"Authentic" Queer Identities – Koos Prinsloo as a Site of Contestation

Siseko H. Kumalo

Summary

Koos Prinsloo's short story, "Promise you'll tell no-one", highlights three aspects that continue to plague Afrikaner identity. The first of these are the phallus, understood here as the symbol of patriarchal power which was the epicentre of Afrikaner identity under the apartheid regime in South Africa, governing both the home and politics. The second aspect is the vacillation between "homomasculinity" (Sonnekus 2013: 35) and heterosexuality, with Afrikaner male identity defined as oppositional to homo-masculinity/homosexuality – with the latter categories typifying the *Other*. Lastly, Prinsloo deals with race, albeit in a fleeting manner. His use of race in "Promise you'll tell no-one" reveals the nature of the dogmatic racial categories of apartheid during the 1980s in South Africa.

Dealing with each of these aspects in seriatim, as a way of raising the question of an *authentic* "queer voice", I highlight how Prinsloo attempts to step outside the strictures of Afrikaner identity. My analysis reveals, however, that while his attempt may be genuine, Prinsloo cannot escape the place-identity into which he was born and from which he wrote. To explicate this position, I refer to other texts such as Oliver Hermanus's *Skoonheid* (2011), Mark Behr's (1996) *The Smell of Apples* (*Die reuk van appels)* and John Trengrove's *Inxeba* (2013). I conclude the article by reposing the question in the context of contemporary South African society so as to glean insights from this short story as a way of better understanding questions of justice as they relate to queerness.

Opsomming

Koos Prinsloo se kortverhaal, "Promise you'll tell no-one" ("belowe dat jy niemand sal vertel nie"), beklemtoon drie aspekte wat die Afrikaner identiteit voortdurend bekommer. Die eerste van hierdie aspekte is die manlike geslagsorgaan ("phallus"), wat hier geïnterpreteer word as die simbool van patriargale mag en wat die sentrale fokus van Afrikaner identiteit was onder die apartheid regering in Suid Afrika, en wat beide families en politiek beheer het. Die tweede aspek is die ambivalensie tussen homomanlikheid ("homosmasculinity") (Sonnekus 2013: 35) en heteroseksualiteit waar Afrikaner manlikheid gedefinieër word as tweestrydig met homomanlikheid/ homoseksualiteit ─ die laaste klassifikasies omskryf die Ander. Die laaste aspek waaraan hierdie artikel aandag gee, is Prinsloo se bepeinsing oor ras, al is dit net vlugtig. Sy gebruik van ras in "Promise you'll tell no-one" vertel ons van die aard van die dogmatiese rassistiese kategorieë van apartheid gedurende die 1980s in Suid-Afrika.

JLS/TLW 35(1), Mar./Mrt. 2019
ISSN 0256-4718/Online 1753-5387

https:doi.org/10.2519/1753-5387/11626

Terwyl ek hierdie aspekte punt vir punt behandel as 'n manier om die vraagstuk oor die outentisiteit van die moffie-stem ("queer voice") te opper, sal ek beklemtoon hoe Prinsloo poog om te ontsnap van die bande van Afrikaner-identiteit. My ondersoek toon aan dat, alhoewel Prinsloo se poging opreg was, hy nie kan ontsnap van die identiteitsplasing waarin hy gebore is en waarvandaan hy spreek nie. Ten einde hierdie posisie te handhaaf verwys ek na ander akademiese tekste soos Oliver Hermanus se *Skoonheid* (2011), Mark Behr (1996) se *The Smell of Apples* (vertaal as *Die reuk van appels*) en John Trengrove's *Inxeba*/*The Wound* ("die wond") (2013). Ten slotte bevraagteken ek of Prinsloo se kortverhaal werklik 'n beter verstaansraamwerk aanbied aangaande vraagstukke oor moffies ("queers") se regte en respekvolle behandeling binne die huidige Suid-Afrikaanse konteks.

Introduction

Place-identity seems central to Koos Prinsloo's (1995: 319) "Promise you'll tell no-one" as he begins the tale with the lines, "[t]he first time I touched somebody else's cock was one summer afternoon in a farmyard near Ingogo ... at the foot of the Majuba mountain, a few miles from Newcastle in Natal." This should not come as a surprise as any reader familiar with the South African Afrikaner literary tradition will know that the *platteland* has been central to the South African white Afrikaner novel. The Afrikaner literary tradition was historically defined by negotiated existence as Afrikaner identity was rooted in the *plaasroman*[1] owing to the shift from the colonial frontier, in the rural country outback, to the urban city during the second half of the twentieth century (see, for instance, Coetzee 2000 on this relationality). As such, place-identity for Prinsloo is doubly burdened because it informs his place (lessness) in Afrikaner masculinities, owing to his sexual desire, as well as his place in the *platteland*. This negotiated place-identity frames the journey that the reader undertakes with Prinsloo as he recounts how he discovered his sexual identity as a boy, all the while carefully negotiating oppositional definitions that constrict Afrikaner white male identity. The farmyard, which is located in the outback of KwaZulu-Natal, is interesting for the reader on two counts. First, it reveals the historical context of how many South Africans negotiate place-identity in relation to the realities of colonial

1. The "plaasroman" as defined by J.M. Coetzee is the Afrikaner parallel to the English farm novel (1988: 63). This genre of literature has been central to Afrikaner identity, with only two writers in the English literary tradition taking up the farm as their subject matter – Olive Schreiner in *The Story of an African Farm* (1883), and Pauline Smith in *The Beadle* (1926), as well as in a collection of short stories titled *The Little Karoo* (1925). With Afrikaner identity historically birthed and constituted on the farm, and subsequently having to be negotiated in the urban landscape in the second half of the twentieth century, it is understandable why the plaasroman is so central to the Afrikaner literary tradition and identity.

incursion. The second aspect lies in how the *platteland* – where Afrikaner identity is often premised – is itself a place of contestation as the South African landscape is tamed and penetrated by Dutch Afrikaner identity as it asserts its *rightful/native* place in the land of the San/Khoi/abaThwa "Hottentot" and the Xhosa "Kaffir" as argued by Coetzee (1988: 18). This is further complicated by the fact that contemporary Afrikaners had to assert their identity against both the Dutch and the English.

The negotiated place-identity of all South Africans owing to colonial invasion is useful as the analysis of John Dixon and Kevin Durrheim (2000) shows. This negotiation explicates the historical contextuality of coloniality in our historical and present lives. Writing about displaced place-identity, these scholars intimate to the importance of place-belonging in the processes of self-definition (Dixon & Durrheim 2000: 29). Prinsloo's act of foregrounding his narrative in his place-identity, which is located in rural Natal, is of immense import as he implicitly attempts to showcase his belonging – that is, nativity – in a land inherited from the dispossession of Indigeneity. The act of asserting his belonging has its roots in the identity formation processes of Afrikanerdom in South Africa; an identity which forcefully penetrates the land while eliding the existence of Blackness prior to its arrival on the southernmost tip of the African continent. To show how Afrikaner male identity jettisons queerness from its original definitions and epicentres of power prior to democratic liberation in South Africa, Theo Sonnekus (2013: 24) turns to Mark Behr's (1993) debut novel *Die reuk van appels*, later translated into English as *The Smell of Apples*. Behr (1996: 124) writes, "[South Africa] was empty before our people [Afrikaners] arrived. Everything, everything you see, we built up from nothing. This is our place given to us by God and we will look after it. Whatever the cost".[2] Against this typical Afrikaner place-identity, I understand Prinsloo (1995) to be

2 While we can be inclined to read Behr (1996) in a satirical manner, the reader also has to acknowledge the historical implications of this assertion. Satire in Behr's (1996) work lies in the reality that as a literato Behr was contesting and revealing the reality of Afrikaner oppression and domination in South Africa witnessed through legislation such as the Group Areas Act of 1950, the political ban on the African National Congress and Pan Africanist Congress in 1960 which culminated in the underground armed struggle of umKhonto weSizwe, the Rivonia Trial of 1963, the death of Biko in 1977, and the countless number of Black political subjects who were banned, went into forced exile and were detained without trial. This short account of history surfaces the lengths to which Afrikaner identity as controlled and curated by the male figure who ruled in the home and in political matters, would go to protect what it built, "[w]hatever the cost!" (Behr 1996: 124). However, Behr's own history is questionable because he was an informant for the Apartheid security police (for example, see <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/people/mark-behr-novelist-who-confessed-to-the-anc-in-1990-that-he-had-been-recruited-as-a-spy-by-south-a6786181.html>).

negotiating his belonging as tenuous on two accounts. First, his Afrikaner identity, which negotiates its place in the South African context and, secondly, on his being a queer voice at the heart of an identity that derides queerness because it is "ungodly" and unmanly. The supposed ungodly nature of queerness threatens the power afforded to Afrikaner patriarchal male identity, which is already questionable as it is predetermined by the act of having forcefully penetrated a landscape to which is ascribed a God-given birthright. This, furthermore, elides Blackness/Indigeneity, subduing it to the will of white patriarchal identity and relegating it to the abject as per the analysis developed by Sonnekus (2013: 30). The elisions of Blackness/Indigeneity, as part of the identity formation processes of Afrikanerdom, also speaks to the second point of interest that the opening lines of "Promise you'll tell no-one" elicit by highlighting how the *platteland* is a site of contestation because it is founded on dispossession and the forced labour of Black/Indigenous peoples. This claim will be substantiated in the discussion on power(lessness) and the vulnerability of the male phallus in the first section of the paper.

Acts of dispossession and forced labour denote the metaphorical forced and phallic penetration that sees the South African landscape tamed by Afrikaner will and Calvinism. Coetzee (1988) suggests that this penetration is informed by the ways in which the Dutch colonial settler, i.e. the forebears of contemporary Afrikaner identity, framed the Indigenous populations found in the country that was to be defined as the "God-given" (Behr 1996: 124) land of the Afrikaner. The Hottentot and Kaffir in the early accounts of European travellers are framed as idle, indolent and animalistic (Coetzee 1988: 2). This definition is aptly demonstrated by one of the accounts which detail the Hottentot from the perspective of an early European traveller/explorer who catalogued his encounters with the Hottentot. He writes: "The Hottentot sleeps all day ... in a hut ... lying all over one another (Hottentot sexual mores) like hogs" (Coetzee 1988: 16). This account of the Hottentot is in stark contrast to the Calvinistic nature and Victorian morals upon which the Dutch settler identity was premised and which frames idleness as a sin against god. As Coetzee says, idleness was viewed as "a sin, [which was otherwise articulated as] a betrayal of one's humanity" (1988: 21). However, it is important to raise the critical question of whether the Hottentot and the Kaffir were indeed as idle as represented in early accounts of the Indigenous communities of South Africa. Coetzee, in his eviscerating *White Writing* – which traces the history of the white [English and Afrikaner literary tradition in South Africa] – is useful once again. Commenting on the elisions that curated a social economy of domination, Coetzee raises an important question when he asks: "Do white hands truly pick the fruit, reap the grain, milk the cows, shear the sheep in these bucolic retreats? Who truly creates wealth?" (1988: 11). This question aids the reader in understanding my assertion of a strained relationality that questions the nativity of Afrikanerdom in our context, specifically between Afrikaner identity and the land. The strained

relationality therefore inspires the second point of intrigue in Prinsloo's (1995) work. In "Promise you'll tell no-one", Prinsloo (1995) foregrounds his narrative in his strained place-identity which, as demonstrated in the brief contextualising history above, can be understood as fraught with incongruences and constant negotiations. These negotiations necessitate an interrogation of the place-identity of the Afrikaner male, which is rooted in land possession by forced penetration and thus points to the dispossession of Indigeneity. This clash between land possession and dispossession centralises power through the phallus that dominates both the private and the public domain. The second point of intrigue then circles back to the first in terms of how the *platteland* is controlled and centred on the power of the Afrikaner male, derived from his phallic God-given right to rule '*die plaasmense*' (the nation).

What do these points of intrigue tell us about "Promise you'll tell no-one"? Now that I have sketched the historical context of the negotiated place-identity of the Afrikaner male, our attention is drawn to how Prinsloo uses the phallus to demonstrate vulnerabilities and power. On the *platteland*, which curates and dictates the modes of being for the *plaasmense*, the phallus rules by its God-given right, thus subjecting and subjugating Other identities to its will. I demonstrate this element in the next section by juxtaposing Prinsloo's (1995) tale with *Skoonheid* (Hermanus 2013) – a film which explores the theme of homomasculinity amongst Afrikaner men in contemporary South Africa. Thereafter, I deal with the vacillating experience detailed by Prinsloo (1995: 323) in his accounts of repressed homomasculinity that defines manliness as strictly heterosexual in nature as evidenced when he writes: "At standard 7 I still did not have a name for this thing. At night I tried to console myself that I was only half like that. And I prayed that it would go away and that I would like only girls." An analysis of this allows me to pose the question of an 'authentic' queer voice more vividly. This then facilitates my interrogation in the third and final section of the paper, which looks at Afrikaner queerness in contemporary South African reality.

The Phallus – A Site of Power(lessness) and Vulnerability

Prinsloo (1995) makes constant reference to the penis in his tale as he negotiates his identity and position of power – as the son of a "*baas"* on the "*plaas"*. He – denoting the double identity of Koos the narrator *and* Koos the writer as Gerrit Olivier (2008: 1) notes – recounts an experience at the age of six when he was made to feel the penis of an "older boy" who "must have been a teenager because his cock lay thick in [his] hand", as he was "egged ... on to push [his] hand into the front of [an older boys'] khaki shorts and [made] to feel" (Prinsloo 1995: 320). The race of the older boy remains unclear to the reader although the story intimates that he is the child of one of the servants

as they (the older boys) made "their way through the thicket [back] to the huts" (Prinsloo 1995: 320). On this account of memory, we notice first the narrator's power position in relation to the older boys that re-invites the question posed by Coetzee (1988: 21) about who built the wealth of whiteness in a context of dispossession, especially owing to accounts of "their" idleness which is construed as a betrayal of their humanity as argued earlier. Secondly, the reader is invited to ask whether, at the age of six, when Prinsloo/the narrator was a young child, could identify his same-sex desire for the penis which inherently locates him in a position of powerlessness in terms of Afrikaner phallic masculinity.[3] The paradox in this complex nexus of race, desire and dispossession lies in Prinsloo's (1995) powerlessness owing to same-sex desire and conversely in his power derived from his racial identity. Third, the reader is invited to interrogate the ways in which Prinsloo (1995) uses and conceptualises Blackness/Indigeneity in his tale (remembering also that he wrote in the 1980s and early 1990s).

The first aspect of masculine powerlessness or a diminished sense of manliness is discussed in a detailed analysis by Sonnekus as he examines how François's[4] masculinity is threatened by the deviant sexual behaviour of "faggots" and "non-whites" (2013: 23). The threat emanates from the categorical definition that locates Afrikaner masculinity – and any masculinity I would suggest – as separate from gayness (Sonnekus 2013: 23). This distinction comes as gayness is seen to be a mode of existence rooted in femininity, which is oppositional to masculinity. Masculinity, as inversely positioned against femininity, is taken to be impregnable, impenetrable and fortified, with the invasion of a man – through anal sex – viewed as shameful and warranting disgust from the social group to which the man belongs. Male-male penetration thus diminishes the manliness of the penetrated on the premise of a *shared* assumption that it is the role of the man to penetrate and impregnate the "feeble" female sex. This categorical distinction rests on a very delicate act – which can also be violent as in the case of rape, i.e. a coerced infringement on the individual's bodily autonomy. The impenetrable, fortified identity that is masculinity thus loses its manliness – becoming the "faggot" or feeble "non-whites" who were subdued under the will and forced penetration of white European colonialism – when subjected to penetration. Siya Khumalo, who writes about the interconnections between sex, religion and politics in his recent book, *You Have to be Gay to Know God*, details this occurrence stirringly when he writes:

3. The reader should also note the inversion of power, with a white body being made to feel the phallus of a Black body.

4. François is the protagonist in Hermanus' (2011) *Skoonheid*, defined as a patriarch who reigns over his wife and two daughters, while secretly enjoying same-sex relations with a group of men on a secluded farmhouse in the city of Bloemfontein in a farming community of the Free State, South Africa.

> Like men and cities are expected to be, the anus is fortified by a network of resistant rings of muscle. But it's an opening in the skin or armour of the extended societal body. When an invader breaches [this armour], it shames the victim and the tribe whose impenetrability [is] continuous with impregnability. (Khumalo 2018: 202)

Prinsloo's same sex desire would have him defined as a "faggot" or a "moffie" (Andrews 2018: 34); definitions that are also the basis of François's compartmentalised identity as argued by Grant Andrews (2018). The compartmentalisation manifests as violence when François can no longer hold these separate categories in check in relation to the object of his desire, Christian.[5] Same-sex desire, as discussed in the relevant literature (see for instance Fraser 1999; Lemon 1992; Ratele, Fouten, Shefers, Strebel, Shabalala and Buikema 2009; Salo 2009; Schneider, Cockroft & Hook 2008;), undermines the masculinist identity of the desirer, with "moffies [defined as subjects who are supposedly] meant to know their place in society, [and] remain disempowered" (Andrews 2018: 37).

Secondly, a queer identity as such locates the queer subject in a space of powerlessness, or a diminished sense of manliness, which foregrounds the question of whether Prinsloo, as a six-year-old, would understand this nexus of politically negotiated subjectivity? Can and should the reader expect a child, who occupies a space of power as the son of a *baas* on the *plaas*, to understand the power of the penis he is made to touch through the khaki shorts of an older boy helping with the shearing of the sheep? Should the reader rather not expect more of the author as he details these memories from a position that purportedly understands the power and vulnerability wielded by the penis? I am of the view that the reader should indeed expect more of Prinsloo (1995), specifically as he details these memories from a position informed by his queerness, which is understood in retrospect from the perspective of a white man who has been framed by his place-identity[6]. The retrospective analysis, which ought to take seriously the place-identity of whiteness in a context that has subdued the native, should inform Prinsloo's work as queerness can be understood as contesting power dynamics defined by a heterosexual economy of desire and social subjectivity. This retrospective position can further be understood as an authentic articulation of

5. Christian is son to François's long-time friend and is depicted in the film, by Charles Keegan, as pursuing his studies at the University of Cape Town in the legal fraternity.

6. With respect to the reader expecting more of Prinsloo as a writer, I am here referring to his capacity in dealing with the power wielded by the penis which he implicitly desires along with the attendant social negotiations which locate Prinsloo, as author and narrator. I expect Prinsloo, through his capacity as a retrospective author, to deal with this nexus of power with more care and detail.

queer identity. However, can Blackness/Indigeneity ever expect whiteness in the South African context to speak from a position which acknowledges the power dynamics that define the social economy which frames South African reality? I would suggest that this expectation is idealistic in nature as "white queer identities"[7] can be construed, historically and contemporarily, as existing through single-issue politics owing to the hegemonic identity of white patriarchy in post-conflictual societies such as ours.

These questions bring me to the third consideration in Prinsloo's (1995) work. From an assumption that locates the older boy in the category of a Black/Indigenous subject whose penis is felt-up by a six-year-old, comes the question of how Prinsloo relates to Blackness and uses it in his writing. The uncritical use of Blackness by Prinsloo surfaces again when he is detailing an anecdote shared by a friend, Lodewyk, who details how "white men were tortured in the old days by being tied naked to masts and ... black women [were made to] rub their cunts against them. If the men got a cock-stand, their cocks were chopped off" (1995: 321). The modes in which Prinsloo (1995) writes about Blackness here highlight what Shannon Sullivan (2006) calls the "unconscious habits of racial privilege", which denotes a *laissez faire* manner of conceptualising, writing about and relating to Blackness from a position that is neither troubled by nor concerned with the implications of ones' actions. It is on the premise of the unconscious habits of racial privilege that I make the claim above that white queer identities are framed as concerned with single-issue politics, which marginalises an intersectional reading of the political context in which queer identities exist. Patricia-Hill Collins in her timeless contribution, *Black Feminist Thought*, notes that the image of the Black woman as "strange" and as an "outsider" is necessary for creating normality; this denotes the abjection of Blackness (2000: 68). Collins (2000) through her analysis showcases how the otherness of the Black women shapes the normalcy of whiteness, and further curates the Black man as normal within the hierarchy of racial and gender privilege. The bifurcations between the Other and normalcy locates the Black queer woman as invisible; a thought

7. I use the concept of "white queer identities" here to denote a phenomenon I explicate in the third section of the paper. The single-issue political stance of "white queer identities" stems from the act of divorcing queerness from certain political realities which frame and inform the lives of marginalised subjectivities who are denied the freedoms and liberties enjoined by the constitution. It is on this premise that I contend that one can be queer, but still enjoy patriarchal privilege that renders this queer subject complicit in maintaining structures of injustice and domination. This ties in with Kimberle Crenshaw's emphasis on the importance of intersectionality (see, for example: Crenshaw, Kimberle Williams. "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color." The Feminist Philosophy Reader. Eds. Alison Bailey and Chris Cuomo. New York: McGraw-Hill 2008: 279-309).

which will be taken up in the third section of the article. From this position, the reader is invited to ask a number of probing questions about the manner in which Prinsloo (1995) represents Blackness/Indigeneity in his work. Are we to expect more of him or is he following in the tradition of white men who consume Black bodies as argued by bell hooks (1992)? If the reader goes with the latter category in understanding Prinsloo's (1995) project, can we view him as genuinely speaking from a position of queerness? This question recentres the focus of this analysis, which is aimed at the investigation of authentic queer identities, and whether there can ever be an authentic Afrikaner queer voice in the South African context. However, my analysis on authenticity, queerness and its relationality to subjective identities will be taken up later in the argument.

The notion of the power(lessness) of the penis and the phallus as a site of vulnerability is taken up by Prinsloo (1995: 324) – though implicitly – in his account of an older man with whom he had an encounter "in a public toilet in the town one Saturday afternoon [… who] chafed the skin off the head of [his] cock, [with his gold ring]". In this representation of the penis as a site of vulnerability, Prinsloo (1995) understands the penis to be vulnerable only when he discusses it in relation to himself, or rather his subjectivity as a white man. I am pressed to ask the question of vulnerability as it relates to the penis in the earlier account wherein Prinsloo (1995: 320) is made to feel the cock of an older boy. The power dynamics of a six-year-old boy, who is also the son of a *baas*, being made to touch the cock of an older boy – whom the reader can understand as a Black/Indigenous subject – reveals how race and power function in a synchronous manner in the social economy of racial domination and land dispossession in South Africa. Prinsloo is uncritical of how this encounter is framed through the lens of a racially dominated socio-political order. While he frames the encounter in a light-hearted manner, with the older boys depicted as laughingly "chortling … through the thicket of poplars on their way [back] to the huts" (1995: 320) where they *belong*, I would suggest that Prinsloo fails to see what can be interpreted as the inversion of racial power relations. In the act of being made to feel the cock of a Black body as a white subject, the penis in this instance becomes the site of powerlessness, taking away the elevated status of the *kleinbaas*.[8] On another reading, the penis can be seen as a site of vulnerability. The penis as a site of vulnerability is only viewed as such when it refers to white subjectivity, because Blackness/Indigeneity is in any regard – non-human. If Blackness/Indigeneity

8. With the inversion of power, the reader is invited to consider whether in this moment, the vulnerability as experienced by Prinsloo the narrator is symptomatic of the powerlessness of whiteness in relation to Blackness. If indeed the power inversions intimate towards the powerlessness of whiteness, one ought to give some thought to the reality that it might be from this position that whiteness in our context is fragile requiring forceful means of asserting itself.

were human, I would suggest that Prinsloo from a retrospective perspective would take care about how he uses the Black body in his short memoire.

With Blackness/Indigeneity implicitly framed as animalistic through Lodewyk's comments (see for instance the work of George Yancy, *Black Bodies, White Gazes: The Continuing Significance of Race* 2008), Prinsloo (1995) does not think to interrogate his own position, which then could be framed as a form of bestiality.[9] This is, in fact, a perverse kind of irony that undermines white power even though it is not acknowledged as such. Exploring his sexuality as a child, Prinsloo (1995: 322) recounts how he tried "to fuck the bitch dog, [whose] cunt was too small" on the farm of his mother's cousin. The casualness with which Prinsloo relates to these issues suggests a dismissal of how these accounts relate to Prinsloo, revealing how whiteness continues to occupy a position of power even reflexively. Further the elisions cited earlier in the argument – which inform the dispossession of Blackness/Indigeneity, only Blackness and Indigeneity are seen to act in forms characteristic of animality which reveals "the politics of sex in race-representation" (Mercer 1994: 172). Writing about racial fetishism, Kobena Mercer (1994) argues that the Black sexual subject is characteristically *Other*. In his (Mercer 1994: 173) analysis of Mapplethorpe's *Black Males*, Mercer shows that Blackness is seen through white eyes "as a cultural artifact [… owing to the ways] in which white people 'look' at Black people and how, in this way of looking, black male sexuality is perceived as something different, excessive, Other". Through this way of looking, which can be described as the white male gaze, whiteness as the invisible seer is characterised as human, as lording over the animalistic Hottentot and Kaffir who lie on top of each other like "hogs" (Coetzee 1988: 18). As a way of further substantiating this position, Mercer asserts that the Black (male) body is "[a]etheticised as a trap for the gaze, providing pabulum on which the appetite of the imperial eye may feed, each image [of the insatiable Black phallus] thus nourishes the racialized and sexualized fantasy of appropriating the Other's body as virgin territory to be penetrated and possessed by an all-powerful desire". The animality of Blackness thus sees the Black male phallus as insatiable, wild and always in heat – ready to rape and pillage the white woman who is protected by the patriarch of the *plaasmense*, yet simultaneously exoticised. Coetzee (1980)

9. I should not be misunderstood as suggesting that Prinsloo, an eleven-year-old boy "in standard 3" (1995: 322), derives agentic pleasure from this act. Rather what I wish to stress in drawing from this example is how Prinsloo (1995) can recount this experience without being Othered racially or categorically defined as socially deviant in terms of racial and sexual transgressions. This capacity to pass his experimentation as just that – experimentation – I suggest is rooted in how he is racially and politically situated. *The white man never traverses socially acceptable sexual norms, as he defines, reshapes and adjusts them in accordance with his will; a position afforded to him by virtue of his occupying a hegemonic social position through his identity.*

characterises this way of seeing in *Waiting for the Barbarians* as a form of paranoia. Coetzee says of this paranoia,

> In private I observed that once in every generation, without fail, there is an episode of hysteria about the barbarians. There is no woman living along the frontier who has not dreamed of a dark barbarian hand coming from under the bed to grip her ankle, no man who has not frightened himself with visions of the barbarians carousing in his home, breaking the plates, setting fire to the curtains, *raping* his daughters.
>
> (Coetzee 1980: 09)

Black genitalia, accordingly, can be said to invite voyeurism, scopophilia and the need to categorically separate the self from Blackness, rendering Blackness as contaminant, although this does not mean that *all* interracial sex is necessarily uncritical. This definition of Blackness resurfaces the question posed above, which asks whether the reader ought to expect Prinsloo (1995) to speak from a space of reflexivity that challenges white domination and injustices in the South African context. This reflexivity would characterise an authentic queer identity/voice. From the perspective that categorises Blackness as contaminant, the single-political nature of white queerness in our contexts is not surprising, for even when speaking from a queer position, whiteness still enjoys the hegemonic status which locates white subjectivities as superior to Blackness. It is from this perspective that we can begin to understand why Prinsloo (1995) does not take care to trouble his bestial behaviour in the name of exploring his sexuality. Black genitalia as contaminant, i.e. the insatiable Black phallus which saw Black men castrated and hanged from trees like 'strange fruit' (Simone 2009) and the abnormal Black woman typified by Saartjie Baartman, thus becomes a threat to the white male penis rendering this bodily ligament as a site of vulnerability. The penis as a site of vulnerability, as it relates to the white man, is evinced in the anecdote shared by Lodewyk (1995: 321), with Blackness viewed as animalistic because white men were punished if aroused by Black womxn who were made to "rub their cunts against the cocks of white men". Categories of Black as animalistic and the racial economy of power and domination, which locates the white man at the apex of a racially segregated society, work in consort to create the white man's vulnerability in his penis. This claim is substantiated by Magubane (2001) who asks the critical question of "*Which Bodies Matter*?" Detailing how Baartman was plucked out of her society because of European voyeurism and maybe even scopophilia, Magubane contends that the Black female body is seen as "animality" and "abnormality" owing to its (perceived and designated) difference (2001: 822). By extension female Blackness/Indigeneity as the body that births *all* Blackness/Indigeneity, threatens the white male. This threat of Blackness as contaminant is seen in *Skoonheid* with the group of men who meet in "clandestine" spaces to have sex with each other in "darkened rooms"

(Andrews 2018: 35), while expelling the Other, who is both the sexual and racial Other, on the premise that these men are not moffies. The phallus thus becomes a site of vulnerability on three counts. First, it is a site of vulnerability in how it can be cut off, owing to its desirous behaviour towards that which has been defined as abject – that which exists outside of group identity – as detailed by Lodewyk in Prinsloo's (1995: 321) work. Second, the desire exhibited by the phallus poses a threat to homogenous group identity, with Blackness viewed as that which could sully racial purity. Sullied racial purity in the South African context was policed via the Immorality Act of 1927. Third, these two vulnerabilities exhibited by the penis can be extended to demonstrate the powerlessness detailed above through same-sex desire, bringing shame to the man who has been penetrated, his penis/spear now rendered useless. In turn, this solicits disgust from the group to which the man belongs as his anus ought to be guarded as impenetrable and impregnable. Here the penis becomes a site of vulnerability in a doubly charged manner – first in how it can be used against the man, and secondly in the penetration signalling a failure to use his penis/spear for the act of furthering the group's progeny. The penis as a site of vulnerability on the third count may give some suggestion as to why François, in *Skoonheid* (Hermanus 2011), compartmentalises his identities, only meeting in clandestine spaces to express and satiate his same-sex desire. Furthermore, François[10] presents himself in the public space as the typical Afrikaner patriarch – father to two daughters, *faithful* husband and upright citizen; characteristics which fortify his masculinity, presenting him as the impregnable, impenetrable protector/ patriarch. However, it is necessary to interrogate how homomasculinity vis-à-vis heterosexuality is negotiated