

**FRANTZ FANON AND CRITIQUE OF THE POST-APARTHEID SOUTH AFRICA  
IN RELATION TO SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

**MAANDA LUXIOUS NDHLOVU**

Submitted in accordance with the requirements for the degree of

**MASTER OF ARTS**

in the subject of

**DEVELOPMENT STUDIES**

at the

**UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AFRICA**

**SUPERVISOR: PROF. VUSI GUMEDE**

**CO-SUPERVISOR: PROF. TENDAYI SITHOLE**

## ABSTRACT

This study introduces the Fanonian thought on race and racism, rhetoric of modernity, and new humanism as three constitutive thematic areas in order to enable a new understanding of the South African situation. These thematic areas are examined with specific reference to socio-economic development within the limited context of post-apartheid South Africa. This is done by reading Fanon's text in the context of South Africa to provide the background against which the unfolding of the post-apartheid era and its political discourses may be analysed. In essence, this study is based on Fanon's predictions that he made in the text written more than 50 years ago about the future of post-colonial states. Therefore, this study argues that Fanon's thought has proven to be more prophetic with regard to post-apartheid South Africa and its political reforms which left the fundamental question of structures such as land, economy, and labour unaddressed. What happened on 27 April 1994 is not genuine liberation, but a mere transition from apartheid to democratic dispensation that left the status quo in spatial arrangements uninterrupted. Indeed, it was an elite pact between the African National Congress and white monopoly capital, which betrayed the national liberation movement and the black majority. The contention is that South Africa celebrated the cosmetic reforms that attributed the term liberation incomplete in the absence of fundamental and structural changes. What is therefore recommended is that for there to be success, there must be genuine liberation that is consistent with the needs of society. This means bringing to an end the racially marked structures and reimagining the black condition, through jobs, education, social and economic programmes aimed at empowering the black majority to depend on themselves as opposed to relying on the State.

**Key Terms:** Fanon, race and racism, modernity, new humanism, black condition, liberation

## DECLARATION

STUDENT NUMBER: 4867-837-6

I, MAANDA LUXIOUS NDHLOVU, declare that the dissertation – **Frantz Fanon and critique of the post-apartheid South Africa in relation to socio-economic development** – is my own work and that all the sources that I have used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by means of complete references.

May 2017

## **DEDICATION**

In memory of my late father

**CHARLIE JACKSON NDOU**

*(Birth and death date unknown)*

**ZODWA ADELATE NDOU**

This is dedicated to you my mother, with love. Even though I never got the opportunity to know you, this is for you for being my mother.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research dissertation bears my name as the author, but truly speaking, I am thankful to many people who have made it possible. Words are inadequate to express my deep gratitude to my supervisors, Prof. Vusi Gumede and Prof. Tendayi Sithole, for guiding me through this dissertation. Their empathy and support sustained me during difficult times when I wanted to give up. Prof. Gumede's broad experience and knowledge of social, economic, and political discourses in the South African context was very helpful. I am thankful to him for his tolerance, humility, guidance, and unwavering support which proved valuable in my study. A huge vote of thanks goes to Prof. Tendayi Sithole with whom I started the road to this study in 2012. I thank him for many things including introducing me to Fanonian Studies. His comments, critical analytic skills, and feedback have been pivotal in enabling me to advance the point of this study. He taught me much more than just how to write a dissertation by constantly teaching me critical reading skills, balancing the study, and maintaining consistency, all of which sharpened the thrust of this study. I really would not have made it through to the end of this study without the excellent supervision and support of both supervisors.

I am grateful to my grandmother, Maria Makwarela Ndou, Mma Peter, for being my pillar of strength. I am very grateful and thankful for your support. I thank you for raising me into the man I am today. I acknowledge the struggle you went through trying to prepare me for today. It was indeed a huge compromise to look after me. Your endless love has always been my pillar of strength! Thank you a million times, and may God be with you at all times!

A special vote of thanks goes to Prof. Mamokgethi Phakeng for encouraging me to finish this dissertation. The support I received from you was equivalent to that of a biological mother. I really appreciate and acknowledge the difference you have made in my life. You have always pushed and made me believe that I can make it through to the end of this dissertation.

I am also thankful to Mr Harry Bopape for his tolerance and allowing me a great deal of time and space to complete this dissertation in his Directorate: Research Support, as a director. His words of encouragement really made a massive difference to me. To the colleagues in the Directorate: Research Support, University of South Africa, thank you all for your patience with me whenever I came knocking on your doors seeking assistance. This study would not have been possible had it not been for your contributions in many different ways.

I also wish to acknowledge the involvement of friends and colleagues who made direct and indirect contributions and inputs. The list appears in no particular order because each contribution has been meaningful: Abinaah Rambau, Daniel Netshivhangani, Brian Mavhungu, Gidimisani Mashau, as well as the endless list of good people who cheered for me all the way, Tate Mulaudzi, Johanna Khomola, Owen Mahabeledzha, Kholofelo Ranjapedi, Mbavhalelo Ndou, Phylistus Mutholing, Leonard Munyai, Rachael Madzivhandila, Timmothy Makananise, Takalani Calvin Mudau, and Ndivhuwo Mashego. Thank you for your friendship, support, and discussions during my studies.

I will forever be grateful to Girls/Boys Town Kagiso Children's Home for recruiting me as a homeless child and adopting me as an orphan. A special thanks go to the management, youth care workers, cooks, cleaners, gardeners, security personnel, sponsors, and donors for their support and ensuring that the institution continues to exist as a home for homeless children. May God bless you all!

Above everything, thank you Lord for giving me life and making everything possible.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

<b>ABSTRACT</b> .....	<b>i</b>
<b>DECLARATION</b> .....	<b>ii</b>
<b>DEDICATION</b> .....	<b>iii</b>
<b>CHAPTER ONE</b> .....	<b>1</b>
INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1 BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY .....	1
1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT .....	2
1.3 AIM OF THE STUDY .....	2
1.5 RATIONALE.....	3
1.6 LIMITATIONS AND DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY .....	4
1.7 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY .....	4
1.8 CHAPTER OUTLINE .....	6
<b>CHAPTER TWO</b> .....	<b>7</b>
FRANTZ FANON: A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	7
2.1 INTRODUCTION .....	7
2.2 FANON ON RACE AND RACISM .....	7
2.3 FANON ON THE RHETORIC OF MODERNITY .....	13
2.4 FANON AND NEW HUMANISM .....	18
2.5 CONCLUSION.....	23
<b>CHAPTER THREE</b> .....	<b>25</b>
THE RELEVANCE OF FANON IN POST-APARTHEID SOUTH AFRICA .....	25
3.1 INTRODUCTION .....	25
3.2 POST-APARTHEID AND THE PITFALLS OF NATIONAL LIBERATION.....	26
3.3 THE LEGACY OF COLONIAL APARTHEID AND THE PROBLEM OF THE PRESENT.....	33
3.4 POST-APARTHEID AND THE MANICHEAN STRUCTURE.....	39
3.5 POST-APARTHEID AND THE STATE OF HYBRIDITY .....	46
3.6 CONCLUSION.....	54

<b>CHAPTER FOUR.....</b>	<b>55</b>
FANON AND THE PROBLEMS OF DEVELOPMENT IN THE POST-APARTHEID ERA .....	55
4.1 INTRODUCTION .....	55
4.2 THE UNRESOLVED LAND QUESTION .....	56
4.3 NATIONALISATION AND THE STRUGGLE FOR ECONOMIC FREEDOM.....	61
4.4 BLACK ELITES, BLACK ECONOMIC EMPOWERMENT, AND THE STATE....	72
4.5 STRUCTURAL VIOLENCE AND THE BLACK CONDITION .....	76
4.6 PARTY POLITICS AS A PREDICAMENT FOR THE NATIONAL PROJECT.....	80
4.7 CONCLUSION.....	84
<b>CHAPTER FIVE .....</b>	<b>87</b>
FANON AND THE QUESTION OF NEW HUMANISM IN SOUTH AFRICA.....	87
5.1 INTRODUCTION .....	87
5.2 FANONIAN HUMANISM AND POST-APARTHEID ERA .....	88
5.3 BIKO: THE QUEST FOR TRUE HUMANITY .....	92
5.4 SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC TRANSFORMATION .....	95
5.5 CONCLUSION.....	98
<b>CHAPTER SIX.....</b>	<b>100</b>
CONCLUSION.....	100
<b>LIST OF REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>106</b>

## CHAPTER ONE

### INTRODUCTION

---

#### 1.1 BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

This study uses the Fanonian thought in an attempt to understand the post-apartheid situation and primarily the unfolding of socio-economic development. More specifically, the study is concerned with three constitutive thematic areas that feature in Fanonian thought on race and racism, rhetoric of modernity, and new humanism to understanding the manner in which they exist and operate in the context of post-apartheid South Africa. These thematic areas are examined and explored with specific reference to socio-economic development within the limited context of the post-apartheid era in South Africa. What is engaged is the political discourse and changing aspects that inform a more significant part of the unfulfilled terrain of liberation. This is done by means of asking fundamental questions and rethinking the political landscape in which the socio-economic reality is (re)formulated, especially in the post-apartheid era.

The South African situation cannot be separated from the prophetic vision entrenched in the political thought of Fanon. This resonance finds meaning in the nature and form of the post-apartheid condition and primarily the socio-economic structure that the country inherited and resumed since the first democratic elections in 1994. Fanon's prophetic warnings about the future of African states were made more than 50 years ago, whereas South Africa attained democracy in 1994, and such is the relevance that this study seeks to establish as part of the contribution in this research. It is therefore the purpose of this study to introduce Fanonian thought on race and racism, rhetoric of modernity, and new humanism in an attempt to contribute to the alternative reading of the post-apartheid era as betrayal for its failure to reimagine the spatial arrangements imbedded in the socio-economic imbalances.

All three aforementioned thematic areas feature in Fanon's varied works and are deployed in this study for their relevance in South Africa, and specifically to advance the new reading of the post-apartheid reality. These themes are fundamental and helpful in understanding the dynamics in which the discourse on development is entrenched in various sections of society. Deploying Fanonian imagination, which centres on liberation, provides the potential to proceed from the legacy of apartheid to a fully liberated society, the post-apartheid era in South Africa

being the case. For that to materialise, a close reading of Fanon's work is engaged to bring on the fore the ideas that could propel the new thinking in relation to socio-economic transformation. This includes asking fundamental questions and rethinking the post-apartheid era and its political discourse against which the thinking of Fanon may be analysed.

## **1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT**

The study is concerned with Fanonian thought on race and racism, rhetoric of modernity, and new humanism in order to understand the terrain in which the post-apartheid era is (re)defined. In part, this entails the critical interrogation of the reality in which the socio-economic development is (re)formulated and primarily in relation to the black condition. This involves the alternative reading of Fanon and asking fundamental questions that challenge the discourse which dominates the political landscape of South Africa. The systematic deployment of Fanon's ideas in this study is the contribution that this research seeks to make to understanding the reality that features and prevails in various spheres of society. This contribution includes examining the political life of black people against the background in which the thinking of Fanon may be analysed. The problem engaged is the monolithic narrative which advocates the notion that freedom from apartheid oppression has been attained while the black majority remain marginalised and excluded from the entire project of socio-economic transformation. This fundamental problem is engaged in a manner that foregrounds Fanon's thinking and political life that reflects the struggle of the post-apartheid era in relation to socio-economic transformation.

## **1.3 AIM OF THE STUDY**

By linking Fanonian thought and South African discourses, the study aims to gain a deeper understanding of socio-economic development in the post-apartheid era. By illuminating what is entailed in socio-economic development, the study intends to locate that within the thinking of Fanon's ideas on race and racism, rhetoric of modernity, and new humanism, as analytical tools. In so doing, the study aims to consider another perspective of socio-economic development with the potential to reimagine another political life in the form of creating new forms of life in relation to the black condition. Moreover, the study also aims to highlight the relevance of Fanon in the political life of South Africa by pinpointing some existential struggles that informed his lived experience in the anti-black world, the post-apartheid era being the case that militates against the black life. Of critical importance in deploying Fanonian thought in

this study is the imagination to free the black body from the legacy of apartheid oppression, racism, violence, and even the pathological attachments of subjection that negates the emergence of the black life.

#### **1.4 RESEARCH QUESTION**

To what extent is Fanonian thought relevant to understanding the socio-economic development in post-apartheid South Africa? To unpack this question, the following sub-questions will be pursued:

- How relevant is Fanon's critique on race and racism, rhetoric of modernity, and new humanism to understanding the unfolding of the post-apartheid era?
- What is socio-economic development in relation to Fanonian thinking?
- Why is socio-economic development a challenge in post-apartheid South Africa?
- Does Fanon see it as something impossible to address or not?
- To what extent do Fanon's ideas on liberation serve as a remedy to socio-economic challenges in post-apartheid South Africa?

#### **1.5 RATIONALE**

There has been a plethora of interventions and analyses made in an attempt to understand the post-apartheid reality and primarily the unfolding of the socio-economic development since 1994. However, none has been more accurate than the prophetic articulations imbedded in the thought of Fanon. The framing of this study from Fanonian thought is important and aims to enable a new reading of the post-apartheid era as a failure on the part of black masses who have hoped that the rise of black administration to power in 1994 will translate into socio-economic transformation and new forms of life in relation to the black condition. The post-apartheid era is lauded as the achievement of the "new" South Africa, but this study argues that the country should instead be viewed as one with the potential to be liberated, since the black majority remains marginalised and excluded from socio-economic transformation.

The introduction of Fanon and his lens on race and racism, rhetoric of modernity, and new humanism as analytic tools of analysis in this study is helpful to understand the dynamics in which socio-economic reality exists and operates in South Africa. The contention here is that these aspects continue to shape and reshape the condition of the black majority who remain

marginalised and excluded from socio-economic and political transformation even in the post-apartheid era. Therefore, what is challenged is the very question that borders on the issue of development, and more specifically, on why the target of poverty, unemployment, and violence is always black people and not the whites or other racial groups. This will refer to various spheres of society and provide all possible examples that are dominating the public discourse to advance the relevance of Fanon's thought in as far as black condition is concerned. Fanon's relevance in the post-apartheid era is the contribution which this study seeks to make in development studies and frontier of knowledge. The nature of this research is something still new in development studies, and Fanon is well known for his contribution to African politics, and as such, this study brings an alternative reading of post-colonial state.

## **1.6 LIMITATIONS AND DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY**

The unfolding of the post-apartheid situation in South Africa encompasses a vast number of issues that cannot all be discussed in a single study of this nature. The nature and scope of Fanonian thought are also complex and open to diverse fields, understandings, and interpretations that cannot be manageable in this research. It was therefore necessary to limit and delimit this study to the three constitutive themes which feature in Fanon's thinking on race and racism, rhetoric of modernity, and new humanism. Focusing these three thematic areas to socio-economic development within the limited context of the post-apartheid era in South Africa makes this research more manageable and focused.

## **1.7 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

This study is not an empirical or experimental research where scientific methods and techniques are employed to determine the statistics. Rather, it is a theoretical and conceptual intervention where qualitative content analysis was used to closely examine the meaning of texts in a particular context, post-apartheid South Africa being the case. The qualitative content analysis has been applied before as a research approach to a variety of studies to allow for critical interpretation based on the knowledge the researcher brings to the research. "Qualitative content analysis is one of numerous research methods used to analyse text data" (Hsieh & Shannon 2005:1278). Elo and Kyngas (2008:107) posit, "content analysis is a method that may be used with either qualitative or quantitative data and in an inductive or deductive way". They stress that when using qualitative content analysis, the aim is to build a model to describe the phenomenon in a conceptual form. So, qualitative content analysis was used to read Fanon's

work, which was produced in text written more than 50 years ago, whereas the study is located in the post-apartheid era, which is the context. In a sense, this study was based on the relationship between text and context to establish the extent of Fanon's relevance in post-apartheid South Africa. This allowed for a critical interrogation of the reality in which the black condition exists and operates as an antithesis of black life in post-apartheid South Africa using Fanon's thought.

The content analysis method was used to analyse literature such as books, essays, and articles based on primary and secondary sources on Fanon's work. According to Lockyer (2008:2), "[t]extual analysis is a method of data analysis that closely examines either the content and meaning of texts or their structure and discourse". This text, as Lockyer (2008:2) stresses, 'can range from books, newspapers, television programs, and blogs, which are deconstructed to examine how they operate, the manner in which they are constructed, the ways in which meanings are produced, and the nature of those meanings'. This method, according to Elo and Kyngas (2008:108), allows the researcher to test theoretical issues to enhance an understanding of the data.

Fanon's contribution as a philosophical and theoretical thinker, social and political analyst, scholar, and analyst is well known through books such as *Black Skin, White Masks*, and *The Wretched of the Earth* that finds a place of reverence among the black majority in South Africa in relation to their existential conditions. Therefore, these books were analysed to gain insight into Fanon's perspectives as a sophisticated contribution to understanding the manner in which the socio-economic and political situation is shaped and reshaped in South Africa during the era that is called post-apartheid. Through content analysis method, it was possible to unravel the political discourses and ascertain the extent of Fanon's relevance that penetrates deeper into the South African situation. As Elo and Kyngas (2008:108) explain, "[t]hrough content analysis method, it is possible to distil words into fewer content related categories". The warnings and diagnoses made in *Black Skin, White Masks*, and *The Wretched of the Earth* were helpful to understanding the problematic nature of the post-colonial state, and particularly with regard to the question of national liberation.

A thematic analysis technique was used to unpack Fanon's themes in relation to race and racism, rhetoric of modernity, and new humanism as three main thematic areas featured in this research. Fanon's thinking was carefully examined in relation to the aforementioned themes, as they form a large part of liberation as a state of becoming a new society or being betrayed,

and these were examined in detail to bring to the fore the evidence that could advance the frontiers of knowledge. Their critical contributions have bearing on various spheres of society in the post-apartheid state setting, particularly the black condition, and were examined in more detail with possible examples to situate Fanon's ideas in the post-apartheid era in South Africa. Braun and Clarke (2006:6) define thematic analysis as "a technique for identifying, analysing, and reporting patterns (themes) within data". This research technique was helpful in that text was readily available and fast-tracked the data collection process and prevented ethical difficulties surrounding access. Moreover, this technique allowed for a close reading and analysis of texts and terms in which the post-apartheid reality is shaped and reshaped. However, the focus of this study was on selected themes and issues relating to race and racism, rhetoric of modernity, and new humanism within the limited context of the post-apartheid era using Fanonian thought.

## **1.8 CHAPTER OUTLINE**

Chapter One provides the introduction and briefly discusses the background of the research, problem statement, aim, research questions, rationale, limitations and delimitations, methodology, and chapter outline of the study.

Chapter Two provides a theoretical framework focusing on Fanon's theories to provide a foundation for this study. In short, this chapter foregrounds the study in Fanonian thought.

Chapter Three examines and explores the relevance of Frantz Fanon in the post-apartheid era. This is done through reading Fanon's text in the context of the post-apartheid era.

Chapter Four focuses on Fanon and the problematics of development in the post-apartheid era. The aim is to examine the socio-economic reality in which post-apartheid is (re)formulated.

Chapter Five relates to Fanon and the question of humanism in the post-apartheid era. This chapter discusses the possibility of Fanonian ideas to the extent that they can be applied in South Africa.

Chapter Six concludes the research by summarising five sets of conclusions that were reached through the three thematic areas that underpin the focus of this study.

## CHAPTER TWO

### FRANTZ FANON: A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

---

#### 2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides a theoretical framework for the study. It applies Fanonian thoughts with special reference to three thematic areas that feature in his thinking on colonial, liberation, and post-colonial condition. The first thematic area is race and racism, and it relates to Fanon's thinking on race as the organising principle of society and racism as the ideology that justifies socio-economic inequality, exploitation, and oppression. The second thematic area is the rhetoric of modernity. Fanon is a strong critic of modernity, as it has nothing to do with the freedom of the oppressed, a theme which is presented in relation to emancipatory projects that have the hidden agenda of colonial projects. Finally, the third thematic area is "new" humanism and relates to Fanon's thinking on the quest for genuine liberation. All these three thematic areas taken together represent the philosophy and ideological position of Fanon, with respect to the colonial, liberation, and post-colonial settings.

By applying Fanonian thought on race and racism, rhetoric of modernity, and "new" humanism as the theoretical framework in this study is helpful to understanding the political discourse which prevails in the post-colonial era. This chapter is also helpful in that it foregrounds Fanonian ideas in South Africa and provides the background against which his thinking may be analysed to understanding the South African situation. Understanding the dynamics in which race and racism, rhetoric of modernity, and "new" humanism exist and operate brings potential to creating and opening the space for human emancipation, especially in the context of South Africa where socio-economic transformation is still a dream. It is therefore imperative to embark this theoretical framework in order to understand the manner in which Fanon viewed the colonial condition and how that is relevant to understanding the South Africa situation.

#### 2.2 FANON ON RACE AND RACISM

The question of race and racism is still the problem at the heart of the post-colonial world. In the case of South Africa, this continues because of the legacy of apartheid, which remains strong even after the formal collapse of apartheid administration. Fanon's analysis of race and racism exposes the silent scandal that masks the entrenched racialised discourses in

development institutions, projects, and practices. According to Fanon (1967:32), “[t]o study the relations between race and racism is to raise the question of their reciprocal action”. For Fanon, race is an organising principle of society and racism is the ideology for justifying social, economic, and political relations. Fanon’s diagnosis of race and racism concerns the lived experiences of black subjects in the anti-black world. The anti-black world is simply a reference to the world and its societies that reject and exclude the black body from the project of humanity. Fanon is to a large extent a victim of racism and speaks from the perspective of the racialised by virtue of being black in the anti-black world.

There are three critical elements in Fanon’s theory of racialisation, namely, race as historically situated, race as culturally maintained, and racial constructions as imbedded in human ontology. Fanon states that race is a historically constructed phenomenon and a culturally mediated phenomenon. As Omi and Winant ([1984]2014:109) states, “racial formation is the sociohistorical process by which racial identities are created, lived out, transformed, and destroyed”. The white and black exist and operate through one another through the nature of their polarised relationship that creates and recreates the white superiority and black inferiority complex. Fanon suggests that this has multiple detrimental psychological effects. “For not only must the black man be black; he must be black in relation to the white man” (Fanon [1952]2008:82-83). Fanon ([1952]2008:82) states, “[a]s long as the black man is among his own, he will have no occasion, except in minor internal conflicts, to experience his being through others”. The essence of the black man is reduced to the biological – often singularly as being sexually powerful and athletic. This essentialised notion is tied to the idea that “Negroes are animals”. In Europe, as Fanon ([1952]2008:146) explains, “whether concretely or symbolically, the black man stands for the bad side of the character”. Centuries of white-black relations have complicated the black ontology to the point of being acted upon.

The black man, trapped in these racial images, enters into the consciousness, suppressed to the realm of the subconscious, and eventually emerged as a collective catharsis in a neurotic form (Hook 2004). “It is in this way that we better understand Fanon’s idea that in a colonial anti-black world the Black does not have ontological resistance or ontological weight in the eyes of the white” (Maldonado-Torres 2007:253). As Fanon ([1952]2008:36) explains, “... the black man cannot take pleasure in his insularity: [f]or him there is only one way out, and it leads into the white world”. Such notions, as Fanon tells, becomes the ‘dream of turning white’ – “that is, the wish to attain the level of humanity accorded to whites in racist/colonial contexts” (Hook

2004:117). The neurosis of blackness pushes down the mind and ability of the black body against self-invention. The purpose, borrowing from Mbeki's words, is:

... to weigh down the African mind and spirit, like the ton of lead that the African slave carries on her own shoulders, producing in her and the rest a condition which, in itself, contests any assertion that she is capable of initiative, creativity, individuality, and entrepreneurship. Its weight dictates that she will never straighten her back and thus discover that she is as tall as the slave master who carries the whip. Neither will she have the opportunity to question why the master has legal title both to the commodity she transports on her back and the labour she must make available to ensure that the burden on her shoulders translates into dollars and yen. (Mbeki 1998b)

Nazneen (2007:356) states, “[t]he poor material circumstances associated with the black body is not a natural consequence of his inferior status, but has the historical background”. Whiteness, according to Fanon, is internalised as “a symbol of purity, of justice, truth, virginity – it defines what it means to be civilized, modern and human” (Sardar [1952]2008:*xiii*). In contrast, “[b]lackness represents the diametrical opposite: in the collective unconsciousness, it stands for ugliness, sin, darkness, immorality, not recognised as human” (Sardar [1952]2008:*xiii*). However, it is at the social and economic level where the truth is produced, something which Fanon undertook to unmask and expose for what it is – white superiority and black inferiority. Theorising race is helpful to understand the systems of power that produce superiority and inferiority formations, such as in the case of South Africa where being white is associated with privilege and blackness with dispossession. Black subjectivities, as Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2011:2) explains, have resulted in “race been used not only to inferiori[s]e black people into damnes, but to deny their very humanity, so as to justify such forms of violence as slavery, colonial conquest, dispossession, imprisonment, rape, and killing”. Thus, the notion of people living according to races is common in South Africa.

Fanon (1967:32) maintains, “[r]acism is not the whole but the most visible, the most day-to-day and, not to mince matters, the crudest element of a given structure”. Race is static, but racism renews itself according to the changing dynamics of the society. Thus, racism has had to change its appearance to adapt to any socio-economic culture that informs it. In the case of South Africa, when racism was finally abolished in 1994, it had to undergo a process of modification to fit itself in the post-apartheid structures where it creates and recreates the

condition of superiority and inferiority. Often its existence is not visible because it is hidden but continues to produce the same effects of racism. As Sithole (2012:10) submits, “[i]n contexts where people declare that race does not exist or where racism is condemned, racism usually occurs in an institutionalised form”. Thus, it makes injustices and indignities of the black majority to be accepted, as the logic is institutionalised, naturalised, and normalised, to justify the socio-economic relations under the mask of negation that seeks to historicise, distort, and silence.

Fanon ([1952]2008:82) suggests, “every ontology is made unattainable in a coloni[s]ed and civili[s]ed society”. He posits, “[o]ntology – once it is finally admitted as leaving existence by the wayside – does not permit us to understand the being of the black man”. This situation takes the form of the black condition to allow dehumanisation, humiliation, and depersonalisation to take place on the black body, since dispossessed ontology accommodates and allows blackness to be inferiorised. The black condition is a condition that gives way to the black body being racialised, abused, and tormented, as blacks are regarded as objects, and not as subjects. The black body exists and operates in the anti-black world – a world where the black subject is not recognised as human, but rather an object that can be smashed or destroyed at any given moment. The anti-black world produces the black pain, suffering, and subjection that make it near impossible for black subjects to escape their indignities in the circle of oppression.

When you examine at close quarters the colonial context, it is evident that what parcels out the world is to begin with the fact of belonging to or not belonging to a given race, a given species. (Fanon 1963:40)

The point here is that race and racism gain meaning from each other through processes that place white people at the climax of racial hierarchy and blacks at the bottom of the ladder – thus “they are co-constituted as opposed to causally related” (Nazneen 2007:355). Neither race nor racism is the product or consequent of the other; rather, each is dialectically co-produced. The Manichean colonial structure ensures that places where white people live are developed, protected, and serviced, while places of blacks are underdeveloped, poor, and neglected. According to Fanon (1963:40), “[t]he originality of the colonial context is that economic reality, inequality, and the immense difference of ways of life never come to mask the human realities”. Race and racism is always the consequence: “you are rich because you are white, you are white because you are rich” (Fanon 1963:40). Thus, skin colour not only separates blacks from whites but also segregates the poor from the wealthy in the manner that produces

clearly demarcated racial formations. Hence, South Africa is one country where spatial arrangements and socio-economic imbalances are based on racial demographics – where blacks are the majority and poor, while whites are the minority but control the economic mainstream.

Talking about race and racism in South Africa is regarded as threatening the status quo in as far as the race relation is concerned. According to Hill (1997:71), “South Africa is a society over dominated and determined by race and racism as the organising principles of allocating power and social relations”. The dominance of superiority of the white race and the inferiority of blackness has resulted in a situation where the former dominates the latter in social and economic terms. This is continuing even in the post-apartheid era under the black political administration led by a black state president. Even poverty is radicalised in South Africa where development is predominantly white (Grosfoguel 2008). However, such complaints about the existence of racism are quickly dismissed on the basis that the country is in the post-apartheid era and led by a black president, as if the problems of structural violence and institutional racism will just end overnight. “While privately many will admit that race has ‘got something to do with it’, publicly there is almost total silence” (White 2002:407). Kothari (2006:9) states that silences about race and racism “mask the perpetuation of a raciali[s]ed discourse in development, its complicity with broader historical and contemporary racial projects and the effects of [racialisation] on the processes and consequences of development”. There is almost silence to confront the question of race and racism in development ideologies, institutions, and practices.

Sithole (2011:8) asserts, “[t]he hegemonic discourse in post-199 downplays race in the quick chase for nonracialism as if there are no problems that are confronting blacks who are trapped in the black condition”. This denialism is defended on the simple narrative that the post-apartheid era represents a free and open society where the notion of “rainbow nation” prevails to unite people along racial, social, economic, and political relations. This frontage gives a false sense that South Africa is a post-race state and development is taking place in non-racialised spaces and outside of racialised histories, while the opposite is actually the case. As White (2002:410) argues, “the secret of development’s power lies in its capacity to enlist others to its own agenda, so that they want what it claims to offer”. South Africa is trying to overcome the legacy of apartheid, but such an attempt is made impossible as a result of white power which seeks to historicise, distort, and silence the existential struggle of the black majority under the pretext that South Africa is at the post-racial context.

