: Mmmm
T: meeting people from all walks of life and you realise, you know what?
C: That’s right
T: and they’re still as humble
C: Ja
T: even though they have so much money
C: Ja
T: to them it’s not all about money anymore, it’s about pleasing yourself, it’s
about loving yourself, loving your family, taking care of your family. Loving
C: God, you know
T: and to me (.) that inspires me. It inspires me to see a black woman out there
making a difference,
C: Ja
T: you know. I mean, there’s so many role models out there. My role model, I
don’t care what people say.
C: Hmm
T: Winnie is my role model. Winnie Mandela(1) I love her to bits because that
woman is from humble beginnings.
T: She is very strong willed
C: Ja
T: She don’t care what people say (1) she still lives on,
C: Ja
T: <and that woman is a role model, people should look up to her and realise
that you know what despite everything else she’s been put through, she still
lives. She smiles>
C: That’s right. And that’s your grandmother’s philosophy?
T: Exactly. They are from two different .hh uh, kinda lives.hh
C: Hmm
T: but (1) yet they think alike. That is something,
C: Ja
T: that is something, you know. I have a LOT OF WOMEN who are my role
models.
C: Hmm
T: I have few men (1) but <I always think that men are more privileged than
women>,
C: Hmm
T: this is why I don’t really look up to them that much.
C: Ja
T: I have (. ) an uncle. He’s very high powered as well. He started an black
advertising agency and >he is doing well, and he is a director in so many
companies<. The other one is R***, lord of films and .hh he is successful. I
mean, they are well off.
C: Ja
T: They are wealthy, they live their lives but you know what, I felt that I want
to make a difference in my life, my own way without pulling strings.
C: Ja
T: I want them to know that I am T** , I am happy and I have it made on my
own, I didn’t have to ask them for anything. .hh Well, I know it sound like a
lot of pride, but you know what, I think that if I (1) rely, rely on them too
much its going to cost me.
C: Yes ( and it’s )
T:Yes (nothing comes for free) Yes, I don’t want to be depending on anybody.
C: So you’ve got where you are on your own.
T: Yes, on my own, I did. Yes
C: Thank you so much. It was a very, very interesting interview.
T: Thank you.
C:Thank you,T**.
INTERVIEW 9.
C: T**, thank you for giving me the opportunity to speaking to you today about yourself. What I’d like you to do is to go back as far as possible and tell me a bit about your life as a child, your extended family and so on.

T: Okay. I come from a very big family. I’ve got four sisters, one brother we’re all married.

Uhm, I come from a >very, very big family where my mother and them had, my mother and them were 10 children <. A very, very close-knit family. Uhmm, my granny was always with us up until the age of 89. She stayed with us for a, for a better part of my life. .hh A, a very strict lady,

C: Ja

T: but also very flexible. Uhmm. My family rules, we we were brought up in a convent, all of us attended Catholic schools;

C: Yes

T: very staunch Catholic background .hh So you know no nonsense .hh but yet ja, we caught on quite a bit if nonsense. Uhmm, as a family we actually stood up, we still stand up for each other. You know if we have a party, gatherings you KNOW you have to have crockery and cutlery for 70 people

C: Yes

T: No, less okay. It’s a bit hectic but its lovely because you eat out twice a week.

C: That’s lovely

T: Ja, and its different foods, it’s different people. Uhm, if your birthdays are on top of each other you’re in trouble

C: Yes

T: you know, so. It, it’s nice because you actually meet everybody, but it gets a bit claustrophobic (1)

because of the extended family .hh My granny for example, had 44 grandchildren

C: Good grief!

T: and she had fifty four great grand children, so .hh hh ja, when a tribe comes together

C: Yes

T: it’s like you actually feel you don’t want to be anywhere and you were actually given, you, you knew that if you went to so and so’s home you had to be in the kitchen.

C: Yes

T: If you were at somebody else’s place you were a guest, so there were little groups of us who knew who had to be in the kitchen at times .hh so there were times when you had fun.

C: Hmm

T: In my personal home we, uhmm, we >didn’t have lots of money<but we weren’t short of anything.

C: Right

T: So we weren’t spoilt brats but we were, .hh you know you had to deserve what you got.

C: Hmm

T: I mean, we got a hiding, we knew what corporal punishment was, my boys know,

C: Hmm

T: what corporal punishment is, “they’ve got 2 wooden sticks themselves”.

C: Tell me and who was the disciplinarian in your family?

T: My mother

C: Your mother?

T: Oh, my mother would take anything from a tomato box to a (. ) whatever to, to slap you. Her favourite was a (1) wet uhmm, face cloth or a dish cloth. She used to buy special dish cloths and she used to put you in the bath, put all the bubbles and when her time was there she would come and lash you, when she finishes with you then she says, “Now, this is why I gave you a hiding” .hh We could never complain that teachers hit us because

C: Ja?
47. T: we always got a hiding ( )
48. T: at home. hh Like I say it was, IT WAS STRICT, strict but it was fun you know. We were, we were
50. really close, um we lost my dad about 15 years ago. hh A big loss because you know the adjustment, but
51. fortunately, my mother’s still alive, she, she coped quite well.
52. C: Ja
53. T: Um she really, you brought us up. Did the mother father routine and everything( )
54. C: How old were you when your dad died?
55. T: I was 20(1) 24.
56. C: So you were grown.
57. T: I was quite. Ja, I was teaching. I was quite, > look I had my two sisters my brother and sister were
58. still at school they were in grade 8<. Um, my mother <spoilt them rotten> because she felt that "look
59. you know there is no Dad".
60. C: Ja
61. T: So I mean >my brother was in standard 8 when he had a car< .hh
62. C: That's spoilt!
63. T: JA. It was, it was, it was a case of I don’t know how to make up (.) for you not having a father so I’m
64. going to give you the material things , hh I ki-, I, I, you know, I am financially stable to give it to you
65. and of course. Ja, you know he was the one .hh that the only boy of course also,º so he was also the
66. spoilt brat in the familyº.
67. C: Tell me what does your mother do for a living?
68. T: She’s a midwife.
69. C: Oh, so she’s a midwife?
70. T: Well >she is a qualified midwife< and she went into ICU so
71. C: And um, did she work throughout the marriage?
72. T: YES, yes
73. C: When your dad was still alive?
74. T: She, she worked right. .hh >With my mother, that is why my mother was the disciplinarian, my father
75. was at home with us all the time, so he was the mother<.
76. C: Okay.
77. T: So, when she-
78. C: So, it’s a bit of a reversed role?
79. T: Ja, so when she came home, she controlled the finances.
80. C: Hmm
81. T: she did everything. <He was really the mother>,
82. C: Hmm
83. T: he cooked, if she walked in, her slippers were given to her .>We had to run in her bath water because
84. you know the nurses worked <, their shifts were terrible.
85. C: Yes
86. T: .hh. So, if she worked the 7 to 7 shift, the queen came home,
87. C: Hah
88. T: and the queen was and up to today, >you won’t believe it my mother never cooked in her life<.
89. C: That’s marvelous!
90. T: She NEVER cooked, she, she would made soup or porridge
91. C: Yes
92. T: or whatever but not a full meal, not a Sunday meal nothing, .hh because he did everything for her. He
C: That’s wonderful!

T: and that is why I think, when, when, when she realized listen I have to .hh get my life. I mean at the age of 55 she went for her driver’s license .hh ,

C: Okay

T: because she couldn’t drive.

C: Yes

T: He was the one who used to take her up and down, fetch her from work, take her to work and she, ‘when he died there was the car and there was her”.

C: Yes

T: And well, she went for her license, she got herself a little car and .hh THANK THE ‘cause she would have driven us crazy.

C: Yes

T: Ja, you know .hh so she SHE survived um and I think that is where we get our survival skills from

C: Hmm

T: You know my granny was also the type of person (_) with all her kids, .hh my grandfather was in both wars, uhhm, you know(.) he was busy,

C: Ja

T: so there was no time for him to mother the kids.

C: Hmm

T: So my granny really reared her kids and that way my mother (.). Look she looked after us financially

C: Ja

T: uhh, but my dad was there,

C: More?

T: to give you the rules to do this and, he would just say, “Your children need a hiding, they, they need this”, not tattle tale

C: Ja

T: But .hh you know, giving her feedback (1) as to what has happened.

C: What did he do for a living?

T: He worked in the furniture union.

C: Okay

T: So they had very strict hours you know,

C: Hmm

T: they used to, you know, on Friday he was off early, weekends he didn’t work, so he was flexible.

C: He was more available

T: He was more available for us, like you know he would fetch us from school .hh take us to sports practices and things like that. Look, she, whenever she was available, she would go.

C: Ja

T: but it was just a case of a reverse of roles and when he died she couldn’t cook. She, she did nothing,

C: Hmm

T: from what HE did and we realized how he had spoilt her.

C: Ja

T: And then we said “Sorry, hold it,

C: Ja

T: enough is enough, sorry. Get yourself somebody else or otherwise (1)”.
C: Learn to do it yourself.
T: Learn to do it yourself. hh Ja, TODAY she, she, she’s coping (1) because she then went uhm, >with
with the money that he left her. We said straight, you know <(1)“Don’t leave it to us (.)”. She’s still
alive.
C: Hmm
T:< Um, she she worked well with (.) whatever finances she was left. I mean, you know, she, she I mean
she had the house, and the car and money and whatever. hh So she went into business um she took my
hh the two babies(.) into business with her and they went into catering.
C: Okay
T: So there she learned and of course (.) it was a turn in her life,
C: Yes
T: where she never ever touched a pot and she had to get
C: Ja, quite dynamic
T: up now at 6 o’clock to go and cook for somebody else, you know.
C: Hmm
T: But she loved it, it kept her going
C: Hmm
T: because she had a job. She could support everybody else
C: Hmm
T: you know, keep her nest egg, do what she had to do. hh But needless to say she still, she, she I
mean financially, she’s fine.
C: Hmm
T: But she is back at work again (.)
C: (   )
T: at the age of 70.
C: Hmm
T: That’s marvelous, what is she doing?
C: Hmm
T: She’s CRAZY!
C: Hah
T: No, she’s um a, a, a, sister or matron she worked with uhm, at Park Park Lane
C: Hmm
T: well in her years when she was (.) nursing, hh opened this millennium you know where Mary Mount
was.
C: Yes, I know where that is
T: >They, they, they’ve got< an old age home there,
C: Ja
T: so she goes and she helps out there like two days a week.
C: Isn’t that lovely?
T: Ja, but it’s crazy
C: Ja, maybe a bit old.
T: No, she loves it.
C: Ja
T: She she look, I think nursing was her first love, so she
C: Hmm
T: “to her, you know to her it was the best”
C: She was born to do it.
T: And, and, and like I say, she’s now gone back, so she’s lasted quite long, she lasted four months.
C: Hmm
T: We said to her, “We give you a month”
C: Hah. Tell me T**
T: So
C: and um when they had disagreements in the household your father and your mother who normally settled it?
T: My mother was, you know she was like a tyrant she had you know it was also this fashion, I’ll never forget-
C: Hah
T: Oh God. Before we built we had these, two two bedrooms you know the two bedroomeed house.
C: Yes?
T: Of course the one was the children’s bedroom and the other was the parent’s bedroom,
C: That’s right
T: my mother had this shoe bag behind, I’ll never forget. I said to her all the time, “I want to buy you a pair of shoes
C: My granny had a shoe bag like that
T: Ja. And when they had arguments, the shoes (1) you just heard the shoes flying. NOBODY GOT NOBODY GOT
C: Yes
T: nobody, I think it was on purpose, that nobody was
C: Yes
T: hit properly on the head or whatever. .hh >But my mother would walk out and my father would be the one to make up. And she was the type of person that chocolates ,flowers. NOT NOT material well
C: Yes
T: material things, I would say<
C: Ja
T: but that was her way of saying, you will make it up to me and um she was shrewd.
C: Hmm
T: in the sense that he was so humble I won’t lie. He would come home and he would give her his pay cheque just like that..
C: Unbelievable…
T: >I’m not lying to you <. Then he’d say to her, “You budget ,
C: Hmm
T: you see to everything” and she would give him spending or pocket money whatever. .hh By the end of the week or the first week, two weeks, then his money is finished.
C: Yes
T: Now he bribes us. Lend me –
C: Hah
T: lend from your brother or ( )
C: Without her knowing obviously?
T: Well, well of course. But she used to, she picked up eventually .hh and then she used to pick a fight like the third week when she knew he had not a dime
C: Yes
T: and she knew listen the only way he’ll come right is the chocolates, the flowers and the you know that routine.
C: Ja
T: .hh >SHE WAS, SHE WAS very, you know she’s changed drastically from what she was< She, she had long nails and she also used to smoke
C: Hmm
231. T: .hh and she used to party. NOW (. ) she’s a total opposite, she’s into the church. She’s got no time for, 232. don’t wear pants, 233. C: Yes 234. T: you must wear skirts 235. C: Yes, you must be feminine. 236. T: Yes, uh, uh, the Lord didn’t want you to have earrings (uh, you know) 237. C: When did she change like this? 238. T: “About what 6 years ago” 239. C: So, its quite late in life then 240. T: JA 241. T: but she was quite emancipated (would you say) 242. T: >No she was, she was. Like I said, she’s very fashionable .hh< 243. C: Yes 244. T: always, she always gave us first I must say. 245. C: Hmm 246. T: “We were always you know smartly dressed” (. ) .hh always bought the best for us, she was always 247. the last to get something. 248. C: Hmm 249. T: “But um JA and um entertaining because they come from a big family. 250. C: Ja, that’s true 251. T: So, you know, you entertained and whatever”. The IRONY OF HER and my aunt is 252. C: Hmm 253. T: that we were all so close, 254. C: Hmm 255. T: that all my aunt’s children went into the medical field 256. C: Okay 257. T: “and all my mother’s children (. ) went into the teaching field, cause my uncle and my aunt were 258. teachers”. 259. C: Yes 260. T: SO, THEY had such an influence over us and my mother had such an influence over them 261. C: over them 262. T: that the two it was so, it was so (. ) fun that everytime we applied (. ) my mother would say,“Where are 263. you going to?”.Then she’d look at my sister and she’d say, “I’m going into education” and she’d look at 264. my cousin and she’d say,“No, I’m going to become a doctor”. It was so fun .hh but it was a bond that 265. was so close. We used to wear the same clothes, 266. C: Hmm 267. T: “we used to go on holiday together, so .hh it was, it was we’re still close you know we still close knit. 268. I mean the children are always together, and things like that °. 269. C: Who would you say is your role model then was it your aunt, your mother, your grandmother? 270. T: I think I had lots, remember, it was, with me more (. ) .hh I would say my father 271. C: Your father? 272. T: He was, he was. .hh We, we come from a, a total mixed breed. 273. C: Ja 274. T: “My granny was Irish (. ) my grandfather was Zulu 275. C: Ja 276. T: My mother, uh ,uh, father was Jewish so, it, all all the blood
C: How amazing!
T: that is there, if you see the family you’ll say,
C: Hah
T: “This is really mixed masala” in the sense that my brother and I are the only dark skinned two people,
C: Ja
T: no blue eyes, my entire family is blonde, blue eyed ( )
C: Incredible!
T: Their children have got green eyes,
C: Mmm
T: my children are the only ones with my brother
C: Ja
T: and we are the only two that took after my father. So JA, it’s, it’s, my father was always there for us
C: Hmm
T: because we felt we weren’t (.) like my grandmother. My granny was Irish so .hh the Irish blood, she
C: Ja
T: had pitch black hair
C: Ja
T: and ALL the children (1) took after my granny with this fair complexion and blondeness in them.
C: Ja
T: But .hh ja, my father was always there for us “because we were always the, the scapegoats, you know,
C: Okay
T: the black sheep of the family”
C: Okay
T: Everybody was identified with my mother’s family;
C: Ja
T: had this green eyes,
C: Hmm
T: blue eyes. So if you didn’t have it you were (1) not an outcast but
C: Yes, in a way
T: Ja, so we stuck to my father, it it it’s funny .Our history is so dynamic
C: Ja
T: in the sense that my father’s family is all white.
C: Okay
T: And, when we used to go to functions
C: Okay, so your father is Zulu?
T: No, no my father’s, my father’s Coloured
C: Okay, but his father was Jewish?
T: His fa-, his mother was Jewish
C: Okay, his mother was Jewish.
T: Well, when we used to go to their functions then my mother would sit with the (. ) Jews
C: Yes
T: with my sister and them and my father and I used to sit at the back .hh because we were, you know
C: Ja, hah
T: of the other side, you know, you in those days it was the milkman
C: Yes
T: and the madam story.
C: Ja
T: So, of course look I, I never bothered, it didn’t I t didn’t bother me, it wasn’t an issue.
C: Hmm
T: but it was just funny (1) that we were never, “you know my father would say, “Ag, let’s lets just sit behind, let’s just see what they’re going to do.”
C: Ja
T: But his family never despised him
C: Hmm
T: Uhm, it was just US that, you know here’s these larneys, hh my mother fits in, my sisters fit in
C: JA
T: (Ok) we are
C: Your brother and yourself.
T: Ja, but, but HE WAS UP, he was hh a mixture, you know he (1) had a beautiful com,
C: Hmm
T: he still has a nice complexion, its just that he didn’t have the eyes, YOU KNOW
C: Okay, Hah
T: (Okay). You just look and say, “Now WHERE DO THESE come from?” You know and with my granny, my grandfather was this typical strappy chappy with (who knows).
C: Ja
T: He WASN’T Zulu totally,
C: Hmm
T: but you know we used to and then of course my granny (total)
C: Who was Irish.
T: Total, total Irish. It was, it was REALLY uhm (3) it’s it was fascinating actually.
C: Ja, it is.
T: I, I must show you photos (. ) of my nieces and nephews, you will just sit.hh. They’re the most beautiful things
C: Ja
T: I (just say that, they’re not things),
C: Yes, but Thelma
T: they’re lovely
C: Sorry to interrupt, if you say apart from identifying with him because of your looks, in what other way would he,
T: Oh, he
C: Did he guide you or was he a role model to you?
T: He was (. ) very sporty, okay.
C: Okay
T: ° He was the sporty type and <he was the musically inclined person >.
C: Hmm
T: So my brother. My brother and I were the two who wanted to (. ) kick balls and to (. ) play hockey
C: and to do this
369. C: Hmm
370. T: and he was very (. ) for sport. ° My other sisters were pretty poppies, uhm you know 
371. C: Hmm
372. T: dolling themselves up, playing with their dolls and .hh putting make- up on. 
373. C: Ja
374. T: You know, like I say with my mother .hh having her nail varnish, 
375. C: Yes
376. T: it was just a novelty to them, to me, < Ag, I couldn’t be bothered, you know >. 
377. C: Ja
378. T: I would sit and do whatever, get dirty. SO HE ACTUALLY more took to us than what he did, well I 
379. mean he loved all the chil-, all his kids but 
380. C: Ja
381. T: we were more closer to him because if he wanted to hit a ball, you know, he he would go that way.hh. 
382. C: Ja
383. T: .hh If you wanted to play sports he’d go out of his way he’d buy you “the best equipment” 
384. C: Hmm
385. T: < just because (. ) he was a sports person and um he wanted us to, to play sport and things like that> 
386. C: Hmm
387. T: And, and, and in that way, you know, we we actually bonded 
388. C: (not because) 
389. T: not, not because of what we looked like and whatever. But ( ) 
390. C: Ja, your interests were similar 
391. T: Our interests were - Ja and if we had to cook I would go into the kitchen before my sisters would go 
392. C: Okay 
393. T: into the kitchen .hh you know. And that was where he (1). My sisters, ag they, they would rather clean 
394. up instead of sitting in the kitchen. 
395. C: Ja 
396. T: He was one who loved to cook with wine and .hh 
397. C: That’s lovely! 
398. T: you know< marinate this and marinate that > 
399. C: Ja 
400. T: and ja, he’d take forever you know. 
401. C: Hah 
402. T: He’d cook at 5 o’clock and we’d only eat at s-, 8 o’clock (. ) type of thing. 
403. C: Yes 
404. T: But it was, was nice and and and he motivated us. 
405. C: Hmm 
406. T: When I said I wanted to go to college he was very (1) angry because then we 
407. C: Okay? 
408. T: it was more (1)°you had to go to varsity. You come from a convent, we’ve spent all this money°. I 
409. said, “I don’t want varsity 
410. C: Hmm 
411. T: it’s not for me um, JUST LEAVE ME”. 
412. C: Yes 
413. T: “I’m going to the Teachers Training College .hh that’s where I want to go. <He was very 
414. disappointed (2) but supported me all the way .hh uhm °until he realized I was the Chairperson of the
and then it was the seventy, just after the '76 riot.

C: That’s right

T: and um, he was political as well

C: Hmm

T: but he sort of (.) stepped back (.) you know

C: Hmm

T: after he had kids he realized,.hh look you can’t fight the political situation etc.

C: Hmm

T: And when he realised I was the Secretary of the, of the SRC and

C: Hmm

T: we were, we used to toyi-toyi here and .hh we were put in vans there and whatever , “he was totally
disgusted, totally°. He was angry, he was, just like he could just say to me, “I’m cutting myself of
you. I didn’t teach you (1) to go into politics, I told you its dirty business.

C: Ja

T: Get out”. BUT I DIDN’T and um (.) he actually I think he actually appreciated the fact that I said to
him I won’t do it.

C: Hmm

T: “You were also political „hh leave me to knock my head sort of” and the day we were supposedly
picked up in these little kwela-kwela vans

C: Ja

T: (coughs) that was the day I realized (.) listen (.).

C: Enough is enough

T: WELL HE WASN’T RIGHT, .hh look (.). we had to fight for what we, what we fought for (1)

C: Ja

T: I will wait for you, I’ve taken leave and I will put you back in my car ºand you will go home and

C: Ja

T: <I will wait for you, I’ve taken leave and I will put you back in my car “and you will go home and

C: Ja

T: so it was a bit difficult but he did a good job, I mean all of us, my, my, my one sister I mean also the
THREE, I mean the first three we, we studied further. The other three earn MORE than us and didn’t
STUDY FURTHER.

C: Okay

T: (That’s the irony of it)

C: What are they doing?
T: Uh, two are working for Discovery Health
C: Okay
T: “uhm, they’ve got good positions, I mean like earning sixteen thousand Rands a month, .hh and the other one is working for Vodacom ,also a good positionº
C: Ja
T: you know, then you look at it you say, “Ja, where (3) where’s the justice, you know? I studied for how many years
C: Ja
T: and where am I today, but look .hh I , I am happy for them .They are all successful .º Fortunately we all have good (1) homes, we come from a, a family where divorce is unknown. You know, you stick it out, you fight each other out, you get blue eyes, you sleep in separate rooms and “THAT’S IT
C: Hmm
T: “that’s it, there is no such thing like, “ Sorry I’m taking my bags, I’m up and out.” My cousin, for the first, the first cousin in the family
C: Hmm
T: hh got divorced .hh about three weeks ago it was like,º it was SO TRAUMATIC
C: Ja
T: because it was something that was just not (.) a norm (.) with us.
C: Ja
T: ° Look, um we are supporting her because her husband was a real dog.
C: Hmm
T: He is, he is still a dog (2) but uhm, JA (1) other than that it’s-º. You know (.) with my father he, he guided you, you did what you had to, you got your dog, you got your this, .hh you got your that, it was always what you had.
C: Hmm
T: Not in abundance (2) but also (1) I tell you (.) some interesting (.) timesº.
C: Tell me and your mother? How did she feel when you got arrested, what did she say?
T: <Uh NOTHING. She was (2) indifferent because she just said, “ I told you so, I told you >”. She was never political, she was not a , it couldn’t bother her you know,
C: Ja
T: which way you went but it wasn’t that I was really arrested also we were just picked up and we were scared.
C: Hmm
T: Uhmm (1)>they they just wanted to sort of give you a little scare to say you know, “Don’t do this”
C: Ja
T: “Get out of it” type of thing. She, .hh look, she was concerned (.) “because it wasn’t only me, it was two of my male cousins (1) and a (.) female cousin of mine. So, it was the whole family that was involvedº.
C: Okay
T: Fortunately (2) their parents were, we, we, were politically very strong. So they (2) you know they supported me (1) and they said to my mother and father, “Chill, back out . Let the children do what they want to do, let us support them”º>
C: Ja, so they were-
T: THEY HELPED,
C: A supportive role
T: JA, THEY HELPED THE SITUATION.
507. C: But your mother was never politically active?
508. T: "No, no, no, no".
509. C: Why do you think that is?
510. T: >I don’t know, I, I, I actually don’t<<. Hh She was a sports person,
511. C: Hmm
512. T: um, very good hockey player, but she was never (3) concerned about colour or race
513. C: Hmm
514. T: um >you know, she treated everybody the same. I think maybe because of her work situation, you
515. know<.
516. C: Ja
517. T: She worked, .hh she worked at Bara, she worked at the Gen ((banging sound from wooden floors
518. upstairs)) so to her (.) everybody was normal.
519. C: Yes
520. T: <There was nobody (1) who was uhm, you know (.) different.
521. C: Hmm
522. T: So she couldn’t understand, yes, she she understood you know .hh I remember in in Market street
523. you know where Edgars was, there was that park.
524. C: Yes, I know Edgars.
525. T: NOW (1) "you couldn’t walk through that park if you were not white". So, the joke was < my granny,
526. my mother, my sisters would walk through that park,
527. C: Ja
528. T: nobody stops them>
529. C: Ja
530. T: .hh My father, myself and my brother would have to walk around and meet at the bottom. >But it
531. was a BIG joke<
532. C: Goodness
533. T: You know and and that, those are things that I always remember and I always felt so (.) .hh NOT
534. BITTER about it
535. C: Ja
536. T: I just thought look at the unfairness of it all.
537. C: Yes
538. T: It’s just because they’re a shade lighter.
539. C: Yes
540. T: Of course, then if my grandfather, if he was with us (.) he’d walk around too. .hh But it was again you
541. know, that type of thing, >but she was, she was, I wouldn’t say she was any different<<.
542. C: Hmm hmm
543. T: Yes (.) she’d scolder. I think I got more of a scolding
544. C: Hmm
545. T: than “I’m sorry my child are you okay?”
546. C: Ja
547. T: But um, but uhm, ja . <She sort of, she sort of just said get out of it, forget about it, do your studies
548. and that’s, and that is WHY SHE SENT US TO A CONVENT
549. C: Hmm
550. T: because that was the ’76 riots.
551. C: Oh, yes, that’s right.
552. T: And then we were, I was in grade seven, (that’s standard five). My sister was in standard seven and
she just sent us straight to the convent and she said. “That’s where you will end that’s where you will finish off, and uh we were called traitors. hh and…

C: Okay, by whom?
T: Well by the other, the the children in our community you see
C: Hmm
T: because they knew when we left the schools to go to this supposed multi-racial school.
C: Hmm
T: because they knew when we left the schools to go to this supposed multi-racial school.
C: Hmm
T: (coughing) Sorry. So, hh it was a case of - We weren’t outcasts cause we never allowed ourselves to be (.) but it was that we were (.) tarnished.
C: Hmm
T: You’d run your way from the situation and we definitely went with the ’76 riot. So it was a bit (.).hh HEAVY AND I THINK THAT impacted on me, and I just thought
C: Ja
T: enough. But it was, it was FUN. I, I won’t, hh I won’t encourage anyone,
C: Ja
T: you know, but ja, you, you have to have some diversion in life
C: Tell me T** and your personal marriage now,
T: OHHH(h)HH (   )
C: how’s it different from your parents’ marriage?
T: hh
C: I mean if you think your dad was the quieter one, in the background
T: (coughs) Ja?
C: and your mum, okay, obviously because she was an absent mother to a great degree
T: Ja
C: because of her work?
T: because, because of her work
C: Yes, and how and the way they dealt with the discipline, how
T: Hmm
C: how, how can you contrast that with your marriage?
T: I don’t have such a luxury, I’ll tell you why,
C: Hmm
T: because I’ve got three boys. I don’t have a husband.
C: Hah
T: No, I’m being DEAD SERIOUS.
C: Yes
T: I, when people ask me how many kids,
C: Hah
T: how many kids do you have? I say, “I have three”.
C: Yes
T: My husband. hh, We we got married when I was 30 “when I got married.” We were going out for eleven years, and he was 36. So he was a spoilt brat.
C: Ja
T: He was the baby,
C: Hmm
T: the baby boy.
T: His mother and father were very old so his mother had NOTHING to do but polish his shoes.
C: Hah
T: clean up after him. No, no really I’m no(h)t lying to you,
C: Oh, I love it, yes
T: and I, <and I took this brat, I still got the brat>. Look he, he he pro-, my husband, I mean he provides
for us,
C: Mmm
T: he does everything
C: Yes
T: <except when he comes home his chair is his chair, my sons chairs have their chairs and mother has to
slave >.
C: Okay
T: Um it’s very different because, like I’m used to my father working. Yes, he’ll get up an cook
C: Ja
T: I mean (.) he does cook often, or >on a Saturday makes breakfast and things like that< but does
absolutely nothingº.
C: Hmm
T: If I go on tour I must take out clothes for him every day, I must pack it in the spare room, from
socks, to underpants to everything,
C: Hmm
T: okay. I tell you his mother had nothing better to do, she used to iron everything from socks to under
pants. So I’ve inherited this (1) spoilt brat, so if people say to me,” How old are your kids?” then I
say, “ The eldest is forty-four,
C: Hah
T: the one is ei(h)ght and the one is three”. And, and everybody stands and looks and says 44? But they
don’t realize to me .hh yes he’s a husband. he’s a friend (   )
C: Yes
T: but he’s just, he’s more of a child to me,
C: Hmm
T: you know. If he gets ill .hh you know, he’s MORE OF A BABY than my baby.
C: Ja
T: I must say to him, “Did you take your medication, did you do this, did you do that”. .hh The phone is
on my side,
C: Yes
T: if the phone rings if he’s on call uh, I must answer first and then I pass the phone on. So I’m you
know, I’m awake hh. Then I get told, “I need tea otherwise I’m going to fall asleep”.
C: Hmm
T: I swear to God, if I don’t get up to make the tea he WILL fall asleep.
C: Ja
T: So it’s all that I, I, I I even say to his sisters you know, I often say to them, “ You people spoiled him
and now I’m sitting with this brat” but nevertheless look I must say he .hh he is not a person who’s never
supported us.
C: Ja
T: I’m not short of anything, I can go home now and say I need this can we look at it, uhm
C: Ja
T: Yes, I did initially (.) do what my father did and I used to hand over my cheque
C: Yes
T: but he did the EXACT same thing my mother did. .hh. You get a small amount of money, by the time
your money’s finished then you are asked what do you work for?
C: Okay
T: I just said to him, “Hold it brother, hold it. Enough is enough.YOU tell me what I have to pay. You
know what I earn (. ) and then you work out what I must do >because you know what, I also want my
own money< “
C: That’s right
T: And, um it worked , it it was a big ( . ) blow to him because he used to brag to everybody (. ) .hh <that
his wife gives him ( . ) her salary.> And you know today it’s not a case of , >I mean I used to just hand it
over just like that < here’s my cheque and we had a joint account , but I
C: Yes
T: I didn’t take money out. If I had to pay accounts, I would pay an account. And then I used to be
clever also. He gives you like R1500 for groceries .hh and I’d spend R1000 on the groceries and I’d
keep the R500. And I just thought: “NO, NONSENSE I don’t have to do that.”
C: Ja
T: <IT’S NOT RIGHT, IT’S NOT FAIR ( . )>
C: What made you come to that decision?
T: hh Man, one day, I won’t lie to you, I forgot (1) Well because also I’m, I’m depe-, it’s its also reverse
I also depend on him with transport and things .hh and I forgot to take transport money,
C: Okay
T: and I couldn’t get home and I phoned my brother and he said, “No I’m far from you”, he said, “<It’s
GOOD it will teach you >, you don’t have”, I didn’t have a bank card I had nothing. He said, “I told you
(1) to become independent . hh To ME it was not a problem it was, it was
C: Ja. It was the trust.
T: YES, it was fun.
C: Hmm
T: (sound of walking upstairs) “I would get 20 times my salary and things like that“. And then .hh I
couldn’t go home and I had to ask somebody but I had to lie, I had to say, “You know, I left my purse
at home .”
C: Ja
T: “I don’t have money, please lend me money °, I need to GET HOME”
C: Yes
T: “and when I got home I said to him, “Enough is enough”. You know what, you don’t care what
happen-”, he’s the type of person whose bank balance must be (.)
C: Ja
T: very fat. If he doesn’t see five digits (. ) on his bank statement (. ) he is MISERABLE. I MEAN
MISERABLE. (okay .hh)
C: Miserable. hah
T: So, JA. Uhm, you know, so far it works but> I still feel you know we, we, we. But I, I, I still count
everything anyway<.
C: Ja
T: But at least I know .hh I have what I have, >but he still gives me you know if I say you have to buy
this you have to buy that < .hh (1) there’s there’s (. ) a good relationship
C: But you have regained your independence?
T: Oh I have but, but okay, look I have in the sense and then .hh when he bought (. ) my car.
C: Yes
T: You know he’s like the type of person who hh he doesn’t brag but he likes to show people that he appreciates (1) his wife.
C: Ja
T: When T*** was born um everybody was saying to him you know, “What did you buy your wife?”
He said, “No, when she gets out of hospital, she’ll get her gift“.
C: Hmm
T: And when I got home there was this car all wrapped up.
C: How lovely.
T: When T*** was born um everybody was saying to him you know, “What did you buy your wife?”
He said, “No, when she gets out of hospital, she’ll get her gift“.
T: And when I got home there was this car all wrapped up.
C: Hmm
T: He tends to overdo it. >And, and, and I, it’s not that I’m chasing my sisters away< because I GIVE to them also. You know if I go shopping and I buy maybe socks or (.) spencers
C: Hmm
T: I’ll throw in two extra for (.) if I know one of them needs or whatever.
C: Yes
T: And he doesn’t have to know he just pays for the things, thinking its for me .hh but, but but IN THAT SENSE he won’t say, “You’re taking four spencers, is it not too much?”
C: Ja
T: To him nothing is too much .hh but if you do squander (1) <he screams>. “So .hh ja he checks my, well he, he’s got access to my bank account *
C: Hmm
T: “and if he just sees something happened“ he says , “WHAAAA, WHAT DID YOU NEED THIS MONEY FOR, WHY DID YOU NEED THAT MONEY?“and you know .hh very strict but
C: Ja
T: but also LOOK MAYBE I NEED IT you know, uhm
C: Hmm
T: We, we would never be where we are today (.) if it wasn’t for him.
C: Ja
T: You know, he’s the type of person, the best or nothing.
C: Tell me T**, and who disciplines the children in your household?
T: hh They’re brats man.
C: Hmm
T: No real(h)lly, there’s no (time) I AM TIRED WHEN I GET HOME). <My boys are spoiled rotten>
If you meet my little one he will tell you straight, “If I want something,
C: Hmm
T: I cry. I howl
C: Hmm
T: <my mother gets irritated >
C: Ja
T: she gives it to me”.
C: Ja
T: hh WE’VE GOT THIS NOW, THIS NEW THING of this wooden spoon which in the holidays we’re going to (1) decorate and whatever (.) okay.
C: Okay
T: BUT uhm JA. I DON’T KNOW IF WE, IF WE GET TO USE IT. Because, you know I, look we do
hit them, we do scold them but

739. T: they, they get away with murder.
740. C: Why is that?

741. T: hh I don’t know, I don’t know if it is because hh his job is very (. ) stressful,
742. C: Ja

743. T: my job is stressful, so (. ) hh the happier the children are the better. So, what we normally do,
744. they’ve got lots of, their rooms, the one room is full of toys

745. C: Hmm

746. T: Now . hh T** looks after his toys very well but T**(. ) is a total (. ) destruction (. ) master.
747. C: Yes

748. T: He’ll go into the room, he’ll chop anything up, he’ll do anything and just . hh he, he, he claims.
749. “It’s exploring”.

750. C: Hah

751. T: I don’t know if a three year old can understand what’s exploring.
752. C: That’s lovely

753. T: But ja, he’s, he’s, he’s a very intelligent child. Like I said to, I said to R**. We had a staff tea and last
754. night I bought a milk tart, and so he said to me, “No Mummy (. ) you can’t take Daddy’s money and buy
755. cakes (. ) for school,

756. C: Hmm

757. T: this is for us” (. ) I said to him, “Yes, I’ve bought you your chocolate bun, you have your bun and the
758. milk tart’s going to school. I eventually got him over that and he had his little bun. 12 o’clock last night
759. he woke up and said, “I still haven’t had my milk tart, can you fetch it for me?”

760. C: Like Daddy!

761. T: So I said, “EXCUSE ME SLAVE (1) this is not time for milk tart”. But you know like I say, they
762. they’re not rude but they are spoilt in the sense that

763. C: Hmm

764. T: . hh I think in the years they got maybe two hidings.

765. C: Hmm

766. T: Ja

767. C: And who gave those hidings?

768. T: The FATHER. The the, the. He normally disciplines them, look I’ll give a little smack here and there
769. but

770. C: Hmm

771. T: not a hiding, I mean (. ) like WE KNOW hidings.

772. C: Ja

773. T: It is. And yet we were brought up (. ) and we, we actually survived.

774. C: Ja

775. T: We do an injustice-, I, I’ve changed now to, to to, with T**. “I’ve now started with pocket money
776. because he, he’s like totally out of it.

777. C: Ja

778. T: He, he’s demanding, he’s uhm everything he sees, he wants, if he doesn’t get it, there’s a tantrum°.

779. C: And tell me how, how do you deal with that kind of conduct, who deals with it in the house

780. T: hh

781. C: household?

782. T: Man, (1) we deal with it but eventually R and I end up fighting each other
C: Hmm
T: because (. ) when he disciplines the one I feel he’s too harsh and . hh it’s, it’s and you know what, that
is why I also just keep quiet.
C: Hmm
T: you know, if they do something like T** wrote on the wall . hh I paid my niece
C: Yes
T: to scrub the walls,
C: Hah to hide it!
T: (dots and ) to hide it and their father came and he looks and he says, “There’s some green on my
wall, can somebody explain it to me?” and I looked at him and I said, “WHERE’S the green?”
C: Hah
T: And then my niece said, “No” but he was too clever. Okay, look, she was about seven .
C: Okay
T: Now, they call him daddy R. “No, daddy R, ma’m paid me R20 to clean the wall”. WELL, I was in
such trouble
C: Oh my word!
T: but ja, >I just said to him, “Look I cleaned the wall< because it was a fresh co-, uh, uh , uh pencil wax
colour
C: Hmm
T: I cleaned it. I did pay her because I was busy
C: Ja
T: and I knew if you come home, (you will beat this child). It was Father’s day (2) you can’t “possibly
beat a child on Father’s day” but T**’s very first hiding was on Christmas day
C: What was, and was it given by R**?
T: Yes, it was, his sister, hh Shame. His sisters have very different ( . ) views ( . ) to what we have.
C: Hmm ( )
T: They are going to an excitement store and they will buy the first ( . ) piece of rubbish
C: Hmm
T: and wrap it up for the children.
C: Hmm
T: And, I will never forget when T** was five, . hh and they bought him this ball ( . ) but, ja to him it was
the cheapest gift that he could get . hh and of course I had to show him (2) that its not, it’s the thought,
it’s not the gift
C: That’s right
T: and he took the gift and he said to his niece, “This is rubbish, I know where your mother bought it
C: hmm ( )
T: and I know what it cost” and he threw the ball and that was -. Of course his father had to do
something (2) uhm ( . ) but it was so embarrassing,
C: I can imagine!
T: and then he said to me ““Do you see you how you spoil your children? Now this is the first of the
embarrassments, more is going to come, if you don’t stop it”. And then o
C: But do you think it’s just you spoiling them or is it him as well?
T: NO, they were spoiled all over it’s hh uhm hh. because of the way we brought up,
C: Hmm
T: you know everybody buys for everybody,
T: and you buy something you buy something worthwhile .hh
C: Ja
T: So that if I pass that handbag down to my niece (3) when she gets it, it’s still in good quality .hh So we never bought anything and with his family (1) they didn’t put value to that.
C: Okay (so a different value system)
T: So they buy the first piece, ja, buy the first piece of nonsense.
C: Ja, tell me and if you think about it. If you think that his mother spoiled him, that’s R.
T: OH
C: and you’re spoiling your sons
T: Ja hh
C: How, how would that affect your daughters-in-law one day?
T: HMM. I pray very hard (ja, I’m not lying to you )
C: Hah
T: No, no, no, no (1) this is sincere. hh Um my mother-in-law and I never spoke, okay
C: Okay
T: before big time, uhm we had a, a GREAT incident. R and I went to a bank party (.) you know the banks (2) they, they, they have drinks
C: Ja
T: galore (.) and whatever. <T**, T** was just born the August, it was the November. .hh and uh, unfortunately they lost, he lost his brother in October >,
C: Hmm
T: so the mother was in mourning you know.
C: Ja
T: She really didn’t cope with the death of her son whatever. So .hh it was her son got married, you know, in that (.) period of time,
C: Ja
T: the son died and the one son was in Denmark. So she literally lost all her boys type of thing.
C: Ja
T: So, she felt very out (1) and I didn’t help the situation, quite honestly because I was just, “Stay away from me and my family, do your own thing”. < .hh And he went (1) and had a nice party, and came home nice and sizzled >, >HE DOESN’T DRINK I must be very>, he, he belongs to the (.) *bank wine club
C: Hmm
T: I drink all the wine that he orders
C: Hah
T: he’ll pour for me, okay.
C: Hmm
T: So when he does go out, I don’t mind but I tell you he was just that I had this little child and .hh you know, my mother-in-law is not helping
C: Ja
T: We’re staying with her you know, it’s a, it’s a fight and < uhm he came home >> I don’t know how he came home> < the Lord guided him>
C: Ja
T: <I heard the gate open and I went outside and he just passed out in the car but it was maybe just him saying I just had to get home, I to-, brought him inside and I said, “Did you eat?”>
C: Hmm
T: This was like ten o’clock and his mother was still not home, she was with his sister. Hh I said, “Did you eat, well if you did, if you didn’t, whatever, there is your food, I’m going to bed”. So, I went into the room and I was reading.

C: Hmm

T: you know, just faffing around, whatever and his mother came home. In the MEANTIME he went to the bathroom, used the loo, went to dry his hands and pulled on the towel but the towel gave way and he fell into the bath.

C: Oh my word!

T: WELL OKAY, I HELPED HIM OUT OF THE BATH and I put him down and said, “Well you know, do your own thing”

C: Hmm

T: hh and what happened was, his mother came home and when she came home, and because he was looking for sympathy AND I WASN’T GIVING IT,

C: Hmm

T: SHE gave it,

C: Okay

T:<and she came into the room and she said, “What did you do to my son?” and I said, “NO IT’S HOW YOU BROUGHT YOUR SON UP!”

C: Ja

T: (Old mother, spoils) your son rotten and he drinks and then he hurts himself and I HURT him? It was a big fight because then, in, (in the state of course)

C: Ja

T: “I’m rude to his mother “and then he attacked me and I said, “<Hey son, remember I too have a mother, I will phone her”>

C: Hmm

T: At that time I was fighting with my mother,

C: Oh my word!

T: so it was so difficult for me to say, I’ll have to pick up the phone and say, “Please somebody fetch me, but I had to do it”.

C: Ja

T: Then he came and said, no he is sorry and he won’t do it and I said, “You know what? It’s time for us to move.

C: Hmm

T: Its either your mother or me OR your mother comes to stay with us (.) under my roof

C: Okay

T: not under her roof (2) because here I have no say, I can’t do a thing, I just got my little room, that’s mine personally

C: Ja

T: everything else is hers, “everything else is your sister’s, she’s welcome to stay with me under my roof”. 

C: What happened?

T: She didn’t, we then moved and her daughters took her in and

C: Okay

T: that was the end. hh BUT, I, I, PRAY GOD that I don’t end up that way

C: Hmm

T: because yes (.) I am close to my boys hh but uhmm I hope I will be more open. I, I, I’ve said to
them on a million occasions, “When you’re eighteen, I hope I would have built you (.) your own place outside ,

C: Hmm

T: whether the two of you stay together or whether have your own little apartments. Uhm, you know, if we have to move,

C: Hmm

T: we’ll look for two little rooms, cottages for you, get out of my house and get out of my life and do your own thing”. JA, it’s easy to say it now because they are small.

C: Ja ( but when it happens )

T: But I hope that ( I would). You know, my granny was always a, a, such a -. You know in-laws were almo-, always closer to her that her own children. < She treated my father and all the others >

C: Hmm

T: < better > than what she treated her own kids

C: Why is that?

T: I don’t know, > you know what<< they just had a lot of respect and love for her >

C: Hmm

T: > and that saddened me because I, I didn’t, I came from a home> where we were not rude to, to the elders,

C: Hmm

T: but we were a “totally different generation”.

C: Yes

T: Because R’s mother (.) was my, almost my grandmother’s age

C: Okay

T: and R’s elder sister (.) was my mother’s age,

C: Yes

T: so he was my uncle’s age and it was, was totally. It was a generation gap (2). Not for the two of us .hh

C: Ja

T: but for me and his family it was totally uncall-. You know, if you walk in > the dishes must be done.

C: Okay

T: But < don’t tell me to do->, I’ll get up and do it.

C: Hmm

T: But don’t say, “She’s the youngest, it must be done” and that was their (1)

C: Ja

T: home ideas. Look, today they understand me very well ( so, you know they)

C: I was going to ask you about that because, talking about the generation gap and how things are different for women in this country.

T: Ja, it’s very different (coughing)

C: How would you say things are different now?

T: Very different. I put my foot down immediately

C: Hmm

T: and said, “Hold it, .hh I’m not the youngest, I will, I AM the youngest”,

C: Hmm

T: I mean I was actually friends with R’s niece, uh, nephew.

C: Ja

T: That’s how R and I met. Because we were going out one evening (.) and HE, I, I met him through. It
966. was his uncle and I was quite shocked, you know
967. C: Hmm
968. T: Here’s my uncle”, but anyway that-, that’s how we met. And I just said to him straight, “Tell your
969. sisters that I may be their children, yes but I’m not their children, I’ve got a mother and father. They
970. mustn’t order me around.
971. C: Ja
972. T: And uhm, that was the biggest, I think for me (.) if I didn’t do that, I would have been in trouble
973. today,
974. C: And also,
975. T: because uhm
976. C: from a work point of view, how do you feel if you consider the previous generations? How do you
977. consider your life to be different? Is there any difference at all?
978. T: I DON’T THINK SO. Look, look, look we, we still (.) maintain that the woman’s place or the one
979. comes home earlier
980. C: Hmm
981. T: does the cooking, you know, I’ve got lots of uncles who are (.) teachers.
982. C: Okay
983. T: So they often (.) took a role of, in the kitchen that type of thing,
984. C: All right
985. T: so that was our norm. You know, like if you (.) come, if you come home early (1)come home early,
986. hh even if it’s ten minutes early before that person, you will start that food >even if you put on rice<.
987. C: Okay
988. T: You have to do it if you don’t, there’s a big fight type of thing. hh.
989. C: Ja
990. T: I HAVEN’T got a fight with my husband yet .
991. C: hah
992. T: No, I’m being dead serious, he’s the ON- I’m not lying <he’s the only one who doesn’t lift a dish,
993. who doesn’t wash dishes, hh he won’t bath the children>.
994. C: Ja
995. T: <If I calculate the times that he (.) changed the children’s nappies>
996. C: Ja
997. T: Ag. He, he was, you know, he was there to play with them,
998. C: Ja
999. T: he was there when they were fed, hh he was there to cuddle them, tickle them, or whatever,
1000. C: Hmm
1001. T: support them but wash (1) and nappies. No ways!
1002. C: Tell me T**, and professionally how would you say are things different for you between your
1003. generation and your mother and your grandmother for example?
1004. T: Uhm, my grandmother, shame (2) she was an ordinary housewife.
1005. C: Hmm
1006. T: So, so, so, ja she changed and yet she produced a lot of (1) professionals (2)
1007. C: Yes
1008. T: despite the fact that she was a total housewife. >My granny would have been the richest person on
1009. earth< if it wasn’t for my grandfather who stopped her from doing her own alcohol
and we kick him, we want to kick him EVERYDAY for that, because who says you now, we could have inherited SOMETHING.
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But I wouldn’t say it’s different.

We, we, we are more aware of that.

you are sort of encouraging the children to study more. Uhm, you know in those days I remember we used to like study for exams,

my mother would come in or my father in would come with a plate of scones or pancakes and Milo and say, “Have your break”. Whereas today, “I don’t do it”. When my nephew was writing Matric, I said to my sister, “Here, there’s Woolies vouchers you go”. I’m not going to come and bake for my- he’s my godchild.

I said, “I’m not baking or whatever, I’m not there for him, go to Woolies buy whatever (1) pre-packed and let the child have it”. And so YES, because of money

you sort of but the the IDEA is still there

but it’s just how it’s done, it’s totally different.

It’s totally different.

“But uhm JA we are still there, the encouragement is still there”,

“professionalism is still there. Yes, nobody will go into nursing, believe you meº

 Ja, that, that’s a no, no. That’s a career that shelved (1) .hh

forever

Ja, no, no. Uhm, there’s no money, ja, there’s a couple who want to do teaching but it’s more, the best is out into business world, money no, that type of thing. WHICH IS MAYBE A DANGER

ALSO because like I said we never had a lot.

Ja

but we were never short of anything.

So. .hh we were close and we appreciated whatever we got. Today. hh our kids get more

That’s right

and ja, you worry (2) is there that, you know that balance, would they appreciate (it). Like, if we got ice cream (.) we never got ice cream on a Tuesday .hh

Your treat was a Friday that’s it. Not another day, not a Sunday, just a Friday you got your treat. And (.) you look forward to it.

Hmm

I don’t think my child looks forward to anything because-. .hh And he is so shrewd

at home he will get me and says, “Mommy I need spending”. His father takes him down

and his father gives him spending so he sits with double.

Then he still runs up and he says to the teacher, “I have to go to my mother for something”
1102. So, they, you know, ja, because of also of communication,
1103.C: Hmm
1104.T: and sometimes you’re just not speaking, and THAT’S WHY WE DECIDED "enough is enough"
1105. ..hh Give his pocket money I .hh I taught him, I said, “Ten percent goes to the church , ten percent to
1106. savings.
1107.C: Hmm
1108.T: ..hh the rest you do what you want”. So this is the second month, the first month .hh JA, he blew it in
1109. the first two days, they went to movies,
1110.C: Hmm
1111.T: it was just gone.
1112.C: It was gone?
1113.T: Uh, IT WAS TOUGH FOR HIM but only because he paid for his brother (1),
1114.C: Hmm
1115.T: did I (1) soften and (2) I sort of, you know (. ) went back. But this month hopefully (1) I will stick to
1116. it and say to him, “We are on holiday (. ) Plan what you want to do. EIGHTY RAND is nothing (. )
1117.C: Hmm
1118.T: but for a little child it’s lot of money
1119.C: Ja
1120.T: and, and we’ll, we will see how it goes. (But ja)
1121.C: Okay, thanks, thanks T**, that was very interesting.
APPENDIX E
**THE SUPER STRATEGY: A SYNOPSIS OF ‘EMPOWERING YOU FOR EXCELLENCE’**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-awareness</td>
<td>Understanding Change/ Stress</td>
<td>Perfecting work - life balance</td>
<td>Expecting more</td>
<td>Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Values</td>
<td>- Process of change</td>
<td>- Roles</td>
<td>- Goal setting</td>
<td>- Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Beliefs</td>
<td>- Resistance to change</td>
<td>- Balance</td>
<td>- Creative problem-solving</td>
<td>- Assertiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Style</td>
<td>- Understanding stress</td>
<td>- Vision</td>
<td>- Motivation</td>
<td>- Empathy/diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Stress management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Time management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOOLBOX**

*Keystone Coaching* has developed a toolbox (activities, questionnaires, assessments etc) which are designed to teach the workplace manager the above 5 SUPER SKILLS, namely self-awareness, understanding change, perfecting work-life balance, motivation and interrelatedness with their 17 subsections. The toolbox is focused on development of the individual and the team and can be adapted to the specific needs of an organization.