Manganyi (1973:4) states, “[a]ppearing together with the communications gap between blacks and whites has been the assault on national cohesiveness, which is progressively being replaced by polarisation in attitudes, interests and goals”. He contends, “[p]art of this polarisation is a result of the policies of separate development while the other should be associated with the development of the consciousness and solidarity” (Manganyi 1973:4). Such a development, as Manganyi (1973:4) stresses, “[w]ithin the South African context, the words ‘black consciousness and solidarity’ have come to be invested with so much that may be regarded as emotional, either in the pronouncements of its proponents or in the defensive reactions of the white public”. Therefore, it is imperative to understand the ontological and epistemic dimensions of racism, especially what they mean at social and economic levels, if a remedy to problems faced by the people is to be found. Thus the idea of race and racism in South Africa was introduced purely for social and economic reasons; hence, the phenomenon of poverty is also racialised in favour of white minorities.

Nazneen (2007:355-356) posits, “[a]lthough processes of raciali[s]ation may operate and manifest themselves differently over space and time, the notion that race is an organi[s]ing principle of social life can inform our understanding not only of national formations but also of global formations”. Fanon’s lens is helpful in that it enables different ways to conceptualise the social and economic realities that are proliferating in the post-colonial world. Sithole (2012:13) is of the view, “[a]lthough some claim that we live in a post-racial world, which means a world where race is considered irrelevant, blackness remains a predicament in terms of Fanon’s understanding of racism during and after colonialism”. Nazneen (2007:355) postulates, “[t]he systems of power that produced colonial formations have reformulated and, hiding behind the myth of neo-liberalism, are reproducing the same inequities”. The entire project of development continues to be maintained and sustained upon racialised structures, institutions, and processes inherited from the past; hence, the socio-economic imbalances remain the same.

Parris (2011:8) contends, “[t]he social and economic realities of colonialism that necessitates native poverty and degradation while ensuring imperial wealth and privilege, also contribute to the coloni[s]ed subject class inferiority complex; for a causal link is established between the impoverished material conditions of colonial oppression and the native’s identity as a [b]lack skinned coloni[s]ed subject”. It is the internalisation of race that concerned Fanon the most, which he wanted to address through a process that requires the liberation or what Thiong’o

(1986) calls *Decolonising the Mind*. According to Fanon ([1952]2008:4), “[w]hite men consider themselves superior to black men ... [b]lack men want to prove to white men, at all costs, the richness of their thought, the equal value of their intellect”. For blacks, the point is always about proving and living up to expectations.

Nursey-Bray (1980:137) suggests, “[t]he ideology of racism has to be confronted because it imprisons the natives within a value system that construes their identity in the negative terms of inadequacy and impotence”. He asserts, “[o]nce the spell of racism has been broken, once the relative autonomy of its ideological structures ceases to hold sway, only then can people assert their positive identity in a liberation struggle” (Nursey-Bray 1980:137). Fanon’s analysis of race and racism allows such conversation to take place in ways that create space and possibility for liberation, transformation, and emancipation. The legacy of the past is a reality, and to address this, Fanon argues for the destruction of the entire colonial structure. His imagination, among other things, is to liberate the black body from the forces of racism, oppression, and inferiority complex.

The next section theorises the reality and rhetoric of modernity in extension to the pathologies of subjection that continue to haunt the black body even in the post-colonial world. The point being argued is the fact that modernity owes its logic to coloniality of power where the darker side is always hidden (concealing violence, racism, and oppression) while displaying cosmetic features that have nothing to do with the existential struggle of black subjects on the other side.

### **2.3 FANON ON THE RHETORIC OF MODERNITY**

The conception of modernity is unpacked for the very purpose of unmasking and exposing the hidden agenda of modernity in the post-colonial world. Fanon is a subject with direct experience of modernity – thus he bears testimony to the darker side of modernity. This experience is informed by his lived experience as a black subject in the anti-black world where he was structurally positioned at the receiving end of racism, subjection, oppression, and him as a resisting subject informed by the spirit of liberation. Admittedly, Fanon’s work never engaged directly with the term modernity, but reading through the lines, *Black Skin, White Mask*, *Wretched of the Earth*, and *Toward the African Revolution*, his perspective on colonisation penetrates deeper into discourses of modernity – there is no modernity without coloniality.

Fanon uses “white” as a generic term for European civilisation and its representatives. In contrast, “black” refers to the non-West in general. According to Fanon ([1952]2008:66), “European civili[s]ation and its best representatives are responsible for colonial racism”. He maintains that race through racism places white man at the apex of power and is deeply Eurocentric. This goes hand in hand with the consequent racial economy where Europe and America are empires and Africa a dark continent that requires tutelage. For that matter, as Fanon ([1952]2008:113) writes, “the Savage are always symboli[s]ed by Negroes” and “the little white boy, becomes an explorer, an adventurer, a missionary”. The society is indeed the embodiment of these values about “white” and “black” prefigured across the world. Fanon emphasises this notion as follows:

The white family is the agent of a certain system. The society is indeed the sum of all the families in it. The family is an institution that prefigures a broader institution: the social or the national group. Both turn on the same axes. The white family is the workshop in which one is shaped and trained for life in society. (Fanon [1952]2008:115)

It is in this spirit of things, through dominance, Europe and America equated themselves with modernity. Therefore, Fanon’s lens is helpful to unmask the racialised forms of knowing and representation in development discourses. Escobar (1995:8) states, “[t]his regime of order and truth is a quintessential aspect of modernity and has been deepened by economics and development”. He submits that modernity discursively produces the third world as primitive and inferior, and accordingly as its object of study and intervention. This is implicitly tied to racialisation, where Western standards serve as the benchmark against which to measure the situation of Third World countries. For that matter, development discourses and institutions of power contained a geopolitical imagination that has shaped the meaning of development for more than four decades (Escobar 1995). As Grovogui (2001:429) correctly asserts, “[t]he reasons for the colonial conquest are political and economic, rather than humanitarian”. This often is accompanied by specific forms of violence justified in the name of securing national development, security, peace and cooperation, justice, and post-colonial modernisation.

Grovogui (2001) posits that to understand the forms of global distinctions that are exhibited in contemporary discourses and practices of international development, it is necessary to ascertain how certain people and places came to exemplify cultural adaptability, political competency, and modernity while other people in other places became the symbol of cultural inflexibility,

political dysfunction, and underdevelopment. It is to be found that these distinctions draw from discourses founded upon the historical classifications of people in racial terms ‘associated with practices such as slavery, servitude, and colonialism’. According to Quijano (2000:533), “[o]ne of the fundamental axes of this model of power is the social classification of the world’s population around the idea of race, a mental construction that expresses the basic experience of colonial domination and pervades the more important dimensions of global power”. Thus race and racism converged and established the two racial axis base on white superiorisation and black inferiorisation essentialised on the idea of development and modernisation.

The current configuration of the world is symbolized by the figure of America at the apex and that of Africa at the bottom of the racialized and capitalist hierarchies, of a world order. Such dark aspects of European modernity as the slave trade, mercantilism, imperialism, colonialism and apartheid bequeathed to Africa a convoluted situation within which the ‘postcolonial’ became paradoxically entangled with the ‘neocolonial’, to the extent that the two cannot be intellectually approached as mutually exclusive states of being. (Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2013:xi)

According to Kothari (2006:11), “[t]he racial categories used to legitimi[s]e conquest and exploitation generated forms of social relations based on hierarchy and superiority”. While modernity proposes to overcome problems of underdevelopment, why does it produce socio-economic relations that are unequal? In the case of South Africa, the challenge arises where there is an attempt at glorifying things that have a hidden agenda, which negates the existential struggle of the struggling black majority. What is not clear is how the democratisation and good governance claims have advanced the inclusive socio-economic transformation, let alone to clarify how the black condition must be addressed. The black condition is testimony to the fact that race and racism remain intact even in the post-apartheid era, where evidence lay bare on structures such as economy, land, and socio-economic inequalities that reflect the power of white monopoly capital. Fanon in Martinique found himself in a similar predicament where he was told that he is a free man but had nothing to show for his freedom. What is argued here is social, economic, political, cultural, and psychological freedom, all of which are a mere rhetoric of modernity in the absence of development and socio-economic transformation.

The problematic persistence of the black condition during the era of apartheid and after it exposes the scandal of modernity, particularly where it is claimed that South Africa is a

democratic, free, and open 'rainbow' society where race, colour, gender, and sex are all accommodated. If this narrative is indeed correct, why then are black people who constitute the political majority in economic and material terms dominated by the minority of white people in economic and material terms? Modernity is a lie that must be understood from the existential reality of the black majority that is trapped at the margins of society. As Sithole (2016:24) puts it, "Fanon's subjectivity is a rallying point of critique to account for the ways in which such a subject is positioned in the existential realm of anti-Blackness". The political life of blackness has been of concern to Fanon and continues to be problematic in post-apartheid South Africa. Modernisation and its representatives of democratisation and good governance have failed collectively to set free the black majority from pathologies of apartheid, including coloured people that are trapped under hellish existential conditions, which are perpetually worsening as the crisis of the liberal Constitution. If modernity was meant to address the problems of existence, why does it create inequality, injustice, and exploitation?

Maldonado-Torres (2007:244) points out, "[m]odernity as a discourse and as a practice would not be possible without coloniality, and coloniality continues to be an inevitable outcome of modern discourses". As pointed above, "[a] characteristic feature of this type of social classification is that the relation between the subjects is not horizontal but vertical in character" (Maldonado-Torres 2007:244). The discourse of rhetoric is central to European modernity. According to Tlostanova and Mignolo (2009:132), "coloniality is the hidden side of modernity – by writing modernity/coloniality we mean that coloniality is constitutive of modernity, and that there is no modernity without coloniality". Tlostanova and Mignolo observe:

Development' is a companion concept to modernity. 'Underdevelopment', however, is not the equivalent, in economic terms, to coloniality in historical and philosophical terms. Underdevelopment is what development proposes to overcome. In contrast, modernity does not propose to overcome coloniality, but rather 'tradition', 'barbarism', 'fanatic religious belief', and the like. Coloniality is indeed the hidden weapon behind the rhetoric of modernity justifying all kinds of actions, including war, in order to eliminate 'barbarism' and overcome 'tradition'. (Tlostanova & Mignolo 2009:132)

Tlostanova and Mignolo (2009) equate coloniality as unconscious, the hidden weapon of both the civilising and developmental mission of modernity that produces the evils of failed states, AIDS, poverty, corruption, and genocide. Kothari (2006:13) points to the fact that

“[d]ichotomies are also evident in the distinctions between ‘first’ and ‘third’ worlds, and are foundational to relations of international aid, institutions of development and discourses of intervention”. These are merely rhetorical devices that have nothing to do with justice, equality, and freedom if extended to the authentic socio-economic transformation. To criticise modernity means to be irrational in the order of things. Kothari (2006:13) states, “[d]iscourses of charity, humanitarianism and philanthropy further obfuscate raciali[s]ed ideas and the reproduction of colonial forms of knowing”. To make way for this rhetoric, Kothari (2006:13) contends, “[r]epresentations in development cooperation, aid and advocacy often utilize images of the third world as black, poor and tribal, and as a wasteland of limited resources”. In this form, the logic of its operation is hidden, but always continues to give effect to coloniality of power.

The current world system signifies the interdependence of modernity and coloniality, which have always been simultaneously at play. In the context of post-independent African states, Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2013:14) argues, “[w]hat Africans celebrated as independence was a myth taken for reality as invisible snares of coloniality of power were ignored, thereby denying the birth of a truly postcolonial African world”. This rhetoric persists through cosmetic changes such as the liberal Constitution, the Bill of Rights, a black president, and a national flag that are brought to light for public exhibition while the black condition remains uninterrupted. Post-apartheid South Africa and its political reform, in particular, is not consistent with genuine modernity due to its failure to clarify how the black condition must be addressed. It is a mere glorification of democracy and ‘rainbow’ nation with no reference to the question of existential freedom of the colonised, oppressed, marginalised, excluded, and condemned. The spatial patterns and socio-economic inequalities inherited from apartheid remain intact. What is to be made clear is that the rhetoric of modernity cannot be understood outside its own infrastructure: the coloniality of power.

Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2013:14) asserts, “[t]he main weakness of emancipatory projects is that they do not question the core logic of Western modernity that globali[s]ed Euro-American views of the world and that constructed a raciali[s]ed, hierarchical, hegemonic, patriarchal and capitalist global social system”. Beliefs and trust are confidently rested on Euro-American ideas, and as such, it implies that the African continent will remain in a permanent state of suffering and slave to the West. It seems to be a tendency of African thinking that when things are done using the Euro-North American policies and reforms, this will translate into tangible transformation. What is taken for granted is that policies and reforms may appear to be impressive, but the output part of them will still fail, since there is modernity without coloniality.

The next section focuses on Fanon and his thinking on new humanism. This borders on Fanon's theory to liberate the world from the forces of racism, dehumanisation, depersonalisation, humiliation, inferiority complex, and the pathological attachments of subjection that continue to haunt the black body even after the formal collapse of colonialism and the apartheid administration.

## 2.4 FANON AND NEW HUMANISM

Fanon declares that he writes for "new" humanism. His imagination, among others, was to free the black body from the forces of racism, oppression, inferiority complex, and the pathologies of subjection that continue to haunt the black condition even in the post-colonial era. Essentially, this means bringing to an end the anti-black world – thus restoration of African humanity and dignity, harnessing African dynamic cultures and values, epistemic freedom and intellectual hegemony, self-assertiveness and self-reliant, self-love and pride, return of land, and economic control to the peoples of Africa and Diaspora. Sithole (2016a:177) points out, "Fanon has been and continues to be an inspiration to the part of the world which still yearns for genuine liberation and which wants to rid itself of all the pathological attachments of subjection". Fanon's humanism is concerned with the existential condition of the black subjects who are at the receiving end of dehumanisation, humiliation, depersonalisation, and even death resulting from the fact of being black in the world. Mignolo (2000:xx) is of the view that Fanon's humanism can be thought of as the "theory arising from the projects for decoloni[s]ation of knowledge and being that will lead to the imagining of economy and politics otherwise". Thus,

It engages the needs and desires to enact the politics and ethics of liberation; it is way of life between languages: a dialogical , ethic, aesthetic, and political process of social transformation rather than *energeia* emanating from an isolated speaker. (Mignolo 2000:265)

In Fanon's ([1952]2008:1) writing on the creation of a "new humanism", one finds the following expressions: "Towards a new humanism ..." "Understanding among men ..." "Our colored brother ... Mankind ... To understand and to love ...". What matters is not the particularity of any specifications but rather a concrete understanding and respect of human life among humankind. Fanon (1967:246) maintains, "new humanism cannot do otherwise than define a new humanism both for itself and for others". He perceives the oppressor and

oppressed as both the victims of a cruel process. What Fanon is proposing is that both whites and blacks must be liberated from pathologies of superiority-inferiority complexes that go beyond race and racism. He calls for the rise of a new society and the creation of new beings based on free and open relations where prejudice based on race and racism is condemned to give effect to the meaning of humanism. As Naya (2011:21) asserts, “Fanon was reaching forward to a new form of humanism, one that would be more inclusive and which would reject the European Enlightenment model”. However, this humanism, Fanon warns, goes beyond the simplicity of slogans, flags, and political gestures that have nothing to do with the fundamental question of structural violence, institutional racism, and freedoms such as socio-economic transformation.

The post-apartheid era and its political reforms are regarded as the creation of the new society, but this cannot entirely be correct, as it has not produced new forms of life in relation to the black condition. For a new society to emerge, the black condition has to be reimagined, and the politics of race and racism have to be ended in structural, fundamental, and definite terms. According to Sithole (2011:2), “[a] new being should not be a contraction to society, but the embodiment of it. That is, the possibility of liberation aimed at resolving the black experience should be consistent with the spoils that come with liberation, the post-1994 being the case”. The South African situation, as Biko explains, is not what was desirable in post-1994 as far as the national project is concerned. He argues:

The integration [whites and black liberals] talk about is first of all artificial in that it is a response to conscious manoeuvre rather than to the dictates of the inner soul. In other words the people forming the integrated complex have been extracted from various segregated societies with their inbuilt complexes of superiority and inferiority and these continue to manifest themselves even in the “nonracial” set-up of the integrated complex. As a result the integration so achieved is a one-way course, with the whites doing all the talking and the blacks the listening. Let me hasten to say that I am not claiming that segregation is necessarily the natural order; however, given the facts of the situation where a group experiences privilege at the expense of others, then it becomes obvious that a hastily arranged integration cannot be the solution to the problem. It is rather like expecting the slave to work together with the

slave-master's son to remove all the conditions leading to the former's enslavement. (Biko [1978]1987:20-21)

For that matter, Sithole (2011:2) posits, “the post-1994 is experiencing the problematic of emancipation not liberation”. According to Sithole (2011:18), “Fanon did imagine another world, the world where the black will be human, and the human which realises humanity not as forms of gift from the master, but as a form of realising humanity as a result of pursuit and realisation of genuine liberation by the oppressed blacks themselves”. Fanon calls for the national consciousness and mutual recognition that lead to mutual ethics of recognition, respect, and humanity. However, this, as Fanon (1967:105) warns, “will not be conferred through the mercy and generosity of the white master”; rather, “liberation must be the work of the oppressed people”. This is opposed to what happened in South Africa where an elite pact between ANC, the apartheid regime, and white monopoly capital gave way for the post-apartheid and first democratic elections in 1994 that left the status quo the way it was before. Fanon (1967:105) submits, “[i]t is the colonial peoples who must liberate themselves from colonialist domination”. This requires the total destruction of the colonial and apartheid systems, including the mind of the oppressed, as well as structures of power such as land, economy, and spatial patterns that produce socio-economic inequalities.

This aforementioned world, which Fanon imagines, is yet to come into existence beyond the rhetoric of emancipation and pretences of modernity. Nayar (2011) postulates that despite Fanon's insistence on violence, violence must be seen as a means towards an end – humanist project. Despite violence, Fanonian humanism is authentic for building the dimensions of the universe, in what Mbembe and Posel (2006:283) term the critical cosmopolitanism – thus “reaffirming the values of humanism, the international project of human rights, and the idea of a politics born of reason, justice, and reconciliation”. Nayar clarifies how the Fanonian position towards the specific goals of new humanism can be understood:

The first goal is the overthrow of the colonizer ... The violence is embedded in the dialectic of master-slave, where the only means to attaining selfhood the dehumanized slave has is violence because it is the only language of colonial relations. This is the violence of the anti-colonial struggle during the course of which the context for the second goal of this violence is also generated. (Nayar 2011:22)

Nayar continues:

This second goal is of the colonized's self-realization and the retrieval of subjectivity – a goal that Fanon sees as possible only through violence. This retrieved subjectivity, dignity and identity, for Fanon, quite possibly leads to death and annihilation. But this annihilation would be one of choice and selfhood rather than abjection, with Fanon arguing that he would be willing to accept 'dissolution'. (Nayar 2011:22)

All the two modes of violence, as Nayar (2011) explains, lead to the genuine liberation that Fanon finds to be the concrete expression of self-realisation and self-pride that lead towards genuine humanity. Maldonado-Torres (2017) is of the view that Fanon's new humanism penetrates deeper into the lived experiences of the oppressed. Fanonian humanism, as Maldonado-Torres (2017:435) elaborates, "seeks to identify the basic components of an attitude that can lead human beings to become agents, both in thinking and practice, in a context that persists in understanding and organi[s]ing humanity in terms of the production of boundaries that segregate human beings and that deprive subjects and groups of a proper experience of spatiality, temporality, and intersubjective relations". Fanon's attention is an indispensable part of re-evolution that constitute the reintroduction of humans into the life of the racialised, colonised, oppressed, and society that is conducive to intersubjective interactions beyond coloniality and all kinds of racism, bias, and oppression (Maldonado-Torres 2017).

The post-apartheid and its political reform in South Africa is lauded as 'rainbow' nation, non-racialism, constitutional, free and fair elections, and freedom and equality; all these attribute the Fanonian terms of humanism – a contradiction or something yet to be realised. As Sithole (2011:19) maintains, "[t]his will not continue indefinitely and for the rainbow to transform there should be incentives to think in unitary terms". Fanon's humanism arises from a necessary condition informed by the liberated bodies, minds, and spaces where people live. South Africa is still in need of humanism, and Fanonian haunt stands on the basis that the legacy of apartheid continues to plague the black body as a general target of racism. According to Ranuga (1986:182), "Fanon was and still is greatly preoccupied with ism, the paralyzing inferiority complex of blacks and their abject of whites as their role model". The imaginations of Fanon, according to Ranuga (1986:182), "were aimed at the physically and mentally coloni[s]ed to rise up and retrieve their self-esteem, dignity and freedom and thus resume their rightful place as respectable members of the World community". Thus, he argues that black people have to

realise that the fear to rally and confront the cause of their oppression is a direct product of racial superiority and socio-economic ascendancy whites had acquired throughout the colonial period. Wright (1992:428) posits, “[t]he sources of this alienation is in part the result of the cultural impact of colonisation and the acceptance and adoption of the culture of the coloniser”. To overcome this alienation, Ranuga (1986:183) contends, “Black consciousness is an ideal that must be pursued relentlessly and ultimately realized by black”. This means resisting whiteness that minimises the significance of black humanity, pride, and self-love – all of which advance the project of humanity in Fanonian terms.

Fanonian humanism calls for self-activity and self-bringing forth of liberty as the phenomenology of liberation (Gibson 2011c). This is not romanticisation in the words of the African past, but a new era where the oppressed become equal members in the community of humanity. According to Gibson (2011c:2), “[t]he beginning of a new being emerges in a violent rupture with the past”. Gibson (2011c:3) points out, “Europe had to be left not because it [is] materialistic, but because its materialism [i]s based on alienation and separation, on the expropriation, exploitation, and indeed murder of humanity”. The precondition for liberation is that the oppressed must determine their own forms of life and society, rather than it being imposed on them. This means it will be consistent with the national liberation that embodies freedom, justice, and equality with regard to the question of existential rights such as social, economic, cultural, material, and political freedoms. Thus, a truly liberated society exists to the degree to which the meaning and application of freedom, justice, and equality are lived by the oppressed as part of the new dispensation. Freire (1972:2) states, “[t]rue generosity consists precisely in fighting to destroy the causes which nourish false charity”. According to Freire (1972:2), “[i]n order for this struggle of human emancipation to have meaning, the oppressed must not in seeking to regain their humanity (which is a way to create it), become in turn oppressors of the oppressors, but rather restorers of the humanity of both”. In most post-colonial African states, there is a tendency of seeking revenge, and this stands in contrast to Fanonian humanism. As Fanon (1963:311) puts it, the liberated must “leave their dreams and abandon old beliefs and friendships from the time before life began”.

Gordon (2000:267) states, “[l]iberation is a teleological concern, a concern about purpose, a concern about ought and whys”. The requirement for liberation is that the oppressed must confront their oppressive reality. Fanon’s new humanism is a call for the renewal of the world. Fanon brings out that the limited objective that the oppressed set for themselves must turn out

the immensity of the task of national reconstruction. The struggle for liberation often falls short, as the liberated become new oppressors. Fanon calls for total liberation, which is informed by the instances where both the oppressor and oppressed are liberated. Thus, he argues that the struggle for liberation must undergo a deep process of modification towards the realisation of genuine humanity. Mngxitama (2010) says that South Africa has always provided a paradox when coming to this question because of fearing to confront white supremacy. According to Mngxitama (2010:9), “[e]very generation must among other important questions, consider afresh the questions so eloquently posed by Fanon”. He further postulated that the post-apartheid era is merely an occasion to conveniently invent blacks as new exploiters and whites as victims of oppression. Fanon’s new humanism is still unborn in South Africa where whites and blacks are still living in spatial arrangements and separate developments.

## **2.5 CONCLUSION**

This chapter provided a theoretical framework for the study and presented Fanonian thought with specific reference to three themes that feature in his thinking. The first of these thematic areas was Fanonian thought on race and racism, and this argued that the question of race and racism continues to trouble the post-colonial world. It was also contended that although the processes of race and racism exist and operate differently over time and space, the notion that they constitute the organising principles of society never changes. It is clear that problems of social, economic, and political inequalities that are haunting the post-colonial world are largely instigated by the workings of race and racism as organising principles of the colonial society. To bring to an end these racialised discourses in development, there should be a clear understanding of the untransformed structures and overhauling them in fundamental terms.

The second theme focused on the rhetoric of modernity. In this regard, through Fanon’s perspectives, it was posited that there seems to be a glorification of things having the hidden agenda of the colonial project. In the case of post-apartheid South Africa, as argued, there is a tendency of thinking that when things are done using institutional reforms and mechanisms, they translate into success. Fanon is concerned about the problems of complacency, and in this chapter, he warned the oppressed to be perpetually on guard against the hidden agenda of modernity, which has nothing to do with emancipation of black people except perpetuating their oppression, as has been the case in South Africa.

The final theme was based on new humanism, which was presented with specific reference to Fanon's thoughts on the creation of the new world, the new society, and the new beings. The theme touched on a number of aspects which are of great concern to Fanon, but also potential solutions were suggested. The imagination of Fanon, among other things as discussed, is that of restoring the humanity and dignity of the oppressed through the ending of the current world, but not in literal terms, but rather by freeing the black body from the forces of racism, oppression, an inferiority complex, and even the pathological attachments of subjection. This theme was rounded off by the idea of Biko's Black Consciousness as a critical tool to advance true humanity. The argument included issues of land ownership and economic control as devices of black power and the restoration of black communities.

## CHAPTER THREE

### THE RELEVANCE OF FANON IN POST-APARTHEID SOUTH AFRICA

---

#### 3.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter is concerned with the relevance of Fanon's ideas to understanding the South African situation and primarily the unfolding of post-apartheid realities. It draws from Fanon's pertinent themes that invariably resonate with the realities in which the post-apartheid era is reformulated. This will refer to various spheres of society and use all possible examples to bring to the fore the evidence that could advance the extent of Fanon's relevance. In a sense, this chapter attempts to read Fanon's text in the context of South Africa to determine whether or not his ideas are indeed fundamental to understanding the South African situation. This will include asking critical questions and rethinking the changing aspects informed by political life in the post-apartheid era using Fanonian lenses. The purpose is to provide a broader sense of the manner in which liberation as a state of becoming a "new" society was betrayed or successfully accomplished by the national liberation movement.

The chapter is presented with five thematic areas in which the post-apartheid era is (re)formulated – namely, post-apartheid and the pitfalls of national liberation, the legacy of colonial apartheid and the problem of the present, post-apartheid and Manichean structure, post-apartheid, and the state of hybridity. These themes are relevant and helpful in understanding the dynamics in which the socio-economic reality of South Africa exists and operates. What is argued is that Fanon's thought constitutes a spectre that haunts, and his relevance finds a place of belonging among the marginalised and excluded black majority who are longing for genuine liberation. This chapter will be helpful to understanding the misadventures that form a large part of liberation, especially in the post-apartheid era. However, this chapter also fleshes out the extent to which the notion of race and racism, and rhetoric of modernity are foregrounded in the post-apartheid era and its political discourses.

### 3.2 POST-APARTHEID AND THE PITFALLS OF NATIONAL LIBERATION

The South African situation since 1994 cannot be separated from the prophetic warnings of Fanon. The failure of national liberation to free the black majority from the forces of racism, oppression, and exploitation was and still is a great concern to Fanon. To amplify this, More (2011:173) argues, “[i]t has been 50 years since Fanon made his predictions about the future of post-independent African states, and despite the existing evidence of their almost correctness and precision, South Africa, being the last African state liberated from the clutches of apartheid colonialism, has failed to learn from Fanon and avoid the pitfalls of the national bourgeoisie of post-independent African states”. This situation is happening because the country’s transition from apartheid to democracy was a mere transition from apartheid to constitutional democracy, which left apartheid structures and the black condition uninterrupted.

Fanon ([1952]2008:169) maintains that in a situation where freedom is granted without “open conflict between white and black”, that freedom amounts to neo-colonialism and slavery. Likewise, in the case of South Africa there were never open conflicts between the apartheid regime and nationalists; hence, the country’s situation is still haunted by the legacy of apartheid which prevails even in the post-apartheid era. As Sithole (2011:3) amplifies, “[a]s an elite project, the national liberation struggle underwent embourgeoisment and systematical liberal disciplining which culminated into a negotiated settlement”. The negotiated settlement between the African National Congress (ANC) and white monopoly capital is where the national liberation was betrayed to allow for the elite pact that has nothing to do with the plight of the black majority. The post-1994 democratisation, as Sithole (2011:3-4) explains, “made way for the illusion of liberation which featured formalistic bourgeois freedoms like the bill of rights, all race elections, a black political administration, Truth and Reconciliation Commission are some of the things that inform the so-called success of the post-1994 era”. For that matter, South Africa can best be regarded as a country that has potential for liberation, not one that is fully liberated, as that claim will render it incomplete of liberation.

The South African reality can be traced back to the distinction that Fanon makes between true liberation and pseudo-independence, or flag freedom. The former emerges from the process of land restoration, economic control, and total destruction of the colonial system through violent struggle, whereas the latter is the product of a negotiated settlement between the nationalist leaders of the colonised and the colonisers (Fanon 1967). Fanon (1967:105) asserts, “liberation must be the work of the oppressed people”. To bring about liberation, he stresses that it is the

oppressed that must liberate themselves as opposed to situations where freedom is given through the mercy of masters because that amounts to false freedom as has been the case with South Africa. To amplify this, More (2011:174) submits, “[t]he gift of humanhood without a struggle still constitutes the slave as a slave since he/she has not attained independent self-consciousness and thus remains dominated by the master”. Most African states are unfortunately still far from being truly liberated, as flag independence and self-destruction seem to be common sense in almost all post-colonial African states.

Fanon (1967) avows that before genuine freedom can be achieved, there must be a revolution between the oppressor and oppressed to affirm cooperation, mutual respect, and dignity between two self-consciousnesses. Therefore, in a situation such as South Africa’s where the open conflict never took place in its full expression, the result has been the advent of neo-apartheid and structural violence informed by land dispossession, economic marginalisation, and loss of humanity. This is something always to be expected in a situation where freedom was conferred through the mercy and generosity of white master rather than a fully fledged rebellion waged by the oppressed themselves. As if Fanon had post-apartheid South Africa in mind, he argues, “One day a good white master who had influence said to his friends, [Let’s be nice to the nigger],” and that is how freedom was simply granted (Fanon [1952]2008:171). True to what has happened in South Africa, Frederick de Klerk, the last apartheid president, simply told Nelson Mandela that “you are now free”. This announcement was followed by jubilation of celebrations and first democratic elections on 27 April 1994 that brought ANC into power. What was celebrated is a contradiction that attributes the term liberation incomplete in as far as genuine liberation is concerned because the gift of freedom without conflict amounts to nothing more than a simple gesture. Ndlovu-Gatsheni emphasises this point as follows:

In 1910 [South Africa] gained what can be correctly termed ‘colonial independence’ (independence without decolonization). Hence the black indigenous people remained dominated and exploited. In 1994, South Africa gained liberal democracy without decolonization. Again the indigenous black population found itself still languishing at the bottom of racial/ethnic hierarchy. Even politicians within the African National Congress (ANC) did not talk about ‘independence day’ but about ‘freedom day.’ Whose freedom remains a key question. (Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2013:142)

Unfortunately, South Africa has not managed to escape the reality that it was never liberated from the entrapment of apartheid. What is often presented is a false sense of freedom that hides behind the political reforms and cosmetic changes that have nothing to do with inclusive socio-economic transformation. The black majority remains marginalised and excluded from the post-apartheid project because the “independence” that was conferred is about moving from apartheid to democracy without interrupting the status quo in the economic mainstream and means of production under white monopoly capital. The other word that can best be used to describe the South African situation is emancipatory project, which is about continuation and crisis in as far as the black condition is concerned. The black majority remains marginalised and excluded from inclusive social and economic transformation, since emancipation proposes nothing to do away with the black condition. Sithole (2011:13) postulates, “[t]he logic of repetition without difference which then means those who are leading liberation become oppressors has been a major pitfall”. There seems to be a tendency of thinking that when a president of a country is a black person, that would automatically translate into a liberated state. In a sense, South Africa is experiencing the problems of emancipation because of the very fact that the country’s historical past is still closely bound with the present.

South Africa’s situation is very much similar to other African states that have failed to learn from Fanon’s prophetic warnings and avoid the pitfalls of liberation. Thiong’o (1986:7) correctly points out, “[t]o the majority of African people in the new states, independent did not bring about fundamental changes”. South Africa’s situation leaves much to be desired in terms of the black political administration that succeeded the apartheid regime, which upon coming to power did not seek to overhaul the colonial structures, but instead inherited the machine of exploitation and continued where the apartheid regime had ended. The administration embraced the apartheid structures and values of apartheid administration, which is to say that there was never a radical break from the legacy of apartheid, which remains entrenched in racially marked structures and ideologies of racism that continue to marginalise and exclude the black majority. Seekings emphasises this situation as follows:

The post-apartheid government inherited institutions and policies that made up a ‘distributional regime’ that was never intended to be pro-poor. Neither the enfranchisement of the poor through democratic elections nor the sometimes pro-poor rhetoric or intentions of political elites has been

sufficient on its own to transform this distributional regime. (Seekings 2014:1)

Seekings (2014) attributes the reason for the foregoing to black political administration, which upon coming to power sought to advance its interests, through demanding minimum reforms in existing institutions and policies while blocking major reforms. This outcome is not what the ANC promised South Africans during the struggle for national liberation. Rather, it promised to prioritise the land question, economic control, and transformation that were to become the pinnacles of liberation success in South Africa. Indeed, just as Fanon imagined (1963:150), ‘nationalist parties that mobili[s]e the people with slogans of independence, when they are questioned on the economic program of the state “they are incapable of replying, because, precisely, they are completely ignorant of the economy of their own country”’. Such is the current reality that is occurring in full concrete expression of betrayed liberation premised on multiple layers of denialism. In its campaign leading up to the first democratic election in 1994, the ANC promised to liberate black people from racial discrimination, oppression, and poverty that have been a defining feature in the face of South Africa. However, all these promises soon fell aside when ANC came to power and ignored the prophetic warnings of Fanon.

The idea of liberation that was expected to set free the black majority from entrapment of violence, blackness, and subjection were soon captured by neo-apartheid and imperatives that disciplined the process of liberation and redirected it into emancipatory reforms. Neo-apartheid refers to a new form of apartheid that rests with structures and racial ideologies under the current dispensation of black imagination and leadership. Characteristics of neo-apartheid state, among other things, are featuring black faces at the top of political power (including the presidency), black subjection, criminalisation, victimisation, poverty, and many more, that symbolise the state of black suffering. As Grosfoguel (2008:615) contends, “a neoapartheid form of democracy is where the demographic majorities are politically excluded and disempowered and a demographic minority rules the country”. In this situation, even poverty is racialised and reserved for blacks who are always the target of structural violence.

Having black presidents such as Nelson Mandela, Thabo Mbeki, or Jacob Zuma as the faces in the top of the administration does not mean apartheid has ended, neither does it represent significant social and economic change for the black majority from discriminated populations. Thus, the notion that South Africa is at the post-apartheid era can be regarded as mythology to

those still waiting for change in relation to their black condition. The same applies to the rhetoric of a rainbow nation and non-racialism, which give the pretention that freedom has been attained when it has not. Sithole (2011:1) argues, “in terms of the post-1994 being declared a rainbow nation it should, instead, be declared the one that is pregnant with the possibility of being liberated since the black condition remains”. True to this, if South Africa was indeed a post-apartheid state or rainbow nation as claimed, why then do the hellish black conditions still exist? It is this predicament that exposes the lie that the national project has been materialised when the black majority is still languishing in township and squatter camps with no electricity and running water. Cosmetic changes on top of government are not what were desired by the liberation struggle, but instead what was desired was a complete liberation in social, economic, and political terms where blacks are in command of the economy.

The political party may well speak in moving terms of the nation, but what is a concern is people who endure the most from the apartheid legacy (Fanon 1963:207). “Declaring apartheid unlawful and unconstitutional does not mean that the racially marked infrastructure and entrenched technologies of racism will just end when the black political administration like the ANC assumed power” (Sithole 2011:4). The reality that continues to intensify the black dispossession, racism, and oppression is the enduring legacy of apartheid put in place during the apartheid era and perpetuated by the ANC government in the post-apartheid era. This lays bare in spatial patterns of socio-economic development that continues to be skewed in favour of white minority and black marginalisation. It is for this reason that South Africa can be described as a neo-apartheid state for its failure to bring to an end the structural violence that continues to place the black majority under the dominance and oppression of the white minority.

The post-apartheid era exists as that which is absent. Thus, it exists as an idea of a liberated state, but in actual fact that liberation does not exist. The fact that the likes of Steve Biko, Tsietsi Mashini, Marcus Motaung, Jerry Mosololi, and Simon Mogoerane while others were incarcerated for a long time, including Nelson Mandela who was jailed for 27 years, does not mean that South Africa is a liberated state (Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2013). As Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2013:12) posits, “[d]espite the sacrifice of these people postcolonial Africa is still far from being truly freed; if anything, it has merely entered into another phase in the colonial continuum”. Therefore, what exists as a post-apartheid state is characterised by a lack of existence in its full presence. This situation propels the need to explain why liberation has

escaped South Africa despite the sacrifices made during the anti-apartheid struggle. This has to do with the fact that instead of the oppressed taking full and effective charge of the birth of a fully liberated and open society, the post-apartheid democratisation and its pacification process was overseen by individuals who lacked the capacity and political will to imagine the political life of the black majority.

What is argued here is the fact that though post-apartheid era is regarded as a “new” society following its political independence, it has failed to bring new forms of life in relation to the black condition. In this condition, black people were left abandoned and open to all kinds of oppression, both in a raw and explicit form, recreated by the very pathologies of apartheid. Gumede (2016:20) maintains, “[t]he very creation of a post-apartheid society was premised on various forms of discrimination, and from 1948 to 1994, these forms of discrimination remain[ed] systematic and comprehensive”. This condition, as Gumede explains, even date back to the arrival of the European settlers in 1652, where colonialism, later succeeded by apartheid, started. In the post-apartheid era, those belonging to the black majority still find themselves marginalised and excluded from the whole project of humanity in terms of social and economic development. Unfortunately, there has not been enough effort to trace these pathologies using a Fanonian lens that provides the revolutionary tools to bring to an end the pathologies of apartheid that remain entangled within structures such as land, economy, and property.

The legacy of apartheid has strengthened and perpetuated the black condition including issues of economic and social development as well as the notion of optimism for the future. While the term postcolony might sound convoluted, it best captures a complicated terrain of liberation that gave birth to a problematic moment in which South Africa finds itself in the post-apartheid era. Postcolony – a reference to the pre-colonial, colonial, and post-colonial Africa in one historical juncture – is to say that South Africa’s present is haunted by its apartheid past (Mbembe 1992). The South African situation in its current reality and, by extension, the black condition is the lived reality in the postcolony. At the core of postcolony, the envisioned idea of liberation was submerged with emancipatory reforms resulting in myths of independence and illusions of freedom. Therefore, at the heart of this entrapment lies the need to liberate; Fanon provides the correct revolutionary tools to do that.

Fanon’s imagination of liberation is the realisation of new humanity, which in the context of South Africa will translate into a “new” society. The current path in South Africa is not heading

towards the direction of realising the liberation of freedom, justice, and equality extended to the comprehensive social and economic transformation, but a tragedy resulting from the paralysis of the black political administration. Theirs does not aim to bring new forms of life in relation to black condition but to reform the anti-black structures that perpetuate the black condition. “It is such imagination which makes liberation to be an illusion since it intends to only reform the colonial infrastructure instead of dismantling it” (Sithole 2011:19). It is not surprising that blacks constitute a political majority but are inferior in economic terms to the white minority, who are in control of economic mainstream. The black condition, which is not what was desirable in a post-apartheid state, explains the very fact that apartheid was reformed on the basis that its legacy is continued by this pseudo-liberation (Sithole 2011).

The post-apartheid situation cannot be distanced from the prophetic warnings of Fanon, and such a state is the exactness of what he imagined it to become – a neo-apartheid state and complicated terrain of unfulfilled liberation premised on freedoms and rights of individuals. For there to be liberation, the blackness found in the loss of land, economic control, and humanity should not just be reimagined but must be reformed on the basis of liberation consisting of the black experience (Mngqxitama 2009). This includes the racially marked infrastructure; it should not just vanish but destroyed in fundamental and structural terms. A situation that must prevail is where freedom, justice, and equality are afforded to all as opposed to being reduced to mere pronouncements of national anthems, slogans, flags, symbols, public holidays, fake freedoms that propagates civil rights, and economic freedom, while the status quo remains intact. The post-apartheid era must accommodate the black majority (not just individuals connected with the ruling party) and give possibilities to reimagine the black condition in fundamental terms consisting of economic rights, justice, and reparations.

The post-apartheid in its current lexicon entrench fake promises repeated over and over again rather than giving birth to genuine freedom that addresses the lived experience of the black majority who are still trapped in the hellish black condition. What is not clear is at whose interest the post-apartheid era stands. The evidence of the past two decades (since the dawn of democracy) reveals that whatever its logic may be, the power of falsification derives from its impervious ties with the apartheid past of racial discrimination, suffering, and victimisation of blacks. There is a need for liberation, not the gestures that give pretention that all is fine with the black condition when the black majority is still marginalised and excluded from the national project. The systematic deployment of Fanonian thought is testimony to the fact that South

Africa needs liberation, not emancipation that dilutes and limits the possibilities of genuine liberation.

### **3.3 THE LEGACY OF COLONIAL APARTHEID AND THE PROBLEM OF THE PRESENT**

The question of the apartheid past constitutes the spectre that haunts South Africa even in the post-apartheid era. This continues because of the legacy of apartheid which was left uninterrupted during the elite pact that resulted in post-apartheid democratisation. South Africa is trying to move beyond the history of apartheid past, but little is made to trace and understand the current problems within the context of the apartheid past. The focus is often on peripheral things such as corruption, nepotism, and implementation that downplay the significance of the pathologies of apartheid in the post-apartheid era. It is a conundrum that seems to escape the critical analysis whenever the South African situation is examined in relation to its socio-economic and political realities. Fanon (1967) did warn about post-colonial African states that behave as if they are dealing with an enemy that they defeated on the battlefield. Implicit in this warning is that the post-apartheid era is still very much entangled in apartheid forces that are preventing it from giving birth to a “new” South Africa as an envisioned idea of national liberation.

More (2014:3) states, “[t]o understand Fanon’s serious concerns with apartheid South Africa, we need to first briefly rearticulate that very system itself”. “In practice and theory, apartheid is a colonialist, capitalist, religious and racial ideology designed to ensure the domination and subjugation of the majority of black people by the minority white European settlers” (More 2014:3-4). More (2014) posits that to most people who did not live under the apartheid era or experience its direct reality, apartheid means something different from the experiences of those who lived and were victims of it. The nature of the post-apartheid state that was inherited from apartheid is itself the logic of apartheid which intends to marginalise, exclude, and continue where the former has paused. The post-apartheid era is premised on various forms of apartheid – “the most vicious forms of labour exploitations in the history of capitalism” (Hirsch 2005:26). During the apartheid era, the distribution of goods and services to the society was allocated on the basis of race, to eliminate competition between white and black populations. The legacy of apartheid in the post-apartheid era ensured that these patterns remain uninterrupted.

What is little known in public discourse, and should be emphasised with much clarity, is that the elite pact and democratisation process involved a degree of compromise that postponed fundamental issues, many of which did not take into account apartheid's real strength and untapped power. It is in this context that South Africa finds itself in this complicated terrain of myths and empty freedom resulting from the loss of economic freedom, reparative justice, and transformation. It is agreed that any liberation project, as Gumede (2015:1) explains, 'has to primarily deal with social and economic inclusion, especially in the South African context'. He stresses that the question of development remains germane for South Africa for many reasons. In analysing development, Gumede (2015:1) submits, "inclusive development remains shallow in South Africa". According to this, he argues that some of the reasons are owing to inappropriate policies and subversive reforms that have limited the pace of development since 1994. This might well be true, but very significantly is the loss of liberation that was betrayed during the process of negotiated settlements.

Fanon (1963) states that it is necessary to recall the apartheid existence and compare it with the post-apartheid situation. He maintains that if these two eras are examined closely, "we will at least be able to reveal the lines of force it implies" (Fanon 1963:37-38). South Africa since 1994 has not managed to escape the 'divide and rule' system which was put in place by the Dutch and British settlers long before the Afrikaner Nationalist Party introduced the word "apartheid" in 1948. For the mere fact that blacks still constitute the political majority outside the economic mainstream, that on its own is definitional to the fact that the legacy of apartheid still haunts South Africa. The legacy of apartheid continues to unfold in the post-apartheid era, and this indicates that there has never been a radical break from the past, which changes to suit contemporary conditions. For instance, during the apartheid era black people were discriminated, oppressed, inferiorised, and now in the post-apartheid era, they remain dispossessed, limited, and restricted from inclusive socio-economic development.

Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2013:67) posits, "[t]he post-1994 South African situation speaks volumes about how the liberation movement was disciplined into an emancipatory force that finally celebrated the achievement of liberal democracy instead of decoloni[s]ation and freedom". He argues that this gave victory to liberal democracy and corporate markets rather than nationalists or serving the interests of society. According to this, it resulted in a false sense of freedom for oppressed black people who were emancipated rather than liberated to the extent that they continued to languish at the bottom of the racial hierarchy. Emancipatory process is a creation

of Western modernism, not an African idea, and it is about attaining civil, political rights only. It does not propose liberation, or clarify how the black condition will be resolved; it only presents sets of rights. The results of this are civil rights and petitions that take away the urgent nature of the demands for freedom, equality, and justice to the extent that the oppressed continued to languish at the margins of society. Essentially, African liberation aims to destroy apartheid structures and offer socialist proposals on how to foster a new dispensation.

Fanon (1963:41) described the ‘world as divided into two compartments’ – the zone of being and non-being. During the period of decolonisation, this spatial arrangement is preserved intact, as was the case in South Africa that left the question of land, economy, and property ownership unresolved. In the post-apartheid dispensation, as Gumede (2015:17) observes, “there are subtle ones: zone of being on one hand and the zone of non-being on the other”. According to this narrative, “black majority remain in the zone of non-being in a sense that they are socially and economically excluded” (Gumede 2015:17). This expression also finds form in economic, social, and development imbalances – such as poverty and unemployment, lack of housing, roads, schools, electricity, health care, and lack of sanitation in communities where the black majority lives. Gumede (2015:17) stresses, “[t]hey also find themselves in the zone of non-being because of racial discrimination and related appalling acts of injustice”. It is in this context that South Africa, according to Fanonian perspective, can be viewed as a post-apartheid neo-colonial and post-colonial corporatist state (Gumede 2015). Indeed, it is correct to argue that development in its genuine term in South Africa, if viewed through Fanonian lenses, has not even started.

Bakken (2014:45) contends, “[w]hen the ANC came to power in 1994, it inherited a contradictory legacy. On the one hand, it had the most developed economy on the African continent; on the other hand, it had major socio-economic problems”. The most developed were white minorities who controlled the economic mainstream, while blacks who are the political majority were in economic terms in marginality. If post-apartheid is haunted by the apartheid legacy, it means that it was reformed on the basis of racially marked structures. Gibson (2011b:11) postulates, “post-apartheid South Africa, with its bipolarity – on the one hand, represents itself to the world as a successful, free and open democracy, a rainbow nation, where everyone can prosper from free-wheeling markets, while, on the other hand, is represented by images of xenophobic violence that reinforces the world’s view of it as permanently conflicted and suffering nation”. In such a state, as Saul and Gelb (1986:64) stress, “racial oppression and

capitalist exploitation have come to feed and reinforce on one another”. This demonstrates the very fact that post-apartheid is still close-bound with the apartheid legacy, which is preventing the country from giving birth to social and economic emancipation.

Mbembe (2011:5) is of the view, “[t]he end of apartheid has not resolved the old question of difference, it has simply shifted the terms of the difference and forms of capitalism”. During the era of apartheid, blacks were exposed to capitalism in its raw form, and in the post-apartheid era, they are confronted with institutional racism and other forms of racial discrimination. Mbembe (2011:3) asserts, “the blacks have consistently taken on the form of waste within the peculiar trajectory race and capitalism”. In this sense, Mbembe (2011) infers that “waste” is the capacity of capitalism to waste black lives. According to Mbembe (2011:3), “capitalism squanders not only flesh and blood, but nerves and brain, life and health as well”. He argues that the notion of squandering and wasting black lives has been an intrinsic part of the logic of capitalism, especially in the neo-apartheid context in which race is critical to the production of social and economic segregation. Mbembe (2011:3) further adds, “[t]oday, this logic of waste is particularly dramatized by the dilemmas of unemployment and disposability, survival and subsistence, and the expansion in every arena of everyday life of spaces of vulnerability”. Post-apartheid did not actually end apartheid and its entrenched capitalism but rather rearranged the forms of marginalisation, exploitation, and oppression along racial lines.

Ineffective policies put in place by the government have strengthened and perpetuated the lines of capitalism reminiscent of apartheid days. As More (2014:5) correctly contends, “it is apartheid laws that put Africans in constant encounter with the wrath of the police and perpetually landed them in prison”. The entire system ensures that black people remain in bondage, and blackness, with its servitude and efforts, assures that blacks and whites remain separated. Terreblanche (2002:25) posits, “[t]he most notable problem among blacks is unemployment and poverty rates of the population, sharp inequalities in the distribution of income, property and opportunities, and high levels of violence and criminality”. This is the reference which Mbeki (1998a) makes when he says “South Africa is a country of two nations” – a nation so marginalised and one of the most unequal societies in the world. This spatial arrangement, as Fanon (1963:38-39) postulates, is constituted by two zones – “[o]bedient to the rules of pure Aristotelian logic, they both follow the principle of reciprocal exclusivity”. In such a state, South Africa, there is neither conciliation nor keen effort to work towards the same

project of humanity; the government has failed on this effort to unite South Africa along racial, economic, social, cultural, and material relations.

It is clear that race and racism still plague the post-apartheid era – that is, race as the organising principle and racism as an ideology that justifies economic exploitation, oppression, and the domination of black people by whites. As Mbembe (2011:4) correctly explains, “race is the main means by which life chances are assigned to different kinds of persons”. According to Mbembe (2011:5), “South Africa’s democracy asserts the equality of all human beings and seeks to derive powers of government from the consent of the governed, yet this is a democracy founded on deep and entrenched forms of racial dispossession and inequality inherited from a past of racial brutality”. Even at the global level, nations are treated differently concerning racial discriminations. For Mbembe (2011:5), “this differential treatment raises, at a deeper level, questions about the way in which race is instituted in a globalized society”. As is the case with South Africa, race constitutes the organising principle and racism is the operating logic of society.

Just as the history of South Africa is a history of racial segregation, the post-apartheid economy is a system of racial exploitation. “Even poverty is radicalized in a neo-apartheid situation” (Grosfoguel 2008:615). The challenge for South Africa, as Grosfoguel (2008:617) attempts to clarify, “is either to decoloni[s]e the country by transforming, deraciali[s]ing, demasculini[s]ing and radicali[s]ing its democracy, or move to a neo-apartheid form of democracy with a white demographic minority leading the country and a non-white majority excluded from the structures of power, resources and democratic decision-making”. Fanon’s imagination centres on decolonisation, and this process involves the social, economic, political, and psychological liberation, which in this instance, post-apartheid South Africa is suffering because its national liberation movement was captured in an elite pact that resulted in myths for freedom and unfulfilled terrain of liberation that is haunting the post-apartheid sociality.

Gumede (2016:4) argues, “[t]he majority of the population is disproportionately bearing the brunt of poverty, marginalisation, and underdevelopment”. While efforts have been made through various initiatives of the government such as the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, Black Economic Empowerment, Reconstruction Development Programme (RDP), and Affirmative Action to address the apartheid legacy, the harsh reality of structural violence and racism in relation to the distribution of goods and services makes it impossible for the black population to climb higher up the socio-economic ladder. High levels of

unemployment, poverty, and unequal income distribution still reflect the legacy of apartheid in the post-apartheid era. The post-apartheid state is clearly experiencing problems of transformation. Though apartheid can be argued to have ended in 1994, institutional racism remains entrenched within structures and (re)produces the socio-economic imbalance which is normalised in the everyday life of the black majority.

The demands of the black majority in the post-apartheid era are marked by calls for basic things such as jobs, housing, electricity, roads, education, and sanitation, which have yet to be fully realised beyond empty promises and the emancipation of elite politics. To amplify this, Nnadozie (2013:85) asserts, “[t]he majority of the people in South Africa are not only deprived of access to basic services but also sidelined from the mainstream activities and processes leading to the provision of such services”. Political independence without economic freedom is an illusion which creates the pretence that the national project has been materialised. The black condition, which is a result of black subjection and marginalisation from economic and social incentives, is a haunt in the heart of the post-apartheid era. In essence, the black condition is a loss when it comes to the post-apartheid settlements, since the question of land, economy, and property remains unaddressed and skewed in favour of the white political minority. To resolve this predicament, the black condition would need to be reimagined with new forms of life in relation to the notion of freedom, justice, and equality that is extended to social and economic change, as well as the quality of life of black people.

The post-apartheid era was supposed to be a new beginning offering a new lease on life to the historical victims of apartheid. However, this is not the case, as the black majority continues to languish in poverty and various other forms of exploitation. To concur with Benjamin (2005:1), “[t]he story of post-apartheid South Africa was supposed to be a happy one filled with anecdotal accounts of how life got better for the majority of people living in the new democracy”. However, post-apartheid, as Benjamin (2005:1) adds, ‘has (re)produced spatial arrangement and socio-economic inequalities found in black townships all across South Africa flaring up in protests. These protesters are often blacks, are angry, desperate and frustrated by living in worsening poverty’. The most known groups are Abahlali baseMjondolo, Students’ Free Education Movement, University Insourcing Protests for Contract Workers, and many others. Their pleas are informed by demands for proper jobs, housing, water, electricity, roads, and even sanitation. In this regard, Mbembe asserts the following:

Many have the feeling that they might never really fulfil their lives; that their lives will always be somewhat truncated; that these lives will never achieve the status of lives that are accounted for, inhabited as they are by a “ghost”.  
(Mbembe 2011:6)

The black administration in the post-apartheid era pretends to be surprised when the marginalised, hopeless, desperate, or “damned, wretched, forgotten” people, as Fanon called them, protest and have no patience to wait for the delivery of basic services. Most of these people bear the brunt of colonial apartheid and have been waiting their entire lives for the creation of new forms of life in relation to their devastating conditions. Most blacks live in fear of being evicted from their homes, and their electricity and water are (re)connected illegally because of the frequent evictions. Many of them are unemployed without any possibility of getting another job. To put it in the words of Mbembe (2011:6), “[b]eyond the repetition of dead paradigms, any new form of radical politics will have to deal with this ghost in life, the pain of disappointment and the sharp experience of defeat, of palpable powerlessness and dashed hopes”. This is what the legacy of apartheid has come to mean for the black majority who remain marginalised and excluded from the national project in the post-apartheid era.

The next section focuses on the Manichean structure and explores the reality in which post-apartheid is (re)formulated. As has been argued above, the form and pattern in which socio-economic conditions in post-apartheid exist and operate are (re)configured on the basis of the Manichean structure, a term which Fanon phrased to describe the spatial arrangement in the colonial society. Though some may contend that the apartheid era has ended in South Africa, the spatial arrangements and socio-economic imbalances reflected in the structures of land, property, and ownership demonstrate that apartheid is still entangled in structures and reflect the power of the white capital. The celebrated post-apartheid era and its political reforms were reformed on the basis of the apartheid past, since the status quo remain uninterrupted.

### **3.4 POST-APARTHEID AND THE MANICHEAN STRUCTURE**

Fanon’s conception of the Manichean colonial structure also needs to be discussed in relation to the post-apartheid socio-economic setting. The Manichean structure is simply a reference to a society divided by race as the organising principle and racism as the operating logic. Fanon states that apartheid South Africa was one form of the Manichean structure, which is divided into compartments of the colonial world. As Hill (1997:71) also puts it, “[a]partheid South

Africa was a society over determined by race”. In the post-apartheid era, these spatial patterns continue because of the post-apartheid and its political reforms which left the infrastructure of Manichean colonial structures intact when the black political administration came to power in 1994. This situation has resulted in whites remaining in power and blacks reduced to the bottom of the ladder in terms of social and economic development. Thus, the superiority of white domination and oppression of black people has created a situation where the former is privileged, wealthy, and arrogant while the latter is deprived, poor, dispossessed, and inferior.

The Fanonian Manichean colonial structure remains relevant to understanding the spatial realities in which the post-apartheid socio-economic setting is founded upon. Thus, Fanon’s description of the superior, prosperous, free, strongly built colonial city, and a “white settler” town of light and plenty on the one hand and the inferior, cramped, poor, and hungry stomachs of “native town” on the other penetrate deeper into the South African spatial patterns and socio-economic imbalances. Fanon applies the Manichean colonial structure to theorise and explore the white-black binaries within what he terms the Manichean colonial world, a world where the white represents the position of universal goodness and the black as a subject of pure evil (Parris 2011). Fanon (1967:38) maintains, “[t]he zone where the natives live is not complementary to the zone inhabited by the settlers”. The two zones are contrasting and characterised by different levels of social and economic development. There is no cooperation between them nor working towards the same project of humanity to harmonise the race relations and society as a whole. Fanon described the Manichean colonial world as follows:

The settlers’ town is a strongly built town, all made of stone and steel. It is a brightly lit town; the streets are covered with asphalt, and the garbage cans swallow all the leavings, unseen, unknown and hardly thought about ... the streets of his town are clean and even, with no holes or stones. The settler’s town is a well-fed town, an easy going town; its belly is always full of good things. The settlers’ town is a town of white people, of foreigners. (Fanon 1967:39)

In contrast to this, Fanon asserts:

The town belonging to the colonized people, or at least the native town, the Negro village, the medina, the reservation, is a place of ill fame, peopled by men of evil repute. They are born there, it matters little where or how; they

die there, it matters not where, nor how. It is a world without spaciousness; men live there on top of each other, and their huts are built one on top of the other. The native town is a hungry town, starved of bread, of meat, of shoes, of coal, of light. The native town is a crouching village, a town on its knees, a town wallowing in the mire. It is a town of niggers and dirty Arabs. (Fanon 1967:39)

There is no reason to deny that both the apartheid and post-apartheid eras in South Africa are founded on the same order. For instance, during the era of apartheid blacks were subject to suffering, poverty, and open to racism in harsh forms, while in the post-apartheid era, they remain trapped at margins of society in hellish existential conditions. The Manichean colonial structure, as More (2014:1) posits, “is not accidental but a consequence of the events and the shape and form which the country has assumed and followed since the installation of Nelson Mandela as the first black president in 1994”. This continues because post-apartheid and its political reforms did not overhaul the racially marked structures of apartheid; hence, the country is still dominated and determined by race and racism, where whites are superior and blacks are inferior both in social and economic terms. The spatial arrangements and socio-economic imbalances remain intact albeit the country is regarded as a post-liberated state. What needs to be reiterated is the fact that post-apartheid and its political reforms were simply about moving to democracy and launching the constitution, but this did not divorce from the marriage with apartheid structures.

The country’s transition from apartheid to liberal constitution, ‘Bill of Rights’, race relations, launching of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, Black Economic Empowerment, Affirmative Action, and others literally changed nothing in South Africa. As Gibson (2009:4) opines, “it is quite clear that ‘deracialization’ of the city has been an essentially ‘bourgeois’ phenomenon with full membership and rights now accessed by money and consequentially with urban policy – under the guise of providing ‘housing’ – geared mainly toward the removal of the poor from urban areas”. In other words, as Gibson (2009:5) postulates, “by creating urban settlements, the shack dwellers had created some freedom for themselves as apartheid began to crumble but with plans to remove these urban settlements, post-apartheid policy has returned to the Manicheanism of the earlier period”. To concur with Fanon ([1952]2008:2), the post-apartheid setting gives rise to “the zone of being and zone of non-being”. Gumede (2015:17) maintains, “[m]any black people in the post-apartheid dispensation remain in the

zone of non-being in a sense that they are socially and economically excluded”. Thus, they find themselves excluded because of racial discrimination and related appalling acts of injustice.

South Africa with its racial binaries, on the one hand, represents itself to the world as a “rainbow nation”, free and open constitutional democratic society where everyone can participate and thrive in free markets and economic opportunities. Nevertheless, it is on the other a country fraught with deep structural inequalities and a perpetual state of civil unrest. This binary division serves as testimony to the very fact that the post-apartheid era is a country of two nations, much to the correctness and exactness of former President Thabo Mbeki’s “Two Nations” speech, when he uttered the following statement:

South Africa is a country of two nations. One of these nations is white, relatively prosperous, regardless of gender or geographical dispersal. It has ready access to a developed economic, physical, educational, communication and other infrastructure ... The second and larger nation of South Africa is black and poor, this nation lives under conditions of grossly underdeveloped economic, physical, educational, communication and other infrastructure. It has virtually no possibility of exercising what in reality amounts to a theoretical right to equal opportunity, that right being equal within this black nation only to the extent that it is equally incapable of realisation. (Mbeki 1998:17)

According to Gibson (2011a:4), “despite the promises of the Freedom Charter, South Africa’s transition from apartheid has not seen a radical transfer of wealth or the creation of social programs based on human needs”. There have not been substantial changes in the status quo in socio-economic relations, since the power of white monopoly capital remains in control. Those of the black majority still find themselves in the zone of non-being where they remain marginalised and excluded at the advantage of white political minorities. To amplify this, Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2013:9) states, “[l]ife in the informal settlements (shacks) of South Africa provides a good example of a hellish life as an underworld of coloniality of being where human beings live in unearthed shacks without protection from lightning”. Thus, “[t]here are no toilets and no sources of clean water. Violence is endemic. Poverty has become an identity itself. Social peace and human security is perpetually absent” (Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2013:9). Gibson (2009:5-6) contends, “[t]hose frightfully small and poorly built structures called houses are based on the removal of the poor from city centres and built far away from bourgeois eyes and

fears outside urban spaces: The poor are othered, uninvited, and the shack communities fragmented”. The black majority is frustrated because the government has done very little to address the situation given the rampant corruption and two decades since the black political administration came to power.

The white situation is contrasted with the black condition. Whites live to enjoy the benefits of democracy. They stay in middle-class residential areas, own means of production and properties, and live in beautiful houses. Their children attend expensive private schools, have expensive medical aid covers, and are guaranteed successful futures, while the black condition is characterised by tragedy and indignities of suffering. The power of white monopoly capital, as Biko ([1978]1987:88) asserts, “had to create some kind of barrier between black and whites so that the whites could enjoy privileges at the expense of blacks and still feel free to give a moral justification for the obvious exploitation that pricked even the hardest of white consciences”. Mngxitama (2010) maintains that the lack of discussion about the reality of racism has resulted in the perpetual state of black injustice and suffering at the hands of white capital. Like Fanon and Mbeki, Nyapokoto reiterated the notion of “two countries in one” – a comparative analysis with respect to Alexandra and Sandton, thus:

Alexandra and Sandton in Johannesburg graphically epitomise the coexistence of poverty and opulence in South Africa. This ambivalent nature compels the Manichean structure, as it clearly illustrates the social inequalities that were inculcated during the era of imperialist control of South Africa. Alexandra emerged as a place for peasants who were forced off their ancestral land to sell their labour cheaply in emerging urban settlements. Sandton crystallised as a place for the owners of the means of production. (Nyapokoto 2014:2)

Gibson (2001:372) contends, “[t]he spatial legacy of apartheid has shifted but has not been fundamentally challenged”. The Sandton and Alexandra binaries serve as a testimony to the fact that the post-apartheid era has undergone little racial change – thus, the former represents the zone of being characterised by good living and prosperity, while in the latter life is lived in conditions of want and poverty (Nyapokoto 2014). Sandton is a place of rich, middle-class people – properties, expensive cars, mansions, nightclubs, just to name a few. “Sandton is neat, salubrious and conducive to human well-being” (Nyapokoto 2014:4). People there drive the latest Ferraris, Porsches, Lamborghinis, Mercedes-Benzes, and BMWs. “On Avis car-rental

maps, international business travellers from O.R Tambo Airport on their way to Sandton are warned not to use the Alexandra (the cramped and overflowing African township) exit on the highway” (Gibson 2001:372). The affluence of Sandton is heavily guarded by the ever-presence of police and security forces day and night, with electricity power, roads and transport flow uninterrupted. Life there is first-class, and the majority are millionaires and billionaires.

On the other side of the M1 Highway is Alexandra, which stands in contrast to Sandton. Alexandra is an informal settlement of shacks and a hellish life with no adequate houses, roads, electricity, sanitation, or recreation. It is a place with nothing to hide the brutish reality of a hellish existential life. It is the home of violence, criminals, beggars, prostitutes, hobos, the condemned, illegals, and the illiterate. Those who seek comfort in substance abuse are found here. Moreover, others who have to steal for survival are also here. Others lose their sanity because to be sane is to invite pain in this place. There are also those who have learned to kill for a wage. The extent of death is directly proportional to personal welfare. Life in Alexandra provides a good example of the zone of non-being in the sense of appalling acts of violence and institutionalised, naturalised, and normalised indignities that keep the structures of black subjugation intact. This form of injustice is rationalised through socio-economic relations that are justified on the basis of the few black elite that own properties in Sandton – thereby accounting for the enrichment of the small class rather than the entire country.

Fanon would claim that the M1 Highway not only separates the whites from the blacks but also presents a clear demarcation between the rich and the poor. Gibson (2001:372:373) postulates, “[t]hough many middle class [b]lacks have moved out of the townships, the inequality in township housing is one indication of the enrichment of this small class”. The shacks make it invisible and non-existent in the smokey environments to see the cars, animals, pigs, and other domestic animals in muddy paths. To concur with Fanon (1963:40), “[t]he originality of the colonial context is that economic reality, inequality and the immense difference of ways of life never come to mask the human realities”. Gibson (2001:373) asserts, “[w]hile apartheid South Africa was far from a closed economy, the end of apartheid came at the very time the world was witnessed to increasing inequalities with pressures to maintain competitiveness based on lowering labour costs”. This situation serves as a testimony to the fact that South Africa is an unequal society and one of the most divided nations in the world after just America.

The M1 Highway separating Sandton and Alexandra can also be understood in what Santos refers to as the “abyssal line”. Santos (2007) posits that the establishment of an abyssal line

constitutes modern world thinking. The abyssal line consists of the visible and invisible distinction through a thin line that divides the social reality into two realms – namely, “this side of the line and the other side of the line” (Santos 2007:45). To concur with Fanon, Santos (2007:45) states that the abyssal line makes it impossible for any conciliation and unity to happen, as a matter of differing existential conditions and ways of life. Thus, “[w]hat most fundamentally characterises abyssal thinking is thus the impossibility of the co-presence of the two sides of the line” (Santos 2007:45). Post-apartheid operates on the basis of abyssal thinking where race and racism constitute the organising principle of the society in as far as the question of social, economic, and political realities are concerned. The dominance of white superiority and inferiority of blacks has created a situation where the former feels justified to abuse and exploit the latter, where subject position of the latter is that of being reduced, restricted, and acted upon.

The notion of “gated communities” is also reminiscent of the Manichean colonial structure. Pithouse (2013:104) is of the view, “gated community and the shanty town in South Africa are equally old, and they are both cosmopolitan spaces – they were produced by the same economy”. According to Landman (2012:60), gated communities “reflect the growing dichotomy” between the white and black communities, and this raises the question of the notion of the “rainbow nation” and South Africa as a non-racial society. The compartmentalised spaces between white and black communities transform different forms of life where access is restricted and entrance is controlled. This state, as Landman (2012:60) explains, “is closely linked and influenced by numerous socio-economic and political processes in practice”, which has resulted in the black majority being marginalised, neglected, and excluded from the project of the post-apartheid era. The gates are guarded and protected by the constant presence of police and security forces, which further intensifies and strengthens the Manichean colonial practices through limiting the spaces where black people would go looking for jobs and greener pastures.

Fanon’s conception of the Manichean colonial structure is by far the logical template to understanding the idea through which South Africa is articulated. This conception also highlights the realities on other parts of the world. “The reality for blacks has been and continues to be informed by repressive structures that are operating on the basis of an insidious logic of race” (Sithole 2014a:339-340). There are those whom such structures operate to their advantage, as Sithole (2014a:340) argues, “namely, whites and some blacks alike, often see it as irresponsible and destructive for blacks to complain about their existential condition through

the prism of race”. This line of thinking operates through race denialism and is prevalent to the extent that it has become hard to escape its constitutive and fundamental delinquencies. The next section links with the above, and focuses on the post-apartheid and the state of hybridity. What is challenged here is the race denialism, which attempts to distort and negate the reality that race is a constitutive source of all problems in the South African situation. The “state of hybridity” is said to be the basis upon which the South African problems are created, thereby denying race.

### **3.5 POST-APARTHEID AND THE STATE OF HYBRIDITY**

What remains unsaid but should be read between the lines is that there is a tendency of conflating and overgeneralising the South African situation, and more so in the light of race denialism. Race detractors claim that the problem of South Africa is not race or racism, but the advent of multiculturalism brought by democracy and globalisation, as if those of the black majority are not the only ones who are exposed to discrimination and other forms of racism. If these race detractors were indeed correct, why are there no white people, Indians, coloureds, and other races living in townships and squatter camps? Fanon undertook to unmask and expose these myths, through what this study conceptualises as hybridisation of South Africa. For Fanon (1967), a society that is not fully decolonised often results in contradictions and contestations that have nothing to do with real problems, which in this study are considered as race, racism, and spatial patterns based on racial discrimination.

Post-colonial reformists such as Bhabha, Mbembe, and Posel, including the ruling party in government – the ANC – would argue that South Africa constitutes a hybrid state in which the country belongs to all who live in it, black and white – that is, regardless of colour, race, and gender, and are united in their cultural diversities. Hybridity is informed by the notion of being many things in one form. According to Bhabha (1985:154), “[h]ybridity is the sign of the productivity of colonial power, its shifting forces and fixities; it is the name for the strategic reversal of the process of domination through disavowal”. That is, as Bhabha (1985:154) expands, “the production of discriminatory identities that secures the pure and original identity of authority”. Imbedded in such a discourse is the revaluation of the colonial identity through the repetition of discriminatory identity effects. The differences imbedded in the inter-cultural diversities can no longer be identified simply because they are squashed into one multi-culture where differences are not to be seen or identified. This discourse is informed by instances of inter-subjective debates, dialogues, and negotiations relating to the imagined goals of the State.

JanMohamed (1985) charges reformists for overlooking race as an organising principle, and racism as an ideology that justifies all forms of racial discrimination, exploitation, oppression, and the domination of one group by another. For instance, JanMohamed (1985:60) argues, “Bhabha completely ignore Fanon’s definition of the conqueror/native relation as a Manichean struggle”. He further adds that Bhabha undermines the political history of colonialism. Though Bhabha does acknowledge that the coloniser and the colonised relation exist and operate at the level of varied social and economic antagonisms, he, however, undermines the notion that race constitutes the organising principle. Bhabha’s position negates the history of race, and this allows him to downplay the history of the material conflict between the coloniser and colonised entirely and to focus on colonial discourse as if it existed in a vacuum. For Bhabha, as JanMohamed (1985:60) posits, “colonial conflict which left the entire economy and material base of the native black destroyed is something that occurred in a vacuum”. This is the reality in which the post-apartheid situation finds itself, where race is erased when it comes to accounting for the problems of socio-economic inequalities.

Bhabha (1994) locates the question of race on “the beyond”. The post-apartheid state in the words of Bhabha (1994:1) is “in the moment of transition where space and time cross to produce complex figures of difference and identity, past and present, inside and out, inclusion and exclusion”. For Bhabha, what is important is to think beyond race and to focus on dealing with new frontiers of democracy, reconciliation, and emancipation. According to Bhabha (1994:1), “[t]he in-between spaces provide the terrain of elaborating strategies of selfhood – singular or communal – that initiate new signs of identity innovative signs of collaboration, and contestation, in the act of defining the idea of society itself”. In such a state, the race question is rendered irrelevant and argued that it is a thing of the past, as if the spectre of race is not haunting the present.

Bhabha’s views on hybridity have not lost their appeal, especially in South Africa where these views enjoy white liberal endorsement, and they feed the ideology of racism, oppression, and exploitation. Bhabha’s hybridity underlines the modern state as being mediated through democratic processes where the majority consensus prevails. In that process, race matters are not an issue, since processes are fair and transparent. Clearly, Bhabha seems to miss the point that political freedom without economic control amounts to nothing more than just a façade. This is the very nature of the post-apartheid state under the black administration of the ANC, which took over political power in government and left the economy under the control of white

capital. This did not amount to the freedom, justice, and equality which the national liberation struggle fought for; it has reformed apartheid rather than destroying it, since the black majority remains excluded.

In Fanon, hybridity is problematic in its meaning of freedom, justice, and equality, when extended to the political life of blackness. The blackness is acted upon by whiteness – “the white man, in the capacity of master says to the Negro, ‘[f]rom now on you are free’ – in a situation where freedom was never created by his actions” (Fanon [1952]2008:172). In such a state, the black man is a slave in the absence of meaningful freedom, justice, and equality. This is a situation currently imbedded in South Africa where freedom, justice, and equality are determined outside the existential condition of the black majority in favour of the minorities in the capital mainstream. Blacks are relegated to the level of subjects who receive tutelage from the surveillance of white liberals. It is tacitly implied that blacks cannot be trusted with important responsibilities such as managing the economy or technology and innovation hub of the country.

Multicultural hybridity marks the post-apartheid era, but this does not mean that race and racism are no more the organising principles of society. White liberals dismiss race, and in place, the logic of multicultural diversity is used to rationalise the argument that South Africa is experiencing the problem of cultural diversity, not racial problems, which is the antithesis of transformation. It is often argued that post-independent states experience problems of transformation at the time when they attain political independence, something which suggests that the South African situation was always to be expected as the last country on the continent to receive its political independence, as it finds itself struggling to come together. It is also maintained that in an atmosphere where democracy prevails, problems become complex, and South Africa is no exception in that regard, since it embodies diverse cultures with differing traditions, value systems, and norms. In such a state, it is implied that race is not an issue, since the post-apartheid era is essentialised on the notion of non-racialism and a rainbow nation, as if there is no institutional racism and violence prevailing against the black majority on a day-to-day basis.

The hegemonic discourse of post-apartheid undermines race in favour of non-racialism, as if problems of racism have ended and/or racial subjection does not exist. If racial discrimination was over, why then is South Africa still experiencing the problem of service delivery protests around the townships and informal settlements where those of the black majority are

overpopulated? Critics of race foreground the problems of unemployment and poverty at the level of service delivery and argue that those in power should take the blame for failing to implement service delivery. According to Sithole (2012:61), “[r]ace denialists are those who state that there is no race and that all people are the same”. These denialists even claim that non-racialism offers the scope to build a new society through constitutional reforms and structural adjustments. Institutional racism operates under the power of race denialism, and this interrupts national project on transformation, development, and emancipation. Problems of service delivery are linked to implementation, not race, as if those who are affected are not the blacks in the townships. If implementation was indeed the only problem, whites too would surely be affected as well as black people.

Mbembe and Posel (2006), for example, downplay the significance of race in favour of non-racialism based on the notion of a rainbow nation. They contend that a rainbow nation constitutes “a critical humanism which breaks with essentialised notions of difference and builds on a philosophy of critical cosmopolitanism” (Mbembe & Posel 2006:283-284). For them, the liberal Constitution informs the success of the post-apartheid era. Clearly, Mbembe and Posel’s position lacks the lived experience of being black in an anti-black world, speaking as if the so-called rainbow nation changed the social and economic conditions of the black majority who remain marginalised, excluded, and trapped on the margins of society. Moving from apartheid to liberal democracy through voting does not mean that problems of race have been resolved. Mbembe and Posel also speak about the politics of hope, which transcends the politics of race and remains fashionable in the post-apartheid era among political analysts and commentators. This view is not only a fallacy but explains the fact that the black majority has been waiting for the better part of their lives hoping for changes in relation to their social and economic conditions.

Mbembe and Posel (2006) assert that the liberal Constitution, Bill of Rights, and democratisation, among others, have all been effective in dealing with the legacies of oppression and racialised inequality. They posit, “South African democracy offers the promise of new life to all to eradicate the indignities and suffering of poverty, ill-health, lack of shelter, and education” (Mbembe & Posel 2006:284). However, if indeed it is true that democracy advances the human rights project, why then is the black majority unemployed, poor, and trapped in the hellish black conditions found in the myriad of dispossession – dispossession of land, economy, and humanity? The logic of “sameness” and “all” that is invoked in the realm

of law does not mean that problems of race will just vanish. As Sithole (2014c:316) captures, for Mbembe and Posel, “the idea of sameness still affirms that there is no subjection”. For this fallacy, it is clear that the black condition is not seen in the light of race but as part of the problem created by the black people themselves, who should take the blame for trying to address the problem at hand.

There is nothing too complex or complicated about the South African situation. South Africa is simply haunted by the binary division of race. The race problem is a scandal that can only be resolved through freedom, justice, and equality in social and economic terms, between whites and blacks. The notion that there is an elite group of black billionaires in the middle-class stratum of South Africa does not mean that the race issue has ended, as what matters is the majority. To concur with Fanon (1963:103), “[t]he liberation of the individual does not follow the national liberation”. True to this, even if there are black people living in the suburbs, it still does not mean that the race problem has been resolved. The same logic applies to the tendency of seeking to replace race with class; the former is foundational and Constitutive to the latter. Class is the institutionalised, naturalised, normalised form, and practice of racial discrimination at a secondary level.

According to Gibson (1999:338), for instance, “politics of class are given more thought in the post-apartheid than race problem itself”. The effects of race and racism are blindfolded when it comes to accounting for the black condition, due to the fact that the black condition is silenced on the basis of class rhetoric. This claim about class is true under the mask of validity that intends to explain away race as an organising principle in the post-apartheid society. Implied here is the view that race is no longer an issue or, more precisely, racial divisions are set aside as a special case to defy explanation. Although such is rhetoric, it is regarded as irrational and irrelevant to question, since the merit of racialisation may not be questioned. “Implicit here is the idea that race is a ‘primordial’ social fracture which should have made compromise impossible and – most important from our vantage point today – which would make democratic consolidation unlikely, since the latter would require ‘national unity’ or a ‘single culture’ to overcome racial differences” (Beall, Gelb & Has 2005:683-684). The question of race actually means nothing to race denialists, but what is important is the future and emancipation of the middle-class segment.

Maldonado-Torres (2008:121) is of the view, “Fanon’s social dialectic analysis penetrates deeper into the lived experience of the oppressed”. To expose the nature in which the post-

apartheid reality is (re)formulated, Fanon invokes the question of race at the Manichean structure and argues that South Africa is constituted by a Manichean structure whose “economic substructure is also a superstructure”. Indeed, the reality is that one is rich because they are white and poor because they are black. This view explains the very fact that black people consisting of the political majority are poor, while the white minority are rich and in control of the economic mainstream, whereas they constitute the political minority. Mngxitama (2016:1) maintains that race denialists “have ensured that blacks remain at the bottom of the social, economic, political ladder of South Africa”. Through means of erasing and silencing of race, the black condition cannot be listened to, something which marks black exclusion from inclusion or participation in the economic mainstream.

The subject position of blackness in the world is that of being marginalised, dispossessed, and excluded from the community of life. Fanon argues that the world is inhabited by two species – “with the fact of belonging to or not belonging to a given race, a given species” (Fanon 163:40). To amplify this, Sithole (2015:2) posits, “the meaning and application of freedom, justice and equality uphold white liberal sensitivities while relegating the black subject to the outside”. This comes as a result of the fact that the struggle for black emancipation is marked by the demands for freedom, justice, and equality, which present a scandal considering the liberal treaties. According to Sithole (2015:2), “[f]reedom, justice, and equality cannot be understood outside the idea of race, where white supremacy is structurally positioned to propagate white sensitivity and to pontificate white norms”. To demand freedom, justice, and equality of black subjects is a scandal which threatens the work, progress, and hegemony of white liberals, since the demand is informed by the proposal to end the anti-black world and the black ontological disarticulation.

By examining the structure and strategy of white liberalism in South Africa, it is clear that blacks are ontologically disarticulated from society in social and economic terms. Hence, Fanon (1963:40) asserts, “you are rich because you are white, you are white because you are rich”. The black subject is relegated to the margins of society, that is, outside the economic mainstream. This subject position constitutes a revolutionary position because its demands seek to interrupt the status quo of white supremacy – that is, the economic structure, the State, and civil society. A civil society, which white liberals talk about, is not the society intended to accommodate black people because its constituent elements are anti-black. A civil society can

only be the site of universal freedom when it extends to the point of freedom, justice, and equality, that is, when the need for political society is obviated (Wilderson 2003).

The rhetoric used to mask reality in South Africa is often that of downplaying the existence of racism by arguing that the country has a black president as a face of the new society. The denial of racism is a common feature among white liberals. “The argument made is that racism and colonial relations are a thing of the past” (Grosfoguel 2008:613). According to Grosfoguel (2008:613), “[t]he difficulty in the struggle against the new cultural racist discourses is its denial of its own racism”. The word “race” and its operating logic “racism” are not used in literal terms; it is claimed that there is no racial discrimination, yet cultural racism and structural violence prevail against black bodies. As Grosfoguel (2008:613) elaborates, “[b]ecause it does not use the word ‘race’ in its discourse, cultural racism claims to be non-racist”. Similarly, Sithole (2015:3) contends, “[t]he idea of race and its operating logic, racism, are not examined as problems, which are the very antithesis of what is being advocated”. Those of the black majority who find themselves suffering have themselves blamed for being lazy, illiterate, and worthless instead of putting the blame on the institutional racism that rests with the structures and institutions of power.

In some quarters of society, there is talk that the problems of South Africa can be resolved through bilateral dialogues involving both blacks and whites. What is invoked is the notion of integration essentialised on the idea of the “rainbow nation”. Critics of this position include Biko ([1978]1987:20), who argues, “[t]he integration that liberals talk about is first of all artificial in that it is a response to conscious manoeuvres rather than to the dictates of the inner soul”. The possibility of this integration is unimaginable in the midst of subjection, which is the heart of racial discrimination. It is this racially marked subjection that needs to be dealt with to ensure that the national project is addressed. Biko ([1978]1987:20) maintains that the integration built from the superiority complex of the whites and the inferiority complex of the blacks will benefit only the white population – “with the whites doing all the talking and the blacks the listening”. The idea of integration cannot be the solution to the problem, but rather the recognition of human dignity that is required to affirm mutual cooperation and respect between two self-consciousnesses.

Biko ([1978]1987:21) is of the view, “[a]t the heart of true integration is the provision for each man, each group to rise and attain the envisioned self”. He argues that each group must be able to assert its values, standards, and norms of existence without being questioned or having to

explain itself to the other. Once there is self-assertiveness and reliance to the point that mutual respect is cemented, then there can be genuine integration. However, as Biko ([1978]1987:21) submits, “it becomes clear that as long as blacks are suffering from inferiority complex as a result of 300 years of deliberate oppression, denigration and derision they will be useless as co-architects of a normal society where man is nothing else but man for his own sake”. This type of integration as is the case with the illusion of the rainbow nation is the reason blacks live to satisfy whites instead of themselves. It is here that the post-apartheid state is flawed with hybridity, where integration has been accorded a higher priority than freedom, justice, and equality of the black population.

### 3.6 CONCLUSION

This chapter examined Fanon's ideas on colonial liberation and the post-colonial setting in an attempt to ascertain the extent of his relevance in South Africa. This was done through the systematic deployment of his ideas to enable a new understanding of the post-apartheid era as an illusion of liberation for its failure to resolve the black condition. For that matter, Fanon's thought continues to be the haunt in the heart of the post-apartheid era, with a devastating impact on social and economic development. South Africa, whose post-apartheid era is regarded as the creation of a "new" society, is experiencing problems of emancipation, which can be seen from socio-economic inequalities and spatial arrangements featured in land, labour, and African subjectivities. This situation continues because of the legacy of apartheid that is embodied in the post-apartheid era. Post-apartheid and its political reforms have failed to bring an end to the anti-black condition which was primarily the target of the national liberation struggle. The South African situation constitutes a logical sense of what Fanon imagined it to become – a complicated terrain of unfulfilled liberation.

Though Fanon's ideas were produced in a text written more than 50 years ago, they have proven more prophetic, and as such, a haunt in relation to the betrayed national liberation. It is a haunt because of its failure to reimagine new forms of life in relation to the black condition. Though Fanon did not live to witness the unfolding of post-apartheid South Africa, his predictions on the pitfalls of the national liberation penetrate deeply into the socio-economic condition of South Africa, especially for the black majority that remains marginalised and excluded from the whole project of national transformation. Fanon has already warned about the illusion of liberation, arguing, "[t]he liberation of the individual does not follow national liberation" (Fanon 1967:103). This is the exactness of the South African situation where there is a tendency of confusing cosmetic changes with national liberation. For that matter, Fanon contends, "[a]n authentic national liberation exists only to the precise degree to which the individual has irreversibly begun his own liberation" (Fanon 1967:103). It is clear from Fanon that for national liberation to materialise in South Africa, black people must unite and fight for their own liberation and not wait for it to come for free. Changes must be seen in relation to the socio-economic transformation whereby freedom, justice, and equality become a reality.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### FANON AND THE PROBLEMS OF DEVELOPMENT IN THE POST-APARTHEID ERA

---

#### 4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter discusses and explores the problems of development in the post-apartheid era and uses Fanon's lens to understand the socio-economic imbalances. This entails asking fundamental questions and rethinking the socio-economic patterns in the era in which the black political administration is in government. The problem examined is whether or not this administration which claims to be revolutionary has indeed advanced the fundamental question of socio-economic transformation or has betrayed it. This socio-economic position can be used to understand the realities and rhetoric that form a large part of post-apartheid black government. This is written from a Fanonian perspective and attempts to use the conception of socio-economic development to demonstrate the manner in which the notions of race and racism, rhetoric of modernity, and new humanism are shaped and reshaped in post-apartheid South Africa. The framing of this chapter is helpful to advance the manner in which the false sense of socio-economic development is normalised under the black political administration that has proven to be more of a crisis than a solution to the black condition.

This is presented with specific reference to six themes that seem to dominate the socio-economic situation and various spheres of society, but the attention is on those that invariably resonate with Fanonian perspectives. The first issue is the unresolved land question. Secondly, there is the issue of nationalisation and the struggle for economic freedom. The third is Black elite, Black Economic Empowerment, and the State – a theme which is presented with specific reference to the notion of betrayal. Fourthly, there is the spectre of national bourgeoisie that continues to haunt the black political administration even in the post-apartheid era. The fifth issue is structural violence and the black condition for a deeper understanding of the problems of socio-economic transformation. Finally, the sixth issue examines the notion of party politics with regard to Fanonian ideas and respecting their roles in society and eventual outcomes in relation to advancing socio-economic transformation. In a nutshell, this chapter attempts to highlight and explore the manner in which Fanonian position differs with the present situation of South Africa with reference to socio-economic development.

## 4.2 THE UNRESOLVED LAND QUESTION

For a colonized people the most essential value [...] is first and foremost the land: the land which will bring them bread and, above all, dignity. (Fanon 1963:44)

Fanon holds that genuine liberation emerges from the restoration of land, which gives power to the oppressed. Without land, freedom amounts to nothing more than just a simple gesture in as far as the question of existential freedom is concerned. Since Fanon (1963) defined decolonisation as a process which entails social, economic, political, and psychological liberation, South Africa remains challenged, as its political reforms left the question of land unresolved. Ntsebeza (2007) and Thwala (2003), among others, estimate that the extent of land dispossession in South Africa is extraordinary compared to other countries on the African continent. It resulted in extreme spatial arrangements and socio-economic imbalances. Blacks are the political majority and constitute 95% of the total population but occupy 13% of the land, while the white minority who only make up 5% occupy 87% of the remaining land surface.

Black people, albeit being told they are free, remain landless and excluded from the whole project of development. They are subject to exploitation, poverty, and hellish conditions as farm labourers on farms run by whites. Modise and Mtshiselwa (2013:1) assert, “[t]he legacy of socio-economic injustice which was inherited from the colonial apartheid continues to haunt the majority of black South Africans”. This is continuing because post-apartheid aimed for democracy, not the fundamental question in order to address land dispossession and the legacy left by the history of dispossession. The black majority bears the brunt of land dispossession and is trapped in the zone of non-being, which is still prevalent as a result of the hellish black condition. They are landless, stranded, and reside on the margins of society. The enduring reality of land dispossession and socio-economic imbalance enjoys the attention of those under the black condition and outside of the nation.

The problem of land post-apartheid is informed by the demands for land restoration, property rights, and economic control. This demand underscores the need for justice and giving the land back to its rightful owners. To use the words of Diale (2012:1341), “[t]his call refers to the restoration of land to its rightful owners which were disposed since the advent of the colonial period right through to the apartheid system”. The current status quo of land gives privilege to

whites and dispossession to blacks. To amplify this, Mayende (2010:60) postulates, “[w]hite privilege, borne out of colonial land theft, has become firmly entrenched and now enjoys the sanction of the new constitution”. Land has created a situation where whites are afforded the luxury of freedom, choices, and superiority, while the blacks are disadvantaged, stranded, and trapped in what Fanon ([1952]2008) calls the “zone of non-being”. The land question remains unresolved because its questions remain unanswered or met with ineffective remedies.

The land problem is perpetuated by the fact that the government is silent on the land scandal. This is not silent in literal terms, but that of not interrogating critical questions when dealing with the land question. According to Mngxitama (2006:39), “[t]he land question is fundamental to understanding the possibilities and limits of change in the South African context”. However, the government does not want the land question to be re-engaged in political terms; it is implied that this question is sensitive and cannot be opened at this moment, yet the status quo of land theft remains intact. The land issue is classified as sensitive while the government is also silent on the legacy of its dispossession, which left the black landless majority marginalised and excluded from the whole project of humanity in the post-apartheid era. It is argued that this question should be abandoned altogether, as it discourages foreign and transnational corporations from investing in the country. In other instances, it is passively implied that the land question is outdated, as if problems of socio-economic inequality and spatial arrangements in development do not exist. It is not seen as important that the lives of the black masses are at stake because of the very fact that subjection continues to haunt the post-apartheid sociality.

The land issue is arguably the most problematic and enduring question currently in the post-apartheid era. The government has failed to learn from the prophetic warnings imbedded in the thoughts of Fanon and from the experiences of other African states. Fanon (1967:120) maintains, “[t]he first truth on the colonial problem is the conquest by the peoples of the land that belong to them”. Decolonisation, which is the brainchild of freedom, should be waged at all levels of physical and psychological liberation to ensure that genuine freedom is achieved through the conquest of land. What happened in 1994 was not liberation; hence, the triad of dispossession remains – which is the dispossession of land, labour, and being. Fanon argues that genuine liberation must be waged by the oppressed people themselves, and be aimed towards resolving the triad of dispossession and the black experience in particular. This is what escaped liberation in South Africa; hence, post-apartheid and its political reform remain an

illusion. No radical response or political intervention is made from the State, as that will interrupt the status quo of land ownership, economic control, and property in the country.

The known reality is that South Africa is a land of the black people. This can be traced back to the year 1652 when Jan van Riebeeck first arrived in the Cape in South Africa. As Diale (2012:1342) correctly puts it, “[t]he historical context of the South African land dispossession can be traced back to the colonial era and historical crimes of the racist-settler-colonial settlement in year 1652”. Upon his arrival in the Cape, Van Riebeeck demanded that blacks vacate the land for white settlers because the country was too small to accommodate both the native blacks and the white settlers. Blacks resisted the command, and this culminated in native blacks being dispossessed, murdered, and conquered by the racist-settler-colonial regime. The first battle for land started in 1652 and continued for three centuries, which only ended with the defeat of the African people at the end of the 19th century. Mngxitama stresses this notion as follows:

The South African social, political and economic realities of today are founded on the long colonial conquest and, later, apartheid land dispossessions, oppression and exploitation of Africans. Imbedded in these is the race issue linked to the objectives of Rhodes and his predecessors, later perfected by crude apartheid ideologues into a policy of racially based accumulation and control. Therefore, to try to understand the possibilities and limits of change in the South African context we have to focus on the land question. (Mngxitama 2006:41)

The problem of the post-apartheid government is of thinking that the starting point of land dispossession was the Native Land Act of 1913. As Diale (2012:1342) elucidates, “[i]t needs to be pointed out that the Land Act of 1913 was not the sole piece of legislation responsible for land dispossession and plunder”. The Land Act of 1913 only legalised land theft through institutionalisation, naturalisation, and normalisation of the black dispossession, poverty, and suffering that are accepted as a way of life in black communities. This land dispossession and black marginalisation is something that is intensified and strengthened by the black government in the post-apartheid era. In 1994 when the ANC came to power, it committed to make the land question its main priority, but this fell apart with the adoption of the neo-liberal policies from the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank templates. These templates have nothing

to do with ending the black dispossession, or resolving the scandal of the land theft which today is even instigated and protected by the legislation and policies.

The neo-liberal consensus adopted by the South African government is a problem, in that it remains indecisive between the interest of the black landlessness and white monopoly capital. The government has failed to prioritise the land question in favour of the black masses and is silent on the prevailing scandal of white dominance over blacks who are marginally relegated to the periphery of society. The government is also silent on spatial arrangements and socio-economic inequalities that reflect the power and dominance of the white capital. This is not silence in literal terms, but that of not wanting to appear political or too radical when it comes to rethinking the land question, as has been the case with Zimbabwe. On this note, this is not to suggest that South Africa should embark on the route taken by Zimbabwe, but the intervention aimed towards resolving the condition of the landlessness.

Since the promise was made to give back the land to the landless black majority, ineffective land reform programmes and irrelevant neo-liberal structural adjustments were adopted. To concur with Pityana (2013:1), “[t]he general level of South Africa’s land reform and redress has been actually frustrating to black communities that bears brunt of the land dispossession and who live with the legacy of that dispossession”. It is unimaginable that only 3% of the land has been restored since 1994 under the black administration. The government naively thought that if things are done using the institutional reforms and mechanisms, they automatically translate into success. Such is a spectre that haunts the whole discourse of the land question post-apartheid. There has not been enough effort made to study and understand the extent to which the neo-liberal model has failed the entire process of socio-economic transformation.

The South African Constitution is lauded as the best in the world in terms of the promotion and protection of justice, freedom, and equality. It is regarded as the embodiment of the Human Rights Project. The argument is that if the Constitution is indeed the best in the world in terms of the aforementioned, why then is the black population landless in their own country? Blacks have nothing to show for their belonging in South Africa except being cheap farm workers. The Constitution heralds the scandal that exposes the very fact that black subjects are structurally excluded in the post-apartheid era. It is the category of the white subjects that takes centre stage in South Africa; hence, the Constitution is silent on the historical scandal of land dispossession and the crimes committed against the black humanity. It is according to this Constitution that whites owe blacks nothing, including the land that was evidently confiscated

from the native blacks. While the Constitution affords protection and guarantees to property for whites minority, it further deprives, disadvantages, and dispossesses the black masses in social and economic terms as a result of being landless.

Pityana (2013:2) argues, “[i]t is important to recall that the South African constitution is a product of a negotiated process”. Those who negotiated sold out on the question of land. The Constitution incorporates a Property Clause (Section 25) which makes it unconstitutional to expropriate land from whites without compensation, even if that land is claimed by the rightful owner. Sithole (2014a:4) asserts, “[t]his makes it impossible for there to be a viable land reform since everything is trapped within the principle of the markets”. In other words, it implies that the status quo of land theft and dispossession should remain unabated. This is imbedded in the primitive modes of accumulation, which serves the best interests of white farmers. Land redistribution through market reform is not what was agreed upon before 1994. Market reform is a deviation from the initial promise of the ANC and the historical Freedom Charter document. The “willing buyer, willing seller” model gives the advantage to powerful white corporations and established farmers (especially white farmers) in the interests of the market economy (Pityana 2013).

The logic of the market essentially means it is “business as usual” in as far as apartheid capitalism is concerned. According to Banksa and Hulmea (2014:193), it is “business as usual with a new face approach rather than a genuine transformation”. What is invoked is black landlessness, which literally means that the status quo of land must carry on uninterrupted. In this instance, if not wanting to sell, one may put the highest price tag on the land, so that blacks would not have the capacity and means to purchase it. In the words of Mkandawire (2010), essentially this means “running while others walk” in the market, inspired by Julius Nyerere’s dictum, which says, “we must run while others walk”. The market reform is not what was desired by the national liberation struggle; the movement demanded that the land be returned to its rightful owners; it also demanded compensation and accountability for land crimes. The patterns of land ownership, usage, and production will remain the same in as far as the logic of the market is concerned.

It is recognised that socio-economic imbalances in South Africa were inherited from colonial apartheid and perpetuated by the black administration in the post-apartheid era, for assuming power and failing to give back the land to its rightful black owners. The need for a radical land reform programme arises from the persistent racial discrimination and practices which continue

to perpetuate the colonial legacy of land dispossession (Kloppers & Pienaar 2014). As already mentioned, it was during the historical scandal of the racist-settler-colonial settlement that black people lost their ownership and control of land. Like Fanon, Mngxitama recognises land as an asset to black people which when acquired and used productively could effectively alleviate dispossession and the black condition in general. He argues, “[t]he emancipation for socio-economic justice as it relates to the land issue needs to be re-premised within the discourse of colonialism and apartheid” (Mngxitama 2006:66).

It is the intervention which this study seeks to make through Fanonian thought to reimagine the government land reform programme. For the national project to prevail, land has to be prioritised and given back to the rightful black owners. Fanon warns that the struggle for land must be the work of the dispossessed for themselves. This whole question of land is long overdue and must be resolved to allow the national project on national transformation to prevail. It must be remembered that the struggle for liberation in South Africa was solely on the question of land, and to make it a reality, land has to be prioritised and given back to black people without compensation to white people. Government market reform has failed with its neo-liberal policies that lack relevance to the South African context.

### **4.3 NATIONALISATION AND THE STRUGGLE FOR ECONOMIC FREEDOM**

The notion of nationalisation has been a foremost talking point in the body of politics in South Africa, and that tells the fact that the struggle for economic freedom, equality, and justice is still an issue. The call for nationalisation in the post-apartheid era is informed by demands of the black majority to be incorporated into the economic mainstream. They demand that strategic sectors of the economy such as mines, land, banks, health care, universities, and roads be nationalised as a way to open the economy for the black majority to participate in markets, trade, and free enterprise opportunities. The promise of nationalisation emerged from the Congress of the People in Kliptown in 1955 when the Freedom Charter was adopted. As Malikane (2011:13) posits, “[t]his call can be found in the most important documents of all national liberation movements, particularly trade unions that continue to envision a socialist South Africa”. In the post-apartheid era, demands to nationalise have been increased by the Economic Freedom Fighters (EFF) party, which claims to be acting in the spirit of the plight of the Freedom Charter.

It is believed that nationalisation will translate into inclusive socio-economic transformation to the masses who are living at the margins of society. During the national liberation struggle, the ANC promised to prioritise this question and to make the dream of the black majority a reality. On 27 April 1994, when the party came to power, the promise to nationalise was overthrown in favour of neo-liberal policies and structural adjustments that have nothing to do with the plight of the poor masses. Mbeki (2009) states that the ANC accepted bribes offered by white monopoly capital to erase the calls for nationalisation, which they perceived as a threat to the power of white economic interests. The meetings took place at the secretive Codesa II where business contacts, connections, and contracts were formalised. That means the masses were betrayed and persuaded to believe that nationalisation is not possible. This owes to moral and political degeneration that seems to be the nature of the black political administration. They are ignorant of the economy and lack capacity to reimagine the black existential condition.

Fanon's diagnosis of the post-apartheid era was on point. He was dismissive of nationalisation, as he saw it as a road of retrogression, if not tragedy, in the hands of nationalist leaders. His contempt is leaders who misuse the national economy to further personal, sectional, and factional interests instead of the interests of the nation, thus the scandalous, quick, and ruthless form of enrichment rampant in the ruling party today. Fanon could only see a nightmare coming – a nationalisation that has become the foundation of patronage, corruption, and nepotism among the ruling class. To concur with Fanon (1963:48), “[s]poilt children of yesterday’s colonialism and of today’s national governments, they organi[s]e the loot of whatever national resources exist”. It is easy to detect and understand the elements of Fanon’s nightmare with what is happening in the ANC and government where state enterprises are debilitating because of inherent corruption and incapacity that seem to be fashionable in black political administration. Fanon saw this coming:

Without pity, they use today’s national distress as a means of getting on through scheming and legal robbery, by import-export combines, limited liability companies, gambling on the stock exchange, or unfair promotion.  
(Fanon 1963:48)

The politics of acquisition, pleasure, and consumption do not transform the economy for the benefit of the people, and such is evidenced in South Africa where the black majority is poor and white minorities (ruling class) are prosperous (Sithole 2012). This is even in the context of rampant unemployment, free education and state crisis, luxury lifestyle, glitz, glamour, cars,

clothes, shoes, watches, champagnes, and expensive displays springing up at the back of the national crisis (Gibson 2011b). The economy has been passed over to individuals that have turned liberation into a mockery, makeshift, and an empty shell to the promises of national liberation. This generation has nothing to do with masses nor inventing anything of its own, as it is the product of native bourgeoisie – it has integrated the most corrupt forms of colonialist and racist thought. The gains of liberation have been seized to self-profit in the shortest possible time and reduced political parties (flagbearers of liberation movement) into a trade union of personal, sectional, and factional interests between the masses and their leaders.

Malikane (2011:13) states, “South Africa ranks seventh internationally in terms of coal and iron ore production, and fifth in terms of gold production”. However, there is nothing to show from the gains of its gold, diamonds, platinum, coal deposits, just to name but a few, as the benefits are captured in the hands of the ruling elite and captains of the economy. Behind the lifestyle of the black ruling class is glitz and glamour that put a different reality to the world. This has resulted in a serious condition of neglect and exclusion that is part of the black condition where a ruling elite has emerged at the expense of the black majority. The wealth of the country is not directed to focus on the lives of the black majority. Malikane stresses that:

Several peer countries, including some that also bore the brunt of colonialism, are outperforming South Africa, not only in terms of output volumes but critically also in terms of developmental indicators, such as employment, poverty and inequality. These countries have one thing in common: significant state ownership in the mineral extraction sector. While others are steaming ahead on the road of economic development, South Africa seems to be caught in a rut of low growth and slow development. (Malikane 2011:13)

The mere fact that the ANC opted to adopt neo-liberal guidelines meant that the nationalisation project was thrown out of the window. The ordinary people who have hoped that the rise of the ANC to power will change things in government and create socio-economic transformation are left stranded and confused, as they remain marginalised and excluded from the post-apartheid era. This has been a common problem throughout the African continent as nationalist leaders rise to power and become captured in a capitalist economy often connected with the powerful white economic oligarchies. To make matters worse, when other African states were starting to get their independence from their colonial powers, South Africa went on to another form of

vicious white government that continued with the neo-liberal policies and structural adjustments that marginalised the gap between the rich and the poor to the point that resulted in the country being one of the most unequal societies in the world. One might go as far as question the progress that has been made in terms of transforming the racial and economic relation mining that are dominated by the middle (ruling) class. Mishaps such as Marikana and xenophobia could have been avoided through nationalisation had the ANC not succumbed to privatising the mining sector.

The nationalisation that Fanon was speaking about is totally different from the control regime that was implemented under the ANC government. The leadership that came to power debilitate the national economy and further misshape structures; under them, stealing, patronage, and nepotism as corruption became the order of the day to get richer in the shortest possible time. For Fanon (1963:180), “[n]ationali[s]ing the intermediary sector means organi[s]ing wholesale and retail cooperatives on a democratic basis; it also means decentralizing these cooperatives by getting the mass of the people interested in the ordering of public affairs”. Hence, Fanon saw this way as avoiding corruption and barring the alienation of the masses it comes with. This kind of nationalisation could open the economy on a national scale and avoid marginalising the masses in the process, as it is the case with the current situation in South Africa. The reason nationalisation failed in most states is largely because the control regime was implemented, propounded by the incompetence of the ruling class that places such industries at the hands of incompetent comrades, family members, and friends.

The point here is that nationalisation, if passed as policy and implemented properly, could undoubtedly address much of the socio-economic imbalances. The argument that it will not work based on the experiences of African states is not inherently correct. The reason in South Africa most state parastatals (state-owned enterprises) are failing is not that the State is inherently incapable of succeeding, but largely because they are being used for personal, sectional, and factional interests by politicians within the ruling party (ANC) as a means in the distribution of patronage. Two examples are the South African Broadcasting Corporation (SABC) and the South African Airways (SAA) that are struggling as a result of mismanagement, incompetent political deployment, and corruption by ANC members. Despite the Public Protector, Thuli Madonsela, releasing findings against Hlaudi Motsoeneng, SABC Chief Operations Officer, for not qualifying to hold the office, the incumbent was nonetheless kept in the post by Communications Minister Faith Muthambi. In SAA, although several

complaints have been laid against its Chairperson, Dudu Myeni, no action has been taken against her owing to cadre deployment and protection from the ANC. Although they are temporarily removed, Myeni has since been reappointed because she is close to Zuma and serves as chairperson of his charity, the Jacob Zuma Foundation.

The Fanonian ideology of nationalisation is underpinned by equitable distribution of goods and services to the public not to sustain and serve the interests of the black elite at the expense of the excluded black majority. If nationalisation is to prosper, the national resources and economy, including state enterprises, must stop being used for political interests – even by the president. This means abolishing corruption, cronyism, patronage, nepotism, political favouritism, and discrimination. If South Africa can openly engage in political debates and discussions around nationalisation, there is no doubt that solution and confidence could be found that lead to successful implementation of nationalisation as a state socialist policy. It cannot be correct that since nationalisation failed in Zimbabwe, that means it will not be possible in South Africa either. The same could be said of capitalism that has never worked and succeeded anywhere in Africa. It is therefore on this basis that nationalisation must be seen as a deliberate attempt to rescue South Africa from the captivity of capitalism.

The policy on nationalisation will reconcile and unite South Africans in social and economic terms. South Africa is divided because those with economic power (rich white families) are against nationalisation in defence of their property and business – hence they speak against nationalisation because they stand to lose. What is proposed here is a different type of nationalisation from Zimbabwe in that land, the economy, and banks will be under the custodian of the State as opposed to individual ownership that has resulted in unfavourable power relations. While Zimbabwe took the land and gave it to black people, South Africa proposes to make the State the owner of the land and redistribute it to people based on sound business proposal. This is to avoid a situation where white people are enjoying land ownership that is not utilised, and those who seek to utilise it are demanded to pay millions for using it. If the State becomes the custodian of land, it means land will be realised and used for purposes that benefit society rather than white individuals. Therefore, in the process of redistributing land even white people will be considered on the basis of a business plan that includes empowering black people. However, in the case where land is needed by both a white and a black person at the same time, that piece of land will be transferred to the latter as a deliberate attempt by the State to empower previously disadvantaged blacks. Such a deliberate initiative

is targeted at empowering black people to climb higher the ladder of the economic stratum where they will then become the shareholders and captains of the industries rather than in current order.

This deviates from the current arrangements where Black Economic Empowerment (BEE) and businesses are forged on political connections between the white monopoly capital and the ruling elite. What nationalisation proposes is premised on workers to partner in business ownership as opposed to the black elite. Thus, if a worker is partnered and signed as a shareholder in a company, it will minimise the potential for exploitation and increase the productivity of that particular worker, since the worker will know that he or she stands to benefit the decent bonus based on the productivity that will intensify their work ethic and increase business returns. However, in a situation where the owner stands to benefit millions from labour exploitation, probabilities of protests and strikes are high regarding demands for increased salaries and wages as has been the case in Marikana. Nevertheless, if black workers are partnered in ownership, it means a totally different scenario where all parties – white and black owners – will be happy to come at the end of the month. Another scenario is that when the State becomes the custodian of ownership, it will establish a bank that will compete with private banks at lower interest rates rather than high percentages that make it impossible for black people to survive. That way will enable black people to lend money and participate in businesses of properties, farms, residential, locomotives, and many others, at lower payable interest rates.

#### **4.4 THE SPECTRE OF THE NATIONAL BOURGEOISIE**

Fanon's analysis of the national bourgeoisie also needs to be discussed to ascertain the extent to which it has been (re)formulated in the post-apartheid state setting. Fanon is critical of the national bourgeoisie and argues that the downfall of the nation state originates with the covert behaviour of the national bourgeoisie for indulging in the politics of corruption, looting, and nepotism, which is done at the disadvantage of the whole nation. The national bourgeoisie has nothing to do with the plight of the masses, which they are indebted to serve; they are satisfied only with the role of being managers for the capitalist system. They have no interest in the national development project and do not even participate in the revolutionary movement. Their interest is in thinking of the best and quickest possible way of making money.

The concept of the national bourgeoisie in the post-apartheid context refers to the national middle class consisting of the ruling political elite, the private sector elite, and the white economic oligarchies. The elite class has its origins in the apartheid civil service, which consisted of the chieftaincies and leaders who constituted the local agents of the apartheid system. The role of the elite class has remained remarkably consistent since the days of the apartheid administration until now in the post-apartheid era. They engage in the politics of patronage and beneficence, which does not transform the economy for the benefit of the entire nation. Even in the context of a national economic crisis, they are seen driving in luxury German cars, staying in expensive suburb mansions, and even splashing massive cash on night lifestyle. The bourgeoisie class has always provided a paradox when coming to the question of social and economic transformation because it does not share the same aspirations as the entire society (Mngxitama 2010).

The South African experience resonates with the experiences of most other post-colonial states in the African continent in relation to the national middle class. Mbeki (2011:6) states, “[o]ver the past 200 years South Africa has been ruled by at least four types of political elite – namely, indigenous African aristocracy; British imperialists; Afrikaner landowners; and black upper class”. Each of these groups of the elite has had its own different perspective on economic development. One thing in common is that all these groups contributed towards the economic development of South Africa, which became the dominant economic power on the African continent. They embarked on different areas of economic development and investment ranging from private property in land, mineral resources, agriculture and environment, transportation, communication, and infrastructure. All these elite groups invested in the economic development of the country. The difference with the post-apartheid black middle class is that it does not invest nor have the means of production, it is dependent oddly on former colonial powers.

According to Mbeki (2011:8), “[t]he black middle class that became South Africa’s dominant political elite in 1994, unlike the previous three political elites, was a class of intellectuals rather than of property owners”. Its main objectives for acquiring power were not to protect or invest in property, since it did not have any. Instead, its main agenda was informed by personal, sectional and factional interests. As Mbeki (2011:8) explains, “[i]t diverts resources from investment to consumption”. Because they are relegated to roles of managers, the black middle class has no control over the means of production; theirs is to ensure that the status quo of the

political system remains the same. They are characterised by a weak economic position. They largely depend on the economic policies and programmes of capitalist societies. Fanon makes it clear that the nationalist bourgeoisie in the former colonies is characterised by a state of dependency:

When questioned on the economic program of the state that they are clamor[ing] for, or on the nature of the regime which they propose to install, they are incapable of replying, because precisely, they are completely ignorant of the economy of their own country .... This economy has always developed outside the limits of their knowledge. They have nothing more than an approximate, bookish acquaintance with the actual and potential resources of their country's soil and mineral deposits; and therefore they can only speak of these resources on a general and abstract plane .... After independence this underdeveloped middle class, reduced in numbers and without capital, which refuses to follow the path of revolution, will fall into deplorable stagnation. It is unable to give free rein to its genius, which formerly it was wont to lament, though rather too glibly, was held in check by colonial domination. (Fanon 1963:150-151)

The national bourgeoisie defines itself as the transmission line between the local economy and the metropolis. That is, as Fanon (1963:152) puts it, “[s]een through its eyes, its mission has nothing to do with transforming the nation; it consists, prosaically, of being the transmission line between the nation and a capitalism, rampant though camouflaged, which today puts on the mask of neo-colonialism”. Fanon’s concerns with the nationalist bourgeoisie, among others, include failing to address the social and economic transformation and investing in human development capital. The moral and political degeneration that has come to characterise the national bourgeoisie has affected the entire national developmental project. Fanon defines the national bourgeoisie class as a sort of “greedy caste, avid and voracious, with the mind of a huckster” because it is quite content with the role of being a middleman, which it facilitates without any moral or conscious interrogation.

The biggest problem facing South Africa is the ruling political elite who have not only abandoned the national liberation struggle but have also undermined the poor by accepting bribes from political patronages. When the ANC took power in 1994, it committed itself to make transformation its major priority and to fulfil the expectations of blacks who have been

marginalised and excluded from socio-economic development its main focus. For the poor black majority, it was hoped that the rise of the black administration to power would bring meaningful changes and renewed hope in relation to their existential conditions. However, this was never to materialise, as the ruling elite became trapped in the politics of patronage, consumption, and enjoyment, leaving the helpless poor majority abandoned and devastated as they were betrayed. Political degeneration has become a regular feature in post-apartheid, especially among the ruling elite, as they became seduced with office powers and privileges.

Fanon's analysis of the bourgeoisie class has proven prophetic of the post-apartheid reality. From a Fanonian point of view, the black middle class harbours blame for the failure to harmonise the social and economic relations of the whole nation. While the elite occupies the top of power in order to enjoy privileges they do not deserve, the black majority is left out on the margins of society neglected and devastated. The spirit of embourgeoisement and making much money within the shortest space of time is rampant among the ruling political elite even in the face of gloom and despondent poverty. Neocosmos observes:

There is little doubt that the politics of grabbing and enrichment among the postapartheid elite have been both brazen and extensive. So-called Black Economic Empowerment (BEE) has enabled the development of a new class of "black diamonds" whose new-found wealth is not particularly geared towards national accumulation and development but primarily towards short-term, quick profits ... in a hegemonic culture that extols the virtues of free-market capitalism, equating private enrichment with the public good and quick profit with development. (Neocosmos 2008:587)

This state of affairs has continued uninterrupted and unfortunately true of all post-independence states on the African continent. Gumede (2007:289) points out, "many of the post-liberation African societies continue to feature a small, rich elite, often connected to the ruling elite and the poor masses, with a small middle class sandwiched between". This situation has brought a false sense of liberation and a perpetual state of suffering among the black majority in the case of South Africa. The notion of privilege and dispossession, according to Fanon (1963), is a consequence of the moral degeneration on the part of the national liberation leaders who have not only become agents of the capitalist system but have also become the oppressors of the poor. The bourgeoisie are obsessed with money and have also become greedy and rich entrepreneurs, whereas at the same time the poor are suffering in poverty.

Gibson (2011a) is of the view that the notion of moral and political degeneration in the ANC-aligned elite and intelligentsia owes its source to the small conception of liberation. It was small in the sense that it understood liberation as political independence instead of decolonisation. To this effect, Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2013:142) amplifies, “South Africa has never been decoloni[s]ed”. Thus, in 1910 it gained what can correctly be termed colonial independence. In 1994, it gained liberal democracy without decolonisation. Even the ANC itself never talks about Independence Day but rather Freedom Day. South Africa was never decolonised, hence post-apartheid experiencing the problem of emancipation. It was in 1994 that some ANC-aligned leaders took advantage during the negotiations and betrayed the nation for their personal benefit and enrichment.

The commercialisation of the national liberation struggle, which concluded the elite pact between the ANC and corporate capital, was a complete failure for those who had waited to see changes in their material, economic, and social conditions. In this regard, Dollery (2003:9) contends, “[t]he effects of this alleged compromise between the ANC and the South African corporate sector and its allies abroad have been nothing short of disastrous”. The resolution ensured that members of the upper classes profit substantially from mainstream economic activity while the poor black majority are left out of the equation. The ANC delegation in the negotiations accepted and welcomed the resolution as they took advantage to make more business and money for themselves, where they even exchanged contacts, connections, and signed lucrative contract deals with members of the white capitalist system.

Nationalist leaders had nothing more in mind to do with the demands of the ordinary masses than take advantage of the opportunity to climb the ladder of the socio-economic stratum. They saw the opportunity to become a generation of the next bourgeoisie and to live the life that is afforded to the bourgeoisie class. To concur with Fanon (1963:44-45), “[t]he look that the native turns on the settler’s town is a look of lust, a look of envy; it expresses his dreams of possession – all manner of possession: to sit at the settler’s table, to sleep in the settler’s bed, with his wife if possible”. All the black man wants is to eject the white man and take his place. That is what the nationalist leadership of the liberation struggle was all about. According to Gibson (2011a:9), “critical voices in the ANC were outmanoeuvred, co-opted, told to keep quiet, or expelled into the political wilderness”. This silencing of the debate is still continuing even as the consequences of the elite pacts are putting the country on the verge of a disastrous

catastrophe. The bourgeoisie only cares about themselves, not the plight of the struggling people.

The whole conception of liberation was problematic in that it failed to recognise the link that created privileges and disadvantages. Thus, it left unchanged the apartheid structures that benefited the white privilege. This failure to foresee and rectify the links between privileged and disadvantaged structures only strengthened and perpetuated the old apartheid relations under the façade of the post-apartheid era. The whole project of liberation has been a failure that is continually perpetuated by the black middle class in the post-apartheid era. Gibson (2001:374) contends, the “ruling political elite always have their eyes fixed on economic opportunities and always keep their minds and ears open to new impulses and voices from below”. Their agenda is always a mission informed by the politics of self-beneficiation. Failure on the part of their obligation is something often dismissed and blame directed at the apartheid past. What cannot be escaped is the lifestyle associated with the bourgeoisie class – being greed, arrogance, and shamelessly driving around in expensive cars and hosting expensive parties while the masses are starving without food, housing, roads, and even sanitation for the basic life of a human being.

The bourgeoisie have nothing better to do with the revolutionary struggle than take over power from the master and live the lifestyle afforded to the bourgeoisie. These economic ambitions have continued to undermine the development of good governance and democracy in general. The black middle class post-apartheid consists of the president, ministers, executives, directors, managers, and professionals, and are nothing but a linkage between the local economy and the capitalist system. This class has ensured a continued imbalance between the poor black masses on the ground and the capitalist system within the global economy. The role of the national middle class has contributed substantially to the creation of a false sense of liberation. Thus, it has undermined and compromised the whole project of national transformation in the post-apartheid era.

#### **4.4 BLACK ELITES, BLACK ECONOMIC EMPOWERMENT, AND THE STATE**

Fanon (1963:175) criticises the black elite for being a “greedy caste, avid and voracious, with the mind of a huckster, only too glad to accept the dividends that the former colonial power hands out to it”. They have nothing better to do than indulge in the politics of patronage, corruption, and consumerism. The aspiration of the black elite is to seize power and live the life afforded to the bourgeoisie class, and to make more money in the shortest possible time. They are characterised by a state of dependency, as they do not own the means of production but depend on the State to maintain and sustain their expensive lifestyle. They want to live the life afforded by the white bourgeoisie without being bourgeoisie, which only goes to show the paralysis of this class.

The foregoing situation is regrettably true of South Africa, as the country finds itself suffering from its own materialistic black elite. The rise of the ANC to power in 1994 following the first democratic elections in South Africa brought renewed hopes for the black majority who were historically and economically excluded from the economic mainstream. However, as the post-apartheid reality reveals, this was never to happen, as those who came to power sought to make the best use of power to enrich themselves instead of the masses that voted for them. The root cause of this problem can be traced to the moral degeneration on the part of the national liberation leaders who betrayed the masses and took the role of managers of the capitalist system. Gibson (2011:3) states, “Fanon’s analysis of the danger of the moral degeneration of the liberation struggle bodes ill for the future of South Africa”. In as far as the status quo is concerned, the black elite ensures that the system remains uninterrupted for as long as that means remaining in power. They do this by being silent when it comes to political questions, especially in relation to the fundamental question of socio-economic transformation, which is critical.

Mngxitama (2010:35) argues, “[t]he irony is that South African elite refrain by large from confronting the sad reality of the black majority”. The elite are silent when it comes to the need to account for the black condition. They have in the post-apartheid era become seduced by office privileges while the black majority is languishing in poverty. Not only have they become greedy and wealthy entrepreneurs but have also become shameless in the face of the desperate masses that they cheated, mugged, and deserted. This situation in the words of Gumede (2007:289) is also true of “[m]any other post-liberation African societies that continue to feature a small rich elite, often connected to the ruling elite and the poor masses, with a small

middle class sandwiched between”. In the case of South Africa, this practice was inherited from the apartheid regime and carried into the post-apartheid era, where the logic of business is to make as much money as possible in the shortest possible time. As Gibson (2011:3) affirms, “[a]t first blush this binary seems to describe apartheid rather than ‘rainbow’ South Africa, where powerful new black elite has emerged”. The black elite is mostly composed of the ANC, and state officials have contributed to the downward spiral of the black condition.

The concept of the black elite in the post-apartheid era consists of the ruling political elite, the black middle class, BEE, and the private sector elite. These elite are all the creation of the colonial capitalist system and therefore have one thing in common imbedded in their thoughts – the primitive mode of accumulation (Mbeki 2009). Mbeki (2009:63) posits, “South Africa today is ruled by black elite with much the same roots and characteristics inherited from the colonial apartheid systems”. The BEE elite emerged as a dominant elite in the post-apartheid era that controlled significant institutions, such as the State, labour unions, trade sector, and even politics. Central to the interests of the BEE elite is the politics of patronage, consumerism, and nepotism, all of which do not translate into the economic development of the nation. In the ANC, the ruling party in government, powerful BEE elite are found in different positions including those of being president, ministers, premiers, and comrades who are all but business entrepreneurs.

During the period of the negotiation settlement between the apartheid regime and leaders of the black nationalists in the 1990s, some comrades sought to make use of this opportunity to benefit themselves instead of national liberation. They took bribes in exchange for contracts, connections, and contacts from the white capital. Fanon (1963) asserts, “during the period of liberation, the colonialist bourgeoisie looks feverishly for contacts with the elite and it is with these elite that the familiar dialogue concerning values is carried on”. In the case of South Africa, as argued previously, “[a] few black people were able to take advantage of favourable state policies such as Black Economic Empowerment (BEE) and Affirmative Action (AA) to climb up the social and economic ladder into the middle stratum/middle class status” (Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2013:142). Examples include Cyril Ramaphosa, Patrice Motsepe, Tokyo Sexwale, and others called the “black diamonds” associated with the ANC. Seekings writes,

Tokyo Sexwale was premier of Gauteng Province; Cyril Ramaphosa was Mbeki’s main rival to succeed Mandela; “Patrice Motsepe has never been active in the ANC, but he is linked by marriage to ANC leaders”; Mathews

Phosa was premier of Mpumalanga Province; Popo Molefe was premier of North-West Province; Saki Macozoma was a prominent ANC spokesperson; Moss Ngoasheng was Mbeki's economic adviser; Wendy Luhabe is the wife of the current ANC premier of Gauteng; and so on. (Seekings 2007:12)

The ANC, which is the ruling party in government, is haunted by the scandal of selling BEE in exchange for political support. To amplify this, Lodge (2014:2) maintains, "indicators include the acquisition of BEE funded businesses by leading politicians and their families, most notably the proliferation of the presidential family's business concerns since Jacob Zuma's accession to the presidency". This is accompanied by cadre deployment for posts in government, municipalities, and BEE companies, which, in turn, must serve the interests of the party as terms and conditions of the agreement. As Sithole (2012:87) correctly explains, "[i]n this scenario, the black elite are rewarded on the basis of political loyalty and they must therefore serve the interests of the State in exchange for a path leading to wealth accumulation through tenders and lucrative contracts". Because the black elite do not own the means of production, they use state power to access white capital, something which includes taking bribes from white oligarchies to silence calls for nationalisation.

Mbeki (2009) states that BEE was invented by white economic oligarchies and their families who control the commanding heights of the South African economy to silence calls for nationalisation. According to Mbeki (2009:66), "BEE was created by the National Party government-controlled New Africa Investment Limited (NAIL), which started operating in 1992, two years before the ANC came to power". Mbeki argues that the aim was to identify and co-opt a few leaders of the national liberation movement by literally buying them off with enormous wealth and assets to make it look like a transfer of power to the black masses. The same so-called black diamonds are used today to counter accusations of racism and to hide the continuation of racial discrimination. These politicians were transformed overnight into multi-millionaires through BEE to silence calls that were perceived as a threat to white capital. The impression created by the ANC in the post-apartheid era is that all historically marginalised, disadvantaged, and excluded blacks would benefit from BEE.

Southall (2003:3) states, "[h]aving conceded democracy in 1994, the objective of the white capitalist class has become to provide for a limited, formal deracialisation by winning over key elements of the national liberation movement, and by carrying through neo-liberal reforms of the economy". In the post-apartheid era, it has become plain among the black majority who

remain that BEE is not what it was presented to the nation to be but a discourse that has become racist in its core ideology of the black elite and enrichment agenda. It is now common to be accused of anti-black racism if one attempts to criticise the scandal of BEE, regardless of applying Fanon's lens (Smith 2016). The benefactors of BEE have an interest in preserving the status quo for as long as it continues favouring them. There is no compassion to the plight of the black majority that is poor, suffering, and struggling for survival. What is a concern for BEE benefactors is living the expensive lifestyle and competing on cars, houses, women, boozing, and so on.

Mngxitama (2010:35) accuses the black elite of being silent when it comes to interrogating the critical question on the fault line of the nation. His charge includes black writers who shy away from writing openly or in a frank manner on the critical questions that confront the black majority. These issues include the question of race and racism in the economic mainstream as one of the issues that strengthen and perpetuate the black condition. Mngxitama (2010:35) argues, "[t]he ink of black writers seems to run dry when they need to write on the black condition". According to Mngxitama (2010), there is emergent anti-black writing which perpetuates racist stereotypes under the guise of criticism that conveniently invents blacks as "new exploiters" and whites as "the victims". He contends that praise is bestowed upon black writers who have become an integral part of condoning, exaggerating, and uncoupling black accumulation from its white base. The primitive modes of accumulation, corruption, and nepotism inherited from the old apartheid system are erased and denied as not coming from the white base.

Furthermore, Mngxitama (2010:35) accuses the ANC of downplaying the occurrences of race and racism in quick favour of non-racialism premised on the notion of the rainbow nation. This paralysis erases measures or any attempt that is supposed to deal with race and racism, and not deny its existence in or impact on society (Sithole 2012). Sithole (2012:51) exclaims, "ignorance is not the issue, but rather a fear to point out race". According to Mngxitama (2010:35), "[t]he ANC is also revealed as a vicious body-guard at the gate of white privilege and happy to be thrown tender bones as it maintains the apartheid status quo". He maintains that to accuse the ANC of bad governance without also revealing in whose interest it governs is to be disingenuous and self-serving. It can be argued here that this situation pushes political commentary to focus its attention on the domain of non-racialism, which in effect says nothing about the black condition or racialised realities in social and economic terms. A large

part of the answer lies in the failure of black people to speak their desires and waiting for white people to feel mercy for them, something that white liberals would not do.

#### **4.5 STRUCTURAL VIOLENCE AND THE BLACK CONDITION**

The life of the black subject is always in trouble because of its entanglement with blackness, racism, and subjection. In the case of South Africa, this happens because of the legacy of the apartheid era, which continues to haunt the black body even in the post-apartheid era. A section of white supremacists, two decades after the apartheid era, even refers to black people as animals, uneducated, criminals, lazy, and dirty masses, all of which are an indication of an entrenched phenomenon of racism. Anti-black racism has been the order of the day in South Africa, where black life can be taken at will, and the democratic law has dismally failed to uproot its causes. The economic and material condition favours the white minority and excludes the black majority. What apartheid has left behind are pathologies that recreate and perpetuate poverty, hunger, landlessness, and cheap labour as part of the exclusive identity of the black majority. It does not matter that one black person is a millionaire or billionaire; the fact that the black majority lives in hellish existential conditions means that the condition of suffering is taken as a shared lived experience. As Fanon (1967:32) observes, “[t]he object of racism is no longer the individual man but a certain form of existing”. The need for liberation should therefore be about the structural transformation of the black condition as a whole.

The political reforms that brought democracy in the post-1994 era did not depart from the apartheid legacy; this transition left the racially marked structures and spatial patterns in socio-economic imbalances intact. For instance, Sithole (2015:24-25) argues, “during the era of [apartheid], [b]lack subjects were open to subjection in its raw and explicit form, but now, it has hidden itself in the everyday life, and its structural constitution is hard to explain in the realm of common sense, created by the very same subjection”. The lack of understanding structural violence around issues of racism, unemployment, poverty, and oppression is what has defeated the national project. The post-apartheid era is regarded as the free and open society, but little is done to address the black condition within the context of structural violence that needs to be resolved to ensure that indeed South Africa is a successful project. Fanon’s continued relevance constitutes a potent force that accounts for the ways in which the tragedy that plagues the black condition must be understood within the context of structural violence which normalises the everyday life of indignities and injustices of the black majority.

Fanon argues for the ways in which the life of the black subject must be understood from the position of the structural violence that negates the demands of the black people in the world. The structural violence is simply a reference to a form of racism that prevents people from living the life that is afforded to human beings. The term structural violence was coined by Galtung (1969) to describe a specific form of violence entrenched into structures of power such as the economy, land, and labour, which all reflected the power of white capital in South Africa. According to Farmer (2004:307), “[s]tructural violence is violence exerted systematically – that is, indirectly – by everyone who belongs to a certain social order”. Structural violence cannot be understood outside the social, economic, and political realities imbedded in society. This is because it operates through the institutionalised, naturalised, and normalised processes of the everyday life but reveals its symptoms. It creates a position of privilege, development, domination, and superiority on one hand but deprivation, dispossession, marginalisation, poverty, and subjugation on the other hand.

Bulhan (1985) identifies three forms of human violence – namely, personal, institutional, and structural violence. None of them exist and operate in isolation – all three are interdependent. “But how each is expressed and modified varies from one society to another” (Bulhan 1985:137). The existence and operation of structural violence vary from one context to another, since societies are characterised by different forms of human oppression. There are societies that carry all three forms of violence, while others only have two or one form of human violence. Appearances of violence are both visible and invisible, as the logic differs from one context and time to another. In the context of South Africa where racism is condemned in the highest constitutional terms, violence has assumed structures such as institutions that continue to (re)produce the effects of racism. Structural violence is unavoidable, as it is institutionalised, naturalised, and normalised in all spheres of human existence and socio-economic arena.

The target of structural violence is the black body in general, and there is little effort done to investigate the absence of white bodies from this form of violence. Sithole (2011:16) states, “[t]he black body exists in the anti-black world and it is in this world that complains against structural violence will not be recognised but ridiculed as mere victimhood or obscene claims by the other blacks who are not part of the lived experience of the black condition”. The political reform of the post-apartheid era in South Africa made a blunder of not addressing the question of structures. This means, as Maldonado-Torres (2008:233) posits, ‘that the colonised

in this sense are operating based on not being colonised directly, but exist within the effects of a colonial structure which continues its legacy'. Mngxitama (2015b) points out that the black suffering reveals the legacy of apartheid that continues to haunt the black body even in the post-apartheid era where non-racism is claimed to exist. South Africa remains a country still dominated by race and racism as organising principles of society.

Structural violence breeds modalities that promote violence, self-hatred, anti-blackness, and xenophobia. The xenophobic attacks that took place in May 2008 and the Marikina massacre in August 2012 serve as testimony that demonstrated the hatred of black bodies in the circle of oppression. The black life seeks to be emancipated in social and economic terms, but such an attempt is made impossible by the very existence of structural violence. Farmer (2004) states that anti-blackness is an experience that often finds itself in structural violence. Such violence, in the case of South Africa, takes place in the form of racism, unemployment, poverty, and illness along racial lines. Therefore, the black condition is located in structural violence, which regulates the form of life that must be lived – a hellish existential condition where life can be taken at free will. To make it inescapable, it relies on race to claim hierarchy, and as such, it is reduced to a level where racism is normalised and naturalised. “Social structures even if they change, the presence of structural violence makes the effects to be the same” (Sithole 2011:17). When tracing the black condition, structural violence needs to be read in relation to race as the constitutive principle of organisation.

Structural violence makes it impossible for black people to prosper from the structural position of their black condition (Mignolo 2011). Mngxitama (2008) indicates that complaints concerning the black condition cannot be listened to or heard, and more so by the institutions that matter the most in society, including government. For black people to demand justice, freedom, and equality is to ask for an impossible request from their structural point of view. Mngxitama (2008) highlights that it is impossible to look at the black condition and squatter camps such as in Alexandra or Diepsloot and see a human image – the image of rats and dogs with their dirt in absolute proximity takes precedence. This is in contrast, as Mngxitama (2008) explains, with white people's pets, where one finds that the dogs and cats of white people have medical aid, while the black garden and kitchen workers do not and cannot afford it. He argues that, from their white privilege, white people do not understand precisely that they, as a group, are the cause of the suffering and animalisation of black people.

Sithole (2011:17) brings out, “[s]tructural violence functions well under the power of denialism and this blinds the view that the national question is about the location and the location of the racist encounter”. The white socio-economic privilege in South Africa distances white people from the pursuit of racial unity. Each time black people complain about their hellish black condition, the prevailing mentality and its logical order called racism among the white and black liberals, they are told to just get over it. Black people trapped in their black condition are told to work hard and look towards the future, as if these problems are not caused and produced by structural violence that makes it impossible to prosper as a black person. As Sithole (2011:8) argues, “[t]he subject position of blackness has been that of the being restricted, excluded, dehumanised and to the lesser extent, being acted upon”. The notion of keeping black people under constant policing and monitoring their mobilities expresses the extent of negation. This act of negation dictates that black people are suffering; pain and experiences do not belong in the public domain but should instead be internalised so as to spare the privileged from feeling guilty.

The black bodies trapped in the black condition do not have the capacity to articulate their grammar of suffering, as there will be a need for empirical facts, statistics, and validity (Wilderson 2003). In the case of the post-apartheid era, black people who complain about the existence of discrimination and other forms of racism are quickly dismissed on the basis of non-racism that turns out to be a façade that defends institutional racism. Every time a conversation of institutional racism is brought up, it is quickly dismissed either through lack of urgency or finding fault with black people as being racist. This does not only demonstrate denialism but also highlights the structural racism rooted in intolerant supremacist beliefs under the current status quo called neo-apartheidism. Therefore, what is to be made clear is that structural violence is a predicament to the black condition because it makes the suffering and indignity of the black majority to be seen as normal – both in socio-economic terms and in the imagination. The lack of capacity to articulate the grammar of suffering is on its own a predicament at the level of the mind, which is negated from modes of self-expression, activism, and praxis.

Fanon’s nightmare, as Mbembe (2011b) posits, ‘is our reality’. Mbembe (2011b) brings to light that to study Fanon today is to translate into the language of today the major questions that forced him to stand up and agitate for liberation. Structural violence was and still is a concern to Fanon. What, then, is to be done? Fanonian imagination in the post-apartheid era must seek

to bring to an end the racially marked structures and spatial patterns that make it practically impossible for the black majority to participate in the broad socio-economic project. This means asking fundamental questions and reimagining the black condition that is found in structures such as power, land, economy, and labour, all of which are critical to the liberation of black people. For this to materialise, there must be a strong effort from government and society and, in particular, the ruling party – ANC – to fully commit to the national project and play the role of a revolutionary party. For as long as government is not condemning racism in the highest constitutional terms and imposing severe punishments, institutional racism will remain part of the post-apartheid society. This identification with Fanonian revolutionary ideas on free and open society is the only thing that can give the post-apartheid era a meaning and human dimension.

#### **4.6 PARTY POLITICS AS A PREDICAMENT FOR THE NATIONAL PROJECT**

Fanon is a severe critic of party politics, as it has nothing to do with bettering the plight of the poor and rather reinforces and perpetuates black suffering. It goes without even saying that the pattern of South African party politics is exactly what Fanon has imagined it would become – a false sense of liberation and repetition without difference. According to Fanon (1963:108), “[t]he notion of the party is a notion imported from the mother country”. In the case of South Africa, this continues because of the legacy of apartheid that was inherited, captured, and continued by the black political administration in the post-apartheid era. The post-apartheid era and its political reforms made way for the illusion of liberation that only features black political parties in government in the absence of fundamental and structural changes. The ANC, which came to power in 1994, has no control of the political system other than to ensure that the status quo of apartheid remains uninterrupted.

It has been two decades since South Africa became a democratic state. South Africa is regarded as a post-liberation state following its transition from apartheid to democracy. The first democratic elections in 1994 resulted in the ANC coming to power and voting in Nelson Rolihlahla Mandela as the first black president in the history of the country. For the black majority, it was hoped that the rise of the ANC to power would bring renewed hopes for a better future in relation to the black condition. However, as developments demonstrate, the rise of the ANC was never going to change anything in relation to the injustices and indignities of the black majority. Shortly after coming to power in 1994, the ANC was immediately captured

into the global politics of capitalism and adopted the approach of business as usual – personal, sectional, and factional politics of enrichment became the order of the day.

When the ANC came to power in 1994, its agenda of liberating black people was stolen, weakened, and silenced, as bribes were exchanged between white corporates and the black political elite. As Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2012:257) puts it, the elite pact between the ANC and corporate capital in 1994 “diluted the liberatory ethos of decoloni[s]ation and channelled it towards emancipation that did not question the alienating logic of modernity itself but called for reforms within the same system”. This situation has resulted in a false sense of liberation, as corruption, moral demise, materialism, and political degeneration became rampant in the ANC. What is seen is the notion of “business as usual”, as comrades sought to use power to enrich themselves instead of the poor people that they are indebted to serve. The politics of economic interests has contributed to the downward spiral of the ANC and the oppression of the black people on a large scale. According to Qobo (2012:15), “[e]very year, reports from the offices of the Special Investigating Unit and the Auditor-General paint a grim picture of maladministration and corruption that affect critical spheres of government”. This situation has had a negative impact on the social and economic lives of the black masses who aspire for changes in relation to the black existential condition.

Fanon (1963) states that before independence the party functions as a platform for the free flow of ideas from the party level right up to the level of government. However, with the arrival of independence, certain imbedded elements inherited from the apartheid past intercepted with the democratic processes of the party. As McKaiser (2012:11) explains, “[a]lmost two decades after the country’s political transition, the shine of the ANC’s public image as a liberator, moral paragon and people’s movement is gradually wearing off”. As can be seen, corruption, moral demise, materialism, and political degeneration have all become a regular feature in the ANC and is rampant. This situation has continued unabated and is regrettably true of all African post-independence states as ruling parties become detrimental to liberation.

Fanon (1963:108) contends, “[t]he great mistake, the inherent defect in the majority of political parties in underdeveloped regions has been, to approach in the first place those elements which are the most politically conscious: the civil servants – that is to say, a tiny portion of the population, which hardly represents more than 1 per cent”. The capitalist society is a town in a comparatively privileged position. This society has nothing to lose compared to the black society. The black society has everything to lose and represents the faction of domestic

workers, taxi drivers, miners, farm workers, and security guards. It is this faction that is occupied by the most faithful followers of the nationalist parties, and not the proletariat factions. Often the former group is ignored, as the reality in South Africa speaks for itself.

The ANC has abandoned its role of revolutionary movement in favour of becoming a capitalist messenger. It has become the party of implementing the needs and interests of capitalist groups. As Fanon (1963:172) puts it, “[t]he party is objectively, sometimes subjectively, the accomplice of the merchant bourgeoisie”. In this form, the ANC is reduced to the mere role of being a manager and serving the mandate of the capitalist system. It has no control over the means of production, nor ownership of the economy or political system other than to ensure that the status quo remains uninterrupted in as far as the politics of capitalism is concerned. The notion of repeating without a difference actually means that the ANC has inherited and assumed the machine of oppression and has now become the oppressor in the struggle for national liberation. This then means that those that were supposed to lead the national liberation struggle become the oppressors of the people as far as the machine of oppression is concerned.

The capitalism that continued after 1994 in South Africa gave the black political administration no chance to reimagine new forms of politics different from apartheid. Hirson (1989:26) highlights, “[u]nder the tremendous impact of capitalism, ANC was forced and absorbed into the economic veins of capitalism, bearing heavily the scars of tribalism”. The politics of patronage, corruption, and nepotism combined and integrated into capitalism were pathologies obtained from the apartheid past. As white politics was moving in the direction of neo-liberalism, so too was the ANC which deviated from the revolutionary role of freeing the black people from race discrimination and oppression to emancipatory politics. Such a deviation from the socialist principles meant the end of the national liberation struggle. The new forms of politics that the ANC carried out in as far as the legacy of apartheid is concerned became encapsulated in the politics of patronage, factions, and tenders. This unchanged way of politics is normalised in the ANC structures and even has its institutional and theoretical approach in the party itself. The national interest is put aside, as party leaders prioritise their own interests.

Gumede (2007) brings out that by virtue of being a ruling party in government, ANC members are able to use the party to extract what they need from the State, such as businesses, contracts, and tenders. The political hegemony of the ANC is the centre of the tactical goals of individuals to advance personal interests, and this undermines the socialist principles of the national project. By working through the ANC and government, members give the impression that they

want to work with the people, whereas their objective in as far as the tool of capitalism is concerned intends to work against them. This is because comrades have economic interests in the State that do not align with the interests of the whole society. This practice does not only disempower the party but also disadvantages it from the opportunity to actively engage in the process of nation building. One of the complex problems facing the post-apartheid era is whether the current socio-economic problems should continue to be blamed on the apartheid past while the black majority bears marginalisation and exclusion under the ANC government. It goes without even saying that corruption and nepotism have increased under the ANC than they were under the apartheid dispensation.

Unless the ANC comes up with a change of attitude among its political leaders, the national project will remain a mythology among the black majority still waiting for change. Buthelezi laments the ANC for putting itself first before the country:

Is ANC brave enough to put the Republic above all else? ... And can the ANC accept that South Africanism means more than holding an ANC membership? (Buthelezi 2012:60)

There is a sense of belief in the ANC that the party is bigger than South Africa. Speaking at the ANC KwaZulu-Natal elective conference and Presidential Gala Dinner at the Gallagher Convention Centre on the eve of the National General Council (NGC), President Jacob Zuma stated, “the Africa National Congress (ANC) is bigger than South Africa”, reinstating the very view that the ANC will rule until Jesus Christ comes back. This is a belief accommodated in the ruling party and even at the level of the tripartite alliance due to the nature of political paralysis that seems to have captured the ANC. The notion of political paralysis sheds light on the manner in which the politics of political correctness in the ruling party allow for vulgarisation and abuse of power. Political correctness is not always a reality held by the majority; although defended as truth, it often stands in contrast to the national aspiration.

To avoid this, Fanon states that the mingling of the political party with government ought to be avoided. He asserts, “[t]he party is not a tool in the hands of the government” (Fanon 1963:185). The party ought to be an instrument in the service of the people where the people themselves decide on policies for the government. In the same form, if the ANC can stick to being the voice of the people and not interfering with the government administration processes, this will help in terms of the separation of powers and minimising the prospects of corruption

in government including the conflict of interests between the ruling party and the State. Fanon contends that the party has to cease being the domain of the elite whereby government bigwigs and other regime dignitaries may have separate meetings in the capital. This means that political activity should be decentralised to remote parts of the country where the majority of the people live. It is through the decentralisation of party activities and leadership that the masses could be able to participate and contribute inputs on the type of government they need.

The decentralisation of political parties to the remote areas places a greater emphasis on the need for socio-economic development within the political systems. The ANC in the context of South Africa is better placed to serve several economic functions. They can deploy those in power who share ideologies, values, and views about the direction of socio-economic development that should be taken by the State to benefit the masses in the countryside and rural areas. Well-organised political deployment to these areas can influence the making of public policy that is people-orientated, especially those that bear the brunt of apartheid marginalisation and exclusions. The new political wisdom that should emerge from political parties in South Africa should be motivated by the pure economic interests of the community it represents. They must focus on only one priority, the creation of socio-economic transformation and self-reliant communities. This means transferring programmes and projects based on the social and economic needs of the society. This way people can manage to take care of themselves and to determine their own forms of life without having to depend on the State for everything.

#### **4.7 CONCLUSION**

This chapter used the Fanonian lens to understand the socio-economic condition of South Africa by discussing the problems of development in the post-apartheid era. What is clear from this chapter is that the post-apartheid era is yet to breathe life into the black majority who remain marginalised and excluded from the whole project of humanity. The land question still remains unresolved and has been a longstanding item on the national agenda. It is clear that the land question constitutes a serious problem in the heart of the post-apartheid era, especially in as far as the black landlessness condition is concerned. It cannot continue unresolved under the excuse that it is a difficult and sensitive issue to engage at this point in time because it tampers with the interests of white people. It is clear from the Fanonian perspectives that there cannot be liberation without the land being conquered and returned to its rightful owners who are the black people.

The same applies to the longstanding quest of nationalisation, which features in various documents of liberation movements. Without land, banks, and mines, among others, being nationalised, the status quo of economic balance will remain in favour of the white monopoly. Nationalising the economy will elevate black people to the height of the economy, where they will become self-reliant and assertive, but most importantly, contribute towards the economic development of the country. The private patterns of ownership cannot be the order of things, as it does not contribute to the social and economic transformation of the whole society. The Freedom Charter, which the national liberation movement is indebted to, stresses that South Africa must belong to all who live in it, and all the mineral resources, wealth, and monopoly capital must be shared and work to benefit the whole society instead of just a few elite. Nationalisation will lead to socio-economic transformation where the black majority will be involved in the economic stream. However, this is not just nationalisation, a genuine liberation that is informed by the ideas of Fanon and consistent with the notion of justice, freedom, and equality.

The question of nationalisation is somehow also related to the problematic question of Black Economic Empowerment, the black elite, and the State. South Africa is clearly struggling because the State is captured by the elite who are indulging in the politics of tenders and contracts that come with Black Economic Empowerment, instead of serving the poor helpless people. Political patronage and looting from the State will not help transform the economy to the benefit of the people. Fanon's ideas were again profound in this context. In short, the relationship between the black elite and the State needs to be clearly redefined to avoid the mingling, something which the black ruling elite in the ruling party are failing to do. There must be a clear separation between the administration of the ruling party and the State in order to avoid the form of confusion that is central to corruption in the South African political discourse.

Another area of concern as already discussed is structural violence and the black condition. For as long as black people are still seen in the light of blackness, the whole project of nation building will simply remain a mythology of the post-1994 era. Clearly, the hellish condition upon which the black majority is still exposed to is not what was desired by the liberation movement. The problematic persistence of structural violence has meant that the life of the black person is always involved in violence, racism, and oppression, all of which are related to the act of dehumanisation, depersonalisation, and degradation of black life. This is racial

discrimination which the ruling party via government must ensure is removed from institutional structures, as it gives violence an infrastructure to remain intact.

The notion of party politics as a predicament for development is also a concern of the challenges that South Africa is facing. From a Fanonian point of view, party politics are supposed to breed life into the nation and contribute to the hegemony of socio-economic development. It is supposed to be a platform for people to build a government of their own and adopt policies of their choice. However, the experience of South Africa under the ANC as a ruling party in government has not been the same. Instead, the party has become the oppressor of the people as they voice complaints against its corrupt leadership and demand for basic service delivery. All this taken together has resulted in the post-apartheid era being a failure and reflects the complicated terrain upon which South Africa finds itself today.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### FANON AND THE QUESTION OF NEW HUMANISM IN SOUTH AFRICA

---

#### 5.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter advances Fanon's ideological position and uses this lens to charting the new terrain of humanism in South Africa, with the potential to advance the post-apartheid era that is consistent with the national liberation. Fanon's thinking and ideas are closely selected and explored, as they have potential to bring conversations about possibilities on how liberation can be translated into inclusive socio-economic transformation. What is engaged is the need to move beyond the notions of slogans, national anthem, public holidays, gestures, and empty promises that have nothing to do with the freedom of the ordinary people. More specifically, this chapter is about the democratisation and human rights project that advances the notion of authentic freedom, justice, and equality informed by inclusive socio-economic transformation that forms a larger part of the outcomes of African liberation. This is not done in the manner of engaging in alternative policy proposal or technical requirements, but through theoretical and political intervention that unravels the conception of liberation in relation to "new" humanism in the light of inclusive socio-economic transformation as addressed by Fanon.

The aforementioned takes the form of applying the following set of themes that feature in Fanon's thinking on the idea of "new" humanism. The first of these themes is Fanonian humanism and post-apartheid era. This proceeds from the affirmed position that post-apartheid comprises needs to be reimagined, and the manner to do this is through the systematic deployment of the Fanonian idea in South Africa. Secondly, and linked to the above, this theme maps Biko's ideas on the quest for true humanity as an extension to the Fanonian thought that speaks on the alternative path towards black emancipation. Therefore, this theme attempts to reimagine Biko's ideas and brings to the fore elements that are still relevant to advancing the inclusive socio-economic transformation consisting of liberated bodies and spaces. Finally, this chapter includes the notion of social and economic transformation, and argues that for this to materialise there must be an initiative to think in unitary terms when it comes to the distribution of goods and services to societies. This chapter makes a meaningful contribution to the South African situation and has a bearing on advancing the discourse of resolving the problems of socio-economic development if taken into consideration.

## 5.2 FANONIAN HUMANISM AND POST-APARTHEID ERA

Fanon had the impression of a “new” South Africa in mind when imagining the futures of post-colonial African states. His proposal is based on a new expression of humanism, one that would be more inclusive and reject the myths of empty freedom imposed from the global North. Fanon (1963:35) envisaged, “[i]t is true that we could equally well stress the rise of a new nation, the setting up of a new state, its diplomatic relations, and its economic and political trends”. For this to materialise, the starting point is not the historical account, but on how the post-apartheid era and primarily the black condition can be reimagined consistent with the spoils of the national liberation. Fanon (1963:35) asserts, “[t]o tell the truth, the proof of success lies in a whole social structure being changed from the bottom up”. This view stresses the fact that to overcome the binary system in which black is bad and white is good, the entire post-colonial structure must be replaced. In the case of South Africa, this translates into bringing to an end the anti-black structures and remodelling the socio-economic imperatives according to the demands of the black majority. What this means is that envisaged change must be informed by socio-economic needs of society that are geared towards resolving the black experience.

Fanon’s project for restoration can be understood from the self-organisation and consciousness that transcend from critical lived experiences and insistent on decentralisation, autonomy, grassroots democracy, and accountability. What black people need in South Africa is not for government to impose on them how their lives must be lived, but for government to reimagine land and nationalise the economy so that the country is open and free for everyone to take care of themselves and manage their own lives without depending on government to dictate their lives. In some instances, there have been traces of this resonance, and particularly with Shack Dwellers Movement (Abahlali baseMjondolo) that claims to dedicate and commit itself to this Fanonian ideal. To amplify this, Gibson (2009:10-11) posits, “Abahlali baseMjondolo appreciates acts of solidarity but shuns money and political power from government and nongovernmental groups”. What is unsaid, but should be read between the lines, is the critical element of self-assertiveness and self-reliance that refuses to depend on donors and free handouts that have been more than a crisis than a remedy to the black majority in South Africa.

Fanon (1963:35-36) maintains, “[t]he need for change exists in its crude state, impetuous and compelling, in the consciousness and in the lives of the men and women who are coloni[s]ed”. What this means is that black people must do away with the notion of self-entitlement that seems to be the nature of the black self-destruction in South Africa. It is true that the national

liberation struggle promised blacks that life would be free in the post-apartheid era, but as past experience shows, the black political administration that came to power in 1994 failed to deliver on those promises. Therefore, there is a need to strive for self-empowerment, intellectual hegemony, sense of community, education, and self-consciousness that propel black emancipation. However, this will not come ‘free of charge’ as Fanon has warned; it is a process that requires the oppressed to combine their strengths and rally against the cause of their oppression, namely, race and racism of a specific type. As Fanon (1963:36) explained, ‘this [change] cannot come as a result of magical practices, nor of a natural shock, nor of a friendly understanding’. The process has to be waged from social, cultural, economic, political, and psychological levels by the oppressed themselves in what will be genuine liberation. Fanon’s commitment to new humanism is resolute. This is made clear in his writing:

The logical end of this will to struggle is the total liberation of the national territory. In order to achieve this liberation the inferiori[s]ed man brings all his resources into play, all his acquisitions, the old and the new, his own and those of the occupant. The struggle is at once total, absolute. (Fanon 1967:43)

Nayar (2011:21) posits, “Fanon proposes an ethics of recognition of difference within the postcolonial paradigm as the first step on the route to the new humanism”. Decolonisation that centres on restoration of humanity, dignity, and African dynamic cultures and values is necessary, as it offers a particular mode in which black life exists and recognised as humans with rights to live life on their own. Nayar (2011:21) argues, “[t]hrough mutual recognition, subjectivities are forged, and from this point a humanist vision is possible”. Fanon identified the question of mutual recognition as fundamental to liberation of the mind, which in the case of South Africa centres on the notion of respect for human life that seems to have lost significance and replaced by the so-called notion of political rights that are enjoyed by the few at the expense of the majority. Such a demise of respect for human life, as Modisane (1986:38) explains, ‘carries very little social stigma where jails are seen social institution for black bodies’. Therefore, Fanon calls for the restoration of national consciousness – that ought not to be limited by fear or ignorance. This aim is for the colonised’s self-realisation and the recovery of subjectivity – a goal that Fanon sees as possible only through violence. In the absence of this recognition, there is no self-consciousness. “It is this ethical recognition of the particularity of the black man that leads to decoloni[s]ation, of both the black and the white” (Nayar

2011:23). Thus, this struggle is essentially a struggle by the oppressed to claim back the humanity from the oppressor who is in denial to give it back. As Biko has written:

In rejecting Western values therefore we are rejecting those things that are not only foreign to us but that seek to destroy the most cherished of our beliefs---that the corner-stone of society is man himself---not just his welfare, not his material wellbeing but just man himself with all his ramifications. We reject the power-based society of the Westerner that seems to be ever concerned with perfecting their technological know-how while losing out on their spiritual dimension. We believe that in the long run the special contribution to the world by Africa will be in this field of human relationship. The great powers of the world may have done wonders in giving the world an industrial and military look, but the great gift still has to come from Africa--giving the world a more human face. (Biko [1978]1987:47-48)

What gives Fanon weight in South Africa is his warning to the black political administration. Fanon (1963:44) writes, “[n]ow what we must never forget is that the immense majority of coloni[s]ed peoples is oblivious to the problems” of responsibilities. Fanon urges black leaders to assume full responsibility and accountability for the economic, political, cultural, and social transformation of the masses in whose name they waged a liberation struggle and are indebted to serve. In that instance, political parties such as the ANC and active others need to remember to carry out their mandate at all times for the poor, to avoid the binary system in which black is bad and white is good and to continue to perpetuate misery to black bodies even in the context of the post-apartheid era. Elsewhere Fanon (1963:53 *emphasis added*) highlights, ‘the native have a tendency to fall asleep and to forget the settler’s hauteur anxiety to test the strength of the colonial system to remind the colonised the battle cannot be put off indefinitely’. That been said, Fanon urges black leaders not to forget who their real enemy is, especially in the context of the post-apartheid era where the past is completely forgotten in the name of reconciliation (without compensation) that did not have any impact on the social, economic, and material condition of the black majority who remain excluded and poor. Here is Fanon’s profound warning:

Certain countries which have benefitted by a large European settlement come to independence with houses and wide streets, and these tend to forget the poverty-stricken, starving hinterland. By the irony of fate, they give the

impression by a kind of complicit silence that their towns are contemporaneous with independence. (Fanon 1963:100 footnote)

Fanon (1963:101) stresses, “[c]olonialism and imperialism have not paid their score when they withdraw their flags and their police forces from our territories”. In the case of South Africa, the power of white monopoly capital has demonstrated that political independence can also be a form of oppression. A very good example is the case of South Africa, which is oppressed by the ANC; Zimbabwe by ZANU-PF; Mozambique by FRELIMO; Cameroon by CPDM, just to name but a few countries that are under repression of liberation parties. From the point of post-apartheid capitalism, which reordered the socio-economic relations among races in South Africa, this confirms Fanon’s continued relevance, and his warnings must be taken seriously. Mbembe (2011b) opines, ‘Fanonian dialectic not only details the counter-revolution within the revolution but also a new consciousness’. Fanon (1963:37) encourages the oppressed black people to continue the struggle for socio-economic change through “total revolution”. However, it should be taken into account, especially in South Africa, that those ejected from the ruling party (ANC) will come with military slogans that could be mistaken for “total revolution”, and only to be realised later that these were mere rhetoric slogans for political survival. Therefore, Fanon warns about this rhetoric and stresses that it must be recognised and energetically counteracted.

From the black people in South Africa in particular, it should bring to mind that the legacy of apartheid and its pathological attachments of racism, oppression, and subjection produce and distribute among black people violence, unemployment, poverty, suffering, and inequalities perpetuated by the post-apartheid superstructures that reproduce and redistribute these conditions. Fanon seeks nothing less than the complete overthrow of the apartheid structures based on exclusion and marginalisation of racial classifications. As Nayar (2011:24) elucidates, Fanonian humanism seeks tolerance and respect of differences, in which the result is ‘reciprocal relativism of different cultures’ where the black is no mere ‘object’ but a black human for the white. Fanon (1967:44) argues, “universality resides in this decision to recogni[s]e and accept the reciprocal relativism of different cultures, once the colonial status is irreversibly excluded”. He calls upon black people to remain watchful in post-independence states and to rebel against everything that seeks to take away their humanity and modalities of life. Post-apartheid South Africa, into two decades after apartheid, should learn that the black condition is a result of complacency on the part of black people, particularly the political

leadership, which for all these years has been wrestling the State against political patronage and seizure of state power, without rearranging the social, cultural, and economic fabric of the South African society.

### **5.3 BIKO: THE QUEST FOR TRUE HUMANITY**

The apartheid existential condition of black people was of concern to Fanon and continued to be of concern to Biko even in post-apartheid South Africa. While Fanon argued for the end of the anti-black world through liberating the black body from the forces of racism, oppression, and an inferiority complex, Biko understood that something also had to be done at the level of social and economic transformation. Biko was clearly ahead of his time, as he predicted a situation where people would be politically free but economically omitted. Like other socialist movements that prioritised political power in Africa, South Africa's own experience is similar in that black people have political power but are in economic terms still powerless. Biko haunts the post-apartheid era for the very fact that the struggle for economic freedom continues. The notions of freedom, justice, and equality as propagated in the post-apartheid era are mere gestures if extended to the question of the social and economic reality of the black majority who are still languishing at the margins of society and yearning for genuine freedom in relation to their hellish black conditions.

Biko, through Black Consciousness, emphasised the need to develop the socio-economic and political awareness among blacks in South Africa. For this to materialise, as Ranuga (1986:184) elucidates, “[t]he national struggle can succeed only if the masses are involved fully and consistently”. Biko argued for the need of Black Consciousness based on full knowledge to activate the black community into thinking about the socio-economic and political problems that torment them in their country and to seek solutions to emancipate themselves from the shackles of the black condition. This way, as Biko explains, is possible towards the goal of liberation that indoctrinates a sense of self-reliance, initiative, and solidarity that is essential to destroy and free black communities from white racism, economic exploitation, dependency syndrome, and capitalism in all its special types. To concur with Fanon (1967:121), “[t]he time has come for serious things, and trivialities had to be left behind”. People want things to change and in the right way that clarifies their possession and roles in a society in which they are equal participants in the economic mainstream, land and agriculture, education and production of knowledge, politics, entrepreneurship, human capital, and social development.

Biko ([1978]1987:38) states, “[i]n laying out a strategy we often have to take cogni[s]ance of the enemy’s strength”, especially in as far as socio-economic and political structure is sealed in apartheid resistance. He urges black people to “recognise the various institutions of apartheid for what they are and what they prescribe them to be in the whole system. Biko encourages the oppressed to continue pressurising the government and institutions to move in the direction of restructuring the spaces that make it impossible for the black majority to participate in the mainstream economy. For Biko, social and economic consciousness is more important than the nationalism upon which the post-apartheid black leadership undertook to prioritise ahead of the whole nation. According to Biko, if one is to understand and overcome forms of class formations, he or she must refuse to confine in micro-identities and elitist interests that overwrite the national agenda. In the post-apartheid era, for instance, there is evidence that the ruling elite has disconnected itself from the masses in a very big way (Mbeki 2009). This does not come as a surprise to Fanon, because, in his view:

Before independence, the leader generally embodies the aspirations of the people for independence, political liberty, and national dignity. But as soon as independence is declared, far from embodying in concrete form the needs of the people in what touches bread, land, and the restoration of the country to the sacred hands of the people, the leader will reveal his inner purpose: to become the general president of that company of profiteers impatient for their returns which constitutes the national bourgeoisie. (Fanon 1963:66)

Fanon did warn of these parasites, and clearly, South Africa did not take this advice seriously and learn much from his prophetic warnings. The current social and economic contradictions demonstrate the paralysed nature of the black leadership that came to power in 1994. What is therefore required is a fundamental overhauling and restructuring of systems along the social, economic, political, and racial relations. True humanity, according to Biko, is not about imitating European methods and standard of life, but harnessing African dynamic cultures and values and creating a more human face society. Biko refuses for black people to surrender their responsibilities to European tutelage because that way is to surrender their souls for permanent slavery and suffering. According to Biko ([1978]1987:48), “[t]he interrelationship between the consciousness of the self and the emancipatory programme is of paramount importance”. He contends that the whole system on which socio-economic and political relations are reformed constitute the acceptance of the major points around which the system revolves. Biko

([1978]1987:48) stresses that liberation “is of paramount importance in the concept of Black Consciousness, [for we cannot be conscious of ourselves and yet remain in bondage]”. The Black Consciousness, in a sense, as Biko explains, has to do with correcting false images that stand in contrast to cultural, social, economic, political, religious, and psychological well-being of black people in the world. Therefore, Biko pleads with black people to embrace the spirit of Black Consciousness as an ideological framework to work together and overcome adversity.

Biko ([1978]1987:48) cautioned South Africa to stay on guard against ‘curious bunch of nonconformists who explain their participation in South Africa in negative terms’. Mngxitama (2010:1) makes sense of this position: ‘[t]he university is a great example of how [one] think about the continuation of racism or the white-supremacist project in terms of how the university is organi[s]ed’. White people claim to be excluded under the pretext of ‘free-education’, academic community and promotions under the current dispensation, ‘and therefore should be jointly involved in the black man’s struggle for a place under the sun’ (Biko [1978]1987:48). In this form, Mngxitama (2010:3) questions, “How is it possible that in a racist country, Black people cannot be allowed to organize on their Blackness?” Biko contends that the character of the liberals in the black man’s history in South Africa is a curious one, and even in the post-apartheid era where those of the black elite have become white souls in black skins in the light of moral and political degeneration.

The integration they talk about is first of all artificial in that it is a response to conscious manoeuvre rather than to the dictates of the inner soul. In other words the people forming the integrated complex have been extracted from various segregated societies with their inbuilt complexes of superiority and inferiority and these continue to manifest themselves even in the “nonracial” set-up of the integrated complex. As a result the integration so achieved is a one-way course, with the whites doing all the talking and the blacks the listening. (Biko [1978]1987:21)

Corresponding this to post-apartheid South Africa, it is clear that as long as blacks are not fully liberated in social, economic, and psychological terms, they will be useless in a democratic society – hence Fanon argues that to overcome the binary system in which black is bad and white is good, an entire structure must be destroyed. According to Biko ([1978]1987:21), “what is necessary as a prelude to anything else that may come is a very strong grass-roots build-up of black consciousness such that blacks can learn to assert themselves and stake their rightful

claim”. Biko’s quest for true humanity arises out of the need to unmask and expose the scandal of liberal humanism, which is to say that there is every attempt to negate the existential struggle that informs the black majority under the pretext of social and economic conditions. The struggle for the quest of true humanity is an ongoing process in South Africa, and this must be shaped and reshaped from inclusive socio-economic justice. Ahluwalia and Zegeye (2001:460) assert, “[f]or black people to work out a socialist programme they would have to defeat the one main element in politics that was working against them: a psychological feeling of inferiority which was deliberately cultivated by the apartheid system as one of the strategies to ensure white domination of South Africa”. To defeat the inferiority complex will require investigating and discovering that which taught the oppressed so easily to surrender his effort to resist the oppression.

Ahluwalia and Zegeye (2001:461) maintain that black people cannot avoid the fact that in South Africa “there is an ill-distribution of wealth that any form of political freedom that did not touch on the redistribution of wealth would be meaningless”. According to Zegeye (2001:462), “[m]eaningful change required reorganising the whole economic pattern and economic policies in the country, involving a judicious blend of private enterprise and state participation in industry and commerce, especially in mining, such as gold mining, diamond mining, asbestos mining and so on”. Fanon (1963:315) even suggests, “Africans must not pay tribute to Europe by creating states, institutions, and societies which draw their inspiration from her”. Biko believed that freedom is imbedded in an individual’s ability to express himself or herself both psychologically, socially, economically, and politically. Therefore, Black Consciousness is an expression of that idea to chant the formulation of a “new” society based on the shared interest and respect for human dignity.

#### **5.4 SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC TRANSFORMATION**

The post-apartheid state is said to be a non-racial, free, and open society where everyone can participate and prosper from the free-wheeling markets and economic opportunities. This is argued and essentialised on the notions of the rainbow nation that “diverse people unite” to become one society. The passing of the liberal Constitution, Bill of Rights, and all-race elections is said to demonstrate the commitment of advancing the transformation agenda. Even at the height of the social and economic inequalities that are prevailing in the post-apartheid era, the government claims that the country is now a better society than it was before 1994, as if there is progress made in as far as the condition of the black majority is concerned. The long-

held power of the ANC in government is celebrated as if it has undone the problems of poverty and unemployment that remain largely a black problem in post-apartheid development discourse. As Zahar (1974:10) puts it, “the several capitalist contradictions and the historical development of capitalist system have generated underdevelopment in the peripheral satellites whose economic surplus was expropriated while generating economic development in the metropolitan centres which appropriate that surplus”. Therefore, it is imperative for ANC to reanalyse the black existential conditions with a view to better understand the socio-economic realities that deepen the black suffering.

Viewed from the Fanonian perspective on development, social and economic transformation has not even started in the post-apartheid era beyond the fake slogans of the emancipatory projects. Gumede (2015b:100-101) states, “Fanon viewed development as associated with socio-economic freedom”. For South Africa, the opposite seems to be the case where socio-economic transformation is based on the notion of inclusive development and has become elusive. Though the South African government may speak positively that the standard of living for the black majority has improved immensely since 1994, the truth lies within the black condition that exposes all the lies. It is clear that, if the standard of the black majority was indeed improved, the black condition would be absent. The very existence of the black condition is a predicament that needs to be reimagined in order to ensure that inclusive socio-economic transformation is successful. This means there should be initiative to think in unitary terms, something that goes with equitable distribution of goods and services. Transformation should not just be a term reduced to slogans and abstracts; it must happen in realistic terms and translate into new forms of life in relation to the black condition. Gumede (2015b) highlights that transformation involves socio-economic progress or an improvement in people’s well-being. In such a state, people must be involved in democratic processes and be allowed to participate and elect the leadership of their own choice.

The issue of transformation is plagued by the legacy of land dispossession, economic exclusion, and marginalisation – all of which requires major structural reforms to ensure that justice, freedom, and equality are not just pronounced but are lived in real terms. Ka Plaatjie (2003:288) is of the view, “returning the land to its rightful owners – the indigenous people of South Africa” is the first crucial step to enhancing social and economic transformation. The challenge for achieving social and economic transformation has been overshadowed by the failure to address the land question – the issue that has been a longstanding item in the national agenda.

Therefore, to achieve radical economic transformation will require revisiting the land question in order to ensure viable, equitable, and inclusive transformation. There has been little attempt to ask fundamental questions and rethinking the political life in the post-apartheid era largely because of the state of black paralysis when it comes to the question of socio-economic transformation. Since decolonisation was defined by Fanon (1967) as a political, economic, social, cultural, and psychological liberation (what Ngugi [1986] calls “decolonizing the mind”), post-apartheid South Africa remains very much a product of the failures of the decolonisation project that prioritised political freedom at the loss of the rest.

Fanon urges black people to wage their struggle for socio-economic change, in the form of a “total revolution”. According to Fanon (1963:310), “[t]otal liberation is that which concerns all sectors of the personality”. In this sense, Fanon cautions the poor masses to remain vigilant under the guise of dominant political and economic superstructures and their ideologies that have a tendency to propagate false expressions that have nothing to do with the social and economic condition of the oppressed, let alone to find cover in their miseries. Fanon (1963:310) warns, “[i]ndependence is not a word which can be used as an exorcism, but an indispensable condition for the existence of men and women who are truly liberated, in other words who are truly masters of all the material means which make possible the radical transformation of society”. He posits that if this could proceed from the understanding that whiteness carries lust of material benefits, then it could be argued that black people are on the right path to emancipation.

It needs to be made clear that what is at stake must not just be the pronouncement of concepts such as RDP, BEE, or Radical Economic Transformation as has largely been the case since 1994. Rather, it should be structural changes that enable socio-economic transformation and inclusive development that speak to human capital and improve the standards of living of the people (Gumede 2017). For Gumede (2017), radical economic transformation must address the fundamental changes in the structure, systems, institutions and patterns of ownership, management and control of the economy in favour of all South Africans, especially the poor. As far as the structure of the economy is concerned, Gumede argues that inclusive socio-economic transformation has to resolve the imbalances in a racialised economy that frustrates the black condition. For addressing the spatial arrangements, the longstanding item of land and socio-economic inequalities must be revisited and addressed within the context of radical socio-economic transformation. This effort must not be a contradiction to society but an

embodiment of it through ending the hellish existential condition found in land dispossession, economic deprivation, and black subjectivity.

The notion of a rainbow nation and non-racism must not just be concepts behind abstract papers but should get rid of racism in fundamental terms that open economic opportunities and markets equally for all – blacks and whites. As Sithole (2011:19) emphasises, “for rainbow nation to transform there should be incentives to think in unitary terms”. According to this view, “[t]he black condition must not symbolically vanish, but vanish in realistic terms” (Sithole 2011:19). Sithole (2011:19) explains, “[e]conomic freedom, reparations and justice must ensure that collective goods by people to benefit not a few black elite”. Therefore, a “new” South Africa that should come into being must not be a repetition of the past but one that “reaffirms the values of humanism, the international project of human rights, and the idea of a politics born of reason, justice, and reconciliation” (Mbembe and Posel 2006:283). This means breaking away from the rhetoric of reducing freedom, justice, and equality to flags, national anthems, symbols, national holidays, and monuments that have nothing to do with the authenticity of social and economic transformation.

## **5.5 CONCLUSION**

This chapter deliberated on the question of Fanon and the question of “new” in South Africa, which was presented with specific reference to Fanonian humanism and post-apartheid era, Biko and the quest for true humanity, and the notion of social and economic transformation. Fanon’s thought continues to haunt South Africa in terms of what needs to be done to ensure that the national project materialises. The imagination of Fanon, among other things, was that of bringing an end to the anti-black world while at the same time reimagining the post-apartheid state. The post-apartheid era is regarded as the creation of a new society, but it has failed to produce new forms of life in relation to socio-economic transformation. In this form, post-apartheid is a contradiction of the society that was imagined by the national liberation struggle.

Fanon imagined a society where there would not be oppressed bodies. This is a society where the humanity of all humans is respected and recognised in social and economic terms. In this society, a notion of freedom, justice, and equality prevails instead of just being reduced to abstracts, slogans, and a national flag. At the heart of the Fanonian project is the black condition that needs to be overhauled to ensure that new humanism is materialised, that is, primarily the unfolding of the “new” society based on the implementation of the socio-economic

transformation and power of liberation aimed at creating new forms of life in relation to remedying the black condition.

The current situation is far from achieving the ideals of a “new” society, as the black political administration intends to reform the status quo of apartheid instead of bringing about true liberation. The logic of repetition without a difference is predominantly the problem faced by the black political administration, which is leading the whole project of humanity in the post-apartheid era. This leadership is yet to make meaningful changes, and its failures are accounted at the level of failing to demise the spatial arrangements in socio-economic imbalances including failing to resolve the black existential condition. Moving from apartheid to liberal democracy does not mean that apartheid and its infrastructure is gone, something which finds itself in structures such as the economy, land, and spatial arrangement, all of which reflect the legacy of apartheid in the post-apartheid era. For the national project to materialise, the triad of dispossession found in the dispossession of land, labour, and being should come to an end and socio-economic transformation aimed at resolving the black experience should be implemented.

## CHAPTER SIX

### CONCLUSION

---

This study applied Fanonian thought on race and racism, rhetoric of modernity, and new humanism as the three constitutive thematic areas to ascertain the extent of Fanon's relevance in post-apartheid South Africa. These thematic areas were studied as conceptual tools to provide the background against which the socio-economic realities may be analysed using the Fanonian lens. For this purpose, Fanonian ideas were fundamental and forthright in revealing the socio-economic inadequacies of the post-apartheid era in South Africa. Since Fanon described decolonisation as a social, economic, political, and psychological liberation, the post-apartheid state remains very much the product of the failures of the national liberation movement. For all intentions and purposes, 27 May 1994 was a false freedom that attributed the term liberation to something yet to happen in as far as the question of inclusive socio-economic transformation is concerned. Ndlovu-Gatsheni, discussing post-apartheid as an example of the state that betrayed the national liberation struggle, contends:

The phase of negotiations involving liberation movements and the representatives of the apartheid state were an opportunity for both to further discipline and panel-beat the liberation movements away from radicalism into neoliberalism. The negotiation phase was a [...] moment to soften, if not corrupt, the ANC leadership to accept neo-apartheid and neocolonialism as liberation. Thus, in 1994, just like in 1910, South Africa gained democracy and the process of de-racialization of society began but without decolonization and liberation taking place. (Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2013:175)

The elite pact and political reforms that resulted in the post-apartheid era did not have anything to do with the plight of the poor black majority. The scandal borders on the black condition. For the mere fact that the black condition remains uninterrupted, this exposes the lie that the post-apartheid project succeeded in opening society for inclusive socio-economic transformation. If the claims were indeed correct that post-apartheid and its democratisation represent a "new" South Africa, why then are the black majority still landless, unemployed, poor, and languishing in hellish squatter camps and jails? In other words, post-1994 did not depart from apartheid, which remains entrenched in structures such as land, economy, and spatial socio-economic arrangements that prevail even after the formal collapse of the apartheid

administration. Though the post-apartheid era is regarded as a “new” society, this study maintains that it is not, especially for failing to deliver on its mandate of inclusive socio-economic transformation that affects the majority in black conditions.

The framing of this study from Fanon’s oeuvre was helpful to understanding the manner in which the notion of race and racism, rhetoric of modernity, and new humanism are entangled in socio-economic structures. For that matter, Sithole (2011:2) illuminates, “[t]he post-1994 South African state cannot be divorced from the prophetic warning embedded in the thought of Frantz Fanon”. As pointed in this study, More’s views have been radical and honest in terms of Fanon’s resurgence in South Africa, where he contends that the country’s situation has become what Fanon imagined it to be:

It has been 50 years since Fanon made his predictions about the future of post-independent African states, and despite the existing evidence of their almost correctness and precision, South Africa, being the last African state liberated from the clutches of apartheid colonialism, has failed to learn from Fanon and avoid the pitfalls of the national bourgeoisie of post-independent African states. (More 2011:173)

This study attempted to read Fanon’s texts in the context of the post-apartheid era using a literature review and qualitative content analysis as the methodology through which the study was unpacked. Through the systematic deployment of Fanonian ideas, five sets of conclusions were reached in this study. In the first chapter, the study presented the general introduction and discussed the latitude of the study with specific reference to the background, problem statement, aim, rationale, methodology, limitations and delimitations, and chapter outline. In essence, this chapter explained what the study intended to do. The starting point was imperative to highlight the fundamental issues that guide the scope of the study. In this chapter, the study outlined the nature of the problem to be investigated and proposed Fanonian thought as a theoretical framework to foreground the nature of this research, and also apply this as a lens to understanding the socio-economic situation within the limited context of the post-apartheid era.

In the second conclusion, a theoretical framework was provided using Fanon’s thoughts on race and racism, rhetoric of modernity, and new humanism to foreground his ideas in the context of South Africa. This was helpful and enabled an understanding of the manner in which the notion of race and racism operates as an organising principle of society, according to which

white people and black managers of capitalism are classified as superior and the black majority is inferiorised. What can be appreciated, as Nazneen (2007:355-356) remarked, is “[a]lthough processes of raciali[s]ation may operate and manifest themselves differently over space and time, the notion that race is an organi[s]ing principle of social life can inform our understanding not only of national formations (as in Fanon’s work) but also of global formations”. Therefore, post-apartheid has not managed to escape the haunt of race and racism, which continues to determine the social and economic life even beyond the formal absence of the apartheid administration.

Fanonian lens revealed the manner and extent to which the racial optic remain rooted in racially marked institutions, structures, entrenched ideologies of racism, and practices that mask the perpetuation of neo-apartheid in the post-apartheid era. Under race and racism, the study raised the following critical aspects, as pointed elsewhere in the study:

The first is the continuing legacy of colonial constructions and the persistence of forms of racial difference and hierarchy in development. The second concerns the power of whiteness and specifically how authority, expertise and knowledge become racially symbolized. The third area for further examination is how ‘race’ is disguised through the use of specialized terminology and criteria in accounting for poverty and social exclusion. (Kothari 2006:9)

It then follows that modernity is a racialised discourse if extended to the notion of socio-economic perspective. As argued above, if modernity was indeed about development and solving problems of human existence, why then does it (re)produces spatial socio-economic inequalities? Tlostanova and Mignolo (2009) make it clear that there is no modernity without coloniality, which affirms the very fact that modernity is a hidden agenda for the coloniality of race and racism. It is for this reason that even development reproduces and perpetuates the racialised discourse where white people remain on top of power and blacks at the bottom in social and economic terms. Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2012:3) states, ‘modernity and development discourses are not free of the colonial matrices of power that underpin the constitutionality of race and racism’. It follows from racialisation that development discourses and processes, as Ndlovu-Gatsheni stresses, suffer from a crisis of ideas because of their entanglement with racial discrimination. In a way, modernity has succeeded in presenting itself as a developmental

discourse while in effect constituting a mere rhetorical device that has nothing to do with justice, equality, and freedom.

Fanon's conception of new humanism attempts to resist against the indignities and injustices that plague the black body, psychology, and material condition of the oppressed. Thus, new humanism is symbiotic towards a decolonial turn that engages the commitment to ordain political liberation based on social, economic, and psychological transformation rather than instances where freedom is reduced to slogans, flags, national anthems, symbols, national holidays, and monuments, all of which have nothing to do with authentic freedom, justice, and equality. Therefore, this conception was deployed to clarify the fact that post-apartheid and its political reforms did not bring the new humanism (new society) in as far as the black condition is concerned. The final chapter in this study sought to shed light on fundamental aspects that would constitute new humanism, argued thereof, as the advancement of inclusive socio-economic project consistent with the embodiment of the national liberation and society as a whole.

In the third conclusion, the study attempted to establish the extent of Fanon's relevance in South Africa by examining his ideas within the context of the post-apartheid era. This was done through systematic deployment of Fanonian ideas in the post-apartheid era to account for the ways in which socio-economic practices are entrenched in racially marked structures of apartheid that give the hellish black condition a form of life to remain intact. Essentially, this chapter attempted to contribute to the understanding of Fanonian re-emergence and ideas within the various spheres of society with regard to the struggle for liberation. It was therefore contended that Fanonian ideas continue to find a particular place of existence among the disgruntled masses who feel betrayed by the ANC government as evidenced by Fanon's writings throughout the study. Therefore, Fanon continues to haunt the post-apartheid state like a spectre of the ghost – "[t]he resurgence of his name and ideas in the country is a consequence of this critique" (More 2011:1). The unfolding of post-apartheid and primarily the ongoing social unrests such as *Vuwani-Malamulele* protests, *Abahlali baseMjondolo Movement*, Black First Land First (BLF), Xenophobia attacks, and Marikana massacre are but some of the evidence that advances the Fanonian presence in South Africa.

The chapter contributed to the understanding of the complicated terrain of complex issues resulting from the myths of liberation. Fanon's famous works *Black Skin, White Masks*, and *The Wretched of the Earth* contain the prophecies and cautions he made more than 50 years

ago about the future of post-independent African states. South Africa's transition from apartheid to democracy makes it typical of a post-liberation state; it followed a path of political power and ignored the prophetic warnings of Fanon. Fanon died 50 years ago, but prophecies continue to haunt the post-apartheid sociality. This finds place in misadventures of national consciousness, a deep sense of betrayal, and many other encounters with apartheid's forms of dehumanisation. For those committed to fighting for the cause of justice, freedom, and equality, Fanon's name remains not just the hope but also the possibility to hold the government accountable for its false promises. Therefore, for this study, the point was to prove that in post-independent African states (the formerly oppressed) nationalists are also forms of oppressors to the masses.

In the fourth conclusion, the study focused on the problems of development in relation to socio-economic development in the post-apartheid era. Fanonian ideas in relation to betrayal, laziness, and cowardice were unravelled to allow for a deeper understanding in relation to the inability to transform the socio-economic situation in the spirit of harmonising society. This chapter attempted to highlight the trends of corruption, poverty, and nepotism resulting from the behaviour of the ruling party and the middle class that are scornful and shamelessly greedy at the expense of the poor black majority suffering in South Africa. The ruling party in South Africa seemed to be part of the gang that looted during apartheid; theirs is concerned with state power and access to state resources while the masses are left to rot on their own. The gains for post-apartheid and its political reforms have been seized to advance the factional, sectional, and personal profits of individuals while masses are rotting in hellish conditions. Fanon was equally scornful of nationalisation, which he saw as a means of enriching the few at the expense of masses.

The ideology of Black Economic Empowerment and Affirmative Action did not address the fundamental question of the black condition. The ANC keeps defending these instruments more in the light of a scandalous, speedy, and pitiless form of enrichment. In other words, the ANC government has failed to build a national economy consistent with the needs of the unemployed masses suffering from acute poverty and unemployment. It is clear that South Africa has not managed to escape the traps of coloniality that feature xenophobia, chauvinism, Negrophobia, and racism. Prisons being full of the black masses, the burning of non-South Africans, and wrecking shops of non-South Africans in shantytowns across the country were all the results of the government insisting that foreign Africans go home to their country. Fanon predicted this nightmare 50 years before the independence of South Africa in 1994 – an indigenous ruling

class luxuriating in the delicious depravities of the Western bourgeoisie, addicted to rest and relaxation in pleasure resorts, casinos and on beaches, spending large sums on display, cars, watches, shoes, and foreign labels (Mbembe 2011b). In a nutshell, this chapter was able to confront these problematics, as they constitute an issue in socio-economic realities of the masses in the post-apartheid state.

In the fifth conclusion, the study attempted to explore the potentials of advancing the possibilities of inclusive socio-economic transformation using the Fanonian conception of “new” humanism. Fanon calls for the end of the anti-black world, a plea that resonates with the plight of the black majority in South Africa who are demanding changes in relation to their existential struggles. The chapter recommended that for South Africa to counter its current challenges, it will require the total overhauling of structures, institutions, and processes. In particular, the question of land, economy, and property will need to be reimagined consistent with the needs of society. These aforementioned aspects are largely the reason the country is experiencing the problematics of emancipation. Therefore, remedying the problem will require abolishing these structures that continue to strengthen and perpetuate the gap between the poor black masses and the rich white (including black liberals) minorities. However, as Sithole (2011) explains, there needs to be a clear understanding of these structures so that the problems are addressed genuinely. The ability to achieve this task is through enabling the masses to become bosses of their own lives by empowering them capitally instead of exploiting them to depend on the State. It will be imperative for future research to focus on Fanon and development in terms of empirical or scientific research where solutions to problems are practical, as this was simply a political intervention where the black condition was employed as a lens rather than as technical methodologies.

## LIST OF REFERENCES

- Ahluwalia, P., & Zegeye, A. (2001). Frantz Fanon and Steve Biko: Towards liberation. *Social Identities*, 7(3), 455-469.
- Bakken, T. (2014). *From Apartheid to Neoliberalism – A study of the economic development in post-apartheid South Africa*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. South Africa: Stellenbosch University.
- Banksa, N., & Hulme, D. (2014). New development alternatives or business as usual with a new face? The transformative potential of new actors and alliances in development. *Third World Quarterly*, 35(1), 181-195.
- Beall, J., Gelb, S., & Hassim, S. (2005). Fragile stability: State and society in democratic South Africa. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 31(4): December 2005, 681-700.
- Benjamin, S. (2005). *The feminization of poverty in post-apartheid South Africa: A story told by the women of Bayview, Chatsworth*. South Africa: Centre for Civil Society.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1985). Signs taken for wonders: Questions of ambivalence and authority under a tree outside, Delhi, May 1817. *Critical Inquiry*, 12(1), Autumn, 144-165.
- Biko, S. ([1978]1987). *I write what I like*. London: Bowerdean Press.
- Bond, P. (2000). *Elite transition: from apartheid to neoliberalism in South Africa*. Pietermaritzburg: UKZN Press.
- Bulhan, H. A. (1985). *Frantz Fanon and the psychology of oppression*. New York, NY: Plenum.
- Buthelezi, P. M. (2012). Creating a shared dream. *The Thinker: For thought leaders*, 35(January), 58-61.
- Cousins, B. (2008). Contextualising the controversies: Dilemmas of communal tenure reform in post-apartheid South Africa. In Claassen & B. Cousins (Eds.), *Land, power & custom*. University of Cape Town.
- Diale, A. J. (2012). The land question in post-apartheid South Africa – A paradox. *Journal of US-China Public Administration*, 9(12), 1341-1350.
- Dollery, B. (2003). History of inequality in South Africa, 1652-2002: Review Note. *Working Paper Series in Economics*, No. 2003-16.
- Elo, S., & Kyngas, H. (2008). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, Vol 62 (1), pp. 107–115.
- Escobar, A. 1995. *Encountering development: the making and unmaking of the third world*. Princeton University Press.

- Fanon, F. (1952, 2008). *Black Skin, White Masks* [Translated by C.L. Markmann]. United Kingdom: Pluto Press.
- Fanon, F. (1963). *The wretched of the earth* [Translated by C. Farrington]. New York, NY: Grove Press.
- Fanon, F. (1965). *A dying colonialism* [Translated by H. Chevalier]. New York, NY: Monthly Review Press.
- Fanon, F. (1967). *Toward the African revolution: Political essays* [Translated by H. Chevalier]. New York, NY/London: Monthly Review Press.
- Farmer, P. (2004). An anthropology of structural violence. *Journal of Current Anthropology*, 45(3), June 2004, 305-325.
- Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, peace, peace research. *Journal of Peace Research*, 6(3), 167-191.
- Gibson, N. C. (1999). Beyond Manichaeism: Dialectics in the thought of Frantz Fanon. *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 4(3), 337-364.
- Gibson, N. C. (2009b). *Fanonian practices and the politics of space in post-apartheid South Africa: The challenge of the Shack Dwellers Movement* (Abahlali baseMjondolo), Presentation at the Frantz Fanon Colloque, Algiers, July 7, 2009
- Gibson, N. C. (2001). The pitfalls of South Africa's 'liberation'. *New Political Science*, 23(3), 371-387.
- Gibson, N. C. (2004). Africa and globalization: Marginalization and resistance. *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, 39(1-2), 1-28.
- Gibson, N. C. (2009). Fanonian Practices and the politics of space in postapartheid South Africa: The Challenge of the Shack Dwellers Movement (Abahlali baseMjondolo). *Presentation at the Frantz Fanon Colloque*, Algiers July 7, 2009.
- Gibson, N. C. (2011a). What happened to the "Promised Land"? A Fanonian perspective on post-apartheid South Africa. *Antipode*, 00(0), 1-27.
- Gibson, N. C. (2011b). *Amandla is still Awethu: Fanonian practices in post-apartheid South Africa*.
- Gibson, N. C. (2011c). The New North African Syndrome: A Fanonian commemoration. *Journal of French and Francophone Philosophy – Revue de la philosophie française et de langue française*, XIX(1), 1-13.
- Gibson, N. C. (2013). *Finding Fanon, looking for second liberations*. Presentation at the Algiers conference on Fanon and Africa (June, 2013).

- Gordon, L. R. (2000). Du Bois's humanistic philosophy of human sciences: The study of African American problems: W. E. B. Du Bois's agenda, then and now. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 568 (March 2000), 265-280.
- Gordon, L. R. (2010). Theory in black: Teleological suspensions in philosophy of culture. *Qui Parle*, 18(2), 193-214.
- Gordon, L. R. (2013). Race, theodicy, and the normative emancipatory challenges of blackness. *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, 112(4), 725-736.
- Grosfoguel, R. (2008). Latins and the decolonization of the US Empire in the 21st century, *Social Science Information: Special Issue on Migrants and Clandestinity*, 47(4), 605-622.
- Grovogui, S. N. (2001). Come to Africa: A Hermeneutics of Race in International Theory. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*, Vol 26 (4), pp. 425-448.
- Gumede, W. M. (2007). *Thabo Mbeki and the battle for the soul of the ANC*. Cape Town: Zebra.
- Gumede, V. (2007). Is government optimally poised to achieve set objectives and targets in time? *SDR*, 5(3), 48-51.
- Gumede, V. (2013). Social and economic transformation in post-apartheid South Africa – policies, progress and proposals. *Draft*, April 2013.
- Gumede, V. (2014). Radical land and agrarian reform on the horizon in South Africa: Following Zimbabwe's footsteps? *The Thinker, Quarter*, 41, 24-31.
- Gumede, V. (2015a). Essay on inclusive development in SA. *Draft*, 5 June 2015.
- Gumede, V. (2015b). Exploring thought leadership, thought liberation and critical consciousness for Africa's development. *Africa Development / Afrique et Développement*, 40(4), 91-111. Dakar: CODESRIA.
- Gumede, V. (2016). *Post-apartheid South Africa: Economic and social inclusion*. Amherst, NY: Cambria Press.
- Gumede, V. (2017). Radical socio-economic transformation is bigger than inclusive growth. *Mail & Guardian opinion article*, 02-08 June 2017.
- Hayes, G. (2011). (Re-)Introducing N Chabani Manganyi. *PINS*, 41(2011), 1-6.
- Hill, M. (1997). Introduction: Vipers in Shangri-la. In M. Hill (Ed.), *Whiteness: A critical reader* (pp. 1-20). New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Hirsch, A. (2005). *Season of hope: Economic reform under Mandela and Mbeki*. South Africa: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press & Canada: International Development Research Centre.

- Hirson, B. (1992). *Nationalisation: A matter of slogans?* South Africa: Ravan Press.
- Hook, D. (2004). Fanon and the psychoanalysis of racism. In D. Hook (ed). *Critical psychology*. Cape Town: Juta, pp.114-137.
- Hsieh, H. F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three Approaches to Qualitative Content Analysis. *Qualitative Health Research, 15*(9), 1277-1288.
- JanMohamed, A. R. (1985). *Manichean aesthetics the politics of literature in colonial Africa*. Amherst, MA: The University of Massachusetts Press.
- Ka Plaatjie, T. (2003). Taking matters into their own hands: The indigenous African response to the land crisis in South Africa, 1990-2001. In M.C. Lee & K. Colvard (Eds.), *Unfinished business: The land crisis in Southern Africa* (pp. 287-316). Pretoria: Africa Institute of South Africa.
- Kloppers, J. H., & Pienaar, G. J. (2014). The historical context of land reform in South Africa and early policies. *PER / PELJ, 17*(2), 677-707.
- Kothari, U. (2006). An agenda for thinking about 'Race' in development. *Progress in Development Studies, 6*(1), 9-23.
- Kunnie, J. (2000). Developing indigenous knowledge and technological systems. In E. Chiwome, Z. Mguni, & M. Furusa (Eds.), *Indigenous knowledge and technology in African and diaspora communities: Multidisciplinary approaches*. (pp. 38–49). Harare: Southern African Association for Culture and Development Studies
- Landman, K. (2012). Gated communities in South Africa: Tensions between the planning ideal and practice. *Research Article, 61*.
- Lockyer, S. (2008). *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods*. Thousand Oaks, SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Lodge, T. (2014). Neo-patrimonial politics in the ANC. *African Affairs, 113*(450), 1-23.
- Maldonado-Torres, N. (2005). Frantz Fanon and C.L.R James on intellectual and enlightenment rationality. *Caribbean Studies, 33*(2), 149-194.
- Maldonado-Torres, N. (2007). On the coloniality of being. *Cultural Studies, 21*(2), 240-270.
- Maldonado-Torres, N. (2008). *Against war: Views from the underside of modernity*. Durham/ London: Duke University Press.
- Maldonado-Torres, N. (2017). Frantz Fanon and the decolonial turn in psychology: from modern/colonial methods to the decolonial attitude. *South African Journal of Psychology, 47*(4), 432-441.
- Malikane, C. (2011). Nationalisation of mines: A necessary step towards economic liberation. In Chapter 1: Economic governance.

- Manganyi, N.C. 1973. *Being-Black-In-The-World*. SPRO-CAS/RAVAN Publisher.
- Mayende, G. (2010). Rural development under a “Developmental State”: analyzing the policy shift on agrarian reform in South Africa. In K. Kondlo & M. H. Maserumule (Eds.), *The Zuma Administration – Critical Challenges*. HSRC Press.
- Mbeki, M. (2006). Concepts of transformation and the social structure of South Africa. *Visions of Black Economic Empowerment*, 216-226.
- Mbeki, M. (2009). *Architects of poverty: Why Africa’s capitalism needs changing*. Johannesburg: Picador Africa.
- Mbeki, M. (2011). *Advocates for change: How to overcome Africa’s challenges*. Johannesburg: PICADOR Africa.
- Mbeki, M. (1998a). South Africa: Two nations. In Thabo Mbeki (comp.). *Africa: The time has come: Selected speeches by Thabo Mbeki* (pp. 68-76). Cape Town: Tafelberg.
- Mbeki, T. (1998b). The African Renaissance, South Africa and the World. *South African Deputy President Thabo Mbeki speaks at the United Nations University*, 9 April 1998. Retrieved from <http://archive.unu.edu/unupress/mbeki.html>
- Mbeki, M. (1998). Statement of Deputy President Thabo Mbeki at the opening of the debate in the National Assembly, On “Reconciliation and Nation Building. National Assembly, Cape Town, 29 May 1998.
- Mbembe, A. (1992). Provisional notes on the postcolony. *Africa*, 62(1), 3-37.
- Mbembe, A. (2005). Faces of freedom: Jewish and black experiences. *Interventions*, 7(3), 293-298.
- Mbembe, A., & Posel, D (2006). A Critical Humanism. *Interventions: International Journal of Postcolonial Studies*, 7(3), 283-286.
- Mbembe, A. (2011). Democracy as community life, Johannesburg Workshop in Theory & Criticism. *The Salon*, 4, 1-6. Retrieved for Online Internet Sources (04 June 2015): [http://jwtc.org.za/volume\\_4/achille\\_mbembe.htm](http://jwtc.org.za/volume_4/achille_mbembe.htm)
- Mbembe, A. (2011b). *Fanon’s nightmare, our reality*. *Mail and Guardian*, 23 December.
- McKaiser, E. (2012). Opinion: Generational change and its impact on South Africa’s politics. In J. Hofmeyr (editor). *The Youth Dividend: Unlocking the potential of young South Africans*. Institute for Justice and Reconciliation, pp. 11-14.
- Mignolo, W. D. (2000). *Local histories/global designs: Coloniality, subaltern knowledges, and border thinking*. Princeton University Press.
- Mignolo, W. D. (2011). Epistemic disobedience and the decolonial option: A manifesto. *Transmodernity*, 1(2), 44-66.

- Mkandawire, T. (2010). *Running while others walk: Knowledge and the challenge of Africa's development*. London: The London School of Economic and Political Sciences.
- Mngxitama, A. (2006). The taming of land resistance: Lessons from the national land committee. *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, 41(1/2), 39-69.
- Mngxitama, A. (2008). The infrastructure of racism is still intact. *Mail and Guardian*, 28 February -7 March, p. 21.
- Mngxitama, A. (2009). Blacks can't be racist. *The New Frank Talk 3: Critical Essays on the Black Condition*.
- Mngxitama, A. (2010, March 31). Writers failing to ask the tough questions on state of this country, *The Star*, p. 35.
- Mngxitama, A. (2015). *Is a decolonised university possible in a colonial society?* Unpublished paper at the University of Johannesburg, 16 March 2015.
- Mngxitama, A. (2015b). The state is perpetuating Afrophobia. *Mail and Guardian*, 15 May.
- Mngxitama, A. (2016). *Is a decolonised university possible in a colonial society?* University of Johannesburg, 16 March 2016.
- Modise, L., & Mtshiselwa, N. (2013). *The Natives Land Act of 1913 engineered the poverty of Black South Africans: A historico-ecclesiastical perspective*. Conference paper delivered at the Theological Society of South Africa (TSSA), Cape Town, South Africa, June 2013.
- More, M. P. (2011). Fanon and the land question in (post) apartheid South Africa. In N. C. Gibson (Ed.), *Living Fanon: Global perspectives* (pp. 173-185). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- More, M. P. (2014). Locating Frantz Fanon in post-apartheid South Africa. *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, pp. 1–15. SAGE.
- Nayar, P. K. (2010). Postcolonialism, Suffering and Affective Cosmopolitanism. *International Conference on 'Postcolonial Literatures and the Transnational'* 7-9 April 2010, Chaudhary Charan Singh University, Meerut, India.
- Nayar, P. K. (2011). Frantz Fanon: Toward a Postcolonial Humanism. *The IUP Journal of Commonwealth Literature*, III(1), 21-35.
- Neocosmos, M. (2008). *From "foreign natives" to "native foreigners": Explaining xenophobia in Post-apartheid South Africa*. Dakar: CODESRIA.
- Neocosmos, M. (2014). Thinking Political Emancipation and the Social Sciences in Africa: Some Critical Reflections. *Africa Development*, XXXIX (1), 125-158. Dakar: CODESRIA.

- Neocosmos, M. (Forthcoming). *Thinking freedom in Africa: Subjective excess, historical sequences and emancipatory politics*. South Africa: UKZN Press.
- Nazneen, K. (2007). Frantz Fanon's theory of racialization: implications for globalization, human architecture. *Journal of the Sociology of Self-Knowledge, Special Double-Issue*, Summer 2007, 353-362.
- Ndllovu-Gatsheni, S. J. (2011). The logic of violence in Africa, *Ferguson Centre for African and Asian Studies*. Working Paper No. 02.
- Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. J. (2012). Coloniality of Power in Development Studies and the Impact of Global Imperial Designs on Africa. *Archie Mafeje Research Institute (AMRI) and Department of Development Studies*, University of South Africa.
- Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. J. (2013). *Coloniality of power in postcolonial Africa myths of decolonization*. Senega, Dakar: CODESRIA Press.
- Ntsebeza, L. (2007). *The land question: Exploring obstacles to land redistribution in South Africa*. Retrieved from <http://www.yale.edu/macmillan/apartheid/ntsebezap2>
- Nnadozie, R. C. (2013). Access to basic services in post-apartheid South Africa: What has changed? Measuring on a relative basis. *The African Statistical Journal*, 16 (May 2013).
- Nurse-Bray, P. (1980). Race and nation: Ideology in the thought of Frantz Fanon. *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, 18(1), 135-142.
- Nyapokoto, R. (2014). *The road between Sandton and Alexandra township: A Fanonian approach to the study of poverty and privilege in South Africa*. Unpublished Masters' Thesis. South Africa: University of South Africa.
- Omi, M., & Winant, H. (2014 [1986]). *Racial Formation in the United States*. Routledge, New York.
- Parris, L. T. (2011). Frantz Fanon: Existentialist, dialectician, and revolutionary. *The Journal of Pan African Studies*, 4(7), 4-23.
- Palmer, R., & Parsons, N. (1977). *The roots of rural poverty in South and Central Africa*. Lusaka: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Pithouse, R. (2013). Conjunctural remarks on the political significance of 'the local'. *Thesis Eleven*, 115(1), 95-111.
- Pityana, S. (2013). *The legacy of land dispossession in South Africa to what extent does the constitution facilitate or limit redress? Council for the advancement of the South African Constitution (CASAC)*. The Land Divided Conference, UCT, March 2013.

- Qobo, M. (2012). Continuity at the expense of new politics. In J, Hofmeyr (editor). *The Youth Dividend: Unlocking the potential of young South Africans*. Institute for Justice and Reconciliation Publisher, pp. 15-19.
- Ranuga, T. K. (1986). Frantz Fanon and Black Consciousness in Azania (South Africa). *Phylon (1960-)*, Vol. 47, No. 3 (3rd Qtr., 1986), pp. 182-191. Clark Atlanta University.
- Rousseau, R. (2014). *Perceptions of inequality in post-apartheid South Africa*. Unpublished Honours Dissertation in Economics. South Africa: University of Stellenbosch.
- Santos, B. S. (2007). Beyond abyssal thinking: from global lines to ecology of knowledges. *Review*, 30(1), 1-33.
- Sardar, Z. 2008. Foreword to the 2008 edition by Ziauddin Sardar. In F, Fanon. *Black Skin, White Masks*. [Translated by C.L. Markmann]. United Kingdom: Pluto Press.
- Seekings, J. (2007). *Who holds power in post-apartheid South Africa?* CSSR Working Paper No. 195, May 2007.
- Seekings, J. (2014). South Africa: Democracy, Poverty and Inclusive Growth Since 1994. *A revised version of a working paper prepared for presentation at the Democracy Works Project seminar at CDE, 19 March, 2013*.
- Sithole, T. (2011). *Fanon, Manichean structure and the challenges of coloniality in the post-1994 South Africa*, Panel: Revisiting the ‘National Question’ as a Continuing African Challenge in the 21st Century, Rabat Maroc/Morocco: CODESRIA.
- Sithole, T. (2012). *Fanon and the positionality of Seepe, Mangcu and Mngxitama as black public intellectuals in the post-1994 South Africa*. Unpublished Master’s Thesis. Pretoria: University of South Africa.
- Sithole, T. (2014a). The Rhetoric of Thabo Mbeki’s ‘Two Nations’ speech and the plague of Manicheanism in South Africa. *African Journal of Rhetoric*, 6(2014), 327-362.
- Sithole, T. (2014b). *Being and land: The ontological scandal of the land question in South Africa*. Paper prepared for the Roundtable Dialogue on Investment on Land or Land Grabbing, Agricultural Production and Food Security. Dakar, Senegal, 5-7 November 2014.
- Sithole, T. (2014c). *Achille Mbembe: Subject, subjection, and subjectivity*. Unpublished Master’s Thesis. Pretoria: University of South Africa.
- Sithole, T. (2016). Frantz Fanon: Africana existentialist philosopher. *African Identities*, 14(2), 177-190.
- Thiong’o, N. (1986). *Writing against neocolonialism*. USA. The Red Sea Press.

- Thwala, W. D. (2003). *Backgrounder – Land and agrarian reform in South Africa*. Retrieved from <http://www.landaction.org>
- Terreblanche, S. J. (2002). *A History of inequality in South Africa, 1652 to 2002*. Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press.
- Tlostanova, M., & Mignolo, W. (2009). Global coloniality and the decolonial option. *Kult*, 6 (Special Issue), 130-147.
- Weheliye, A. G. (2008). Pornotropes. *Journal of visual culture*, Vol 7(1): pp. 65–81. SAGE: Los Angeles, London, New Delhi and Singapore.
- White, S. (2002). Thinking race, thinking development. *Third World Quarterly*, Vol 23 (3), pp. 407-419
- Wilderson, F. B. III. (2003). The prison slave as hegemony's (silent) scandal. *Social Justice*, 30(2), 18-27.
- Wright, C. (1992). National liberation, consciousness, freedom and Frantz Fanon. *History of European Ideas*, 15(1-3), 427-434.
- Zahar, R. (1974). *Frantz Fanon: colonialism and alienation*. New York: Monthly Review Press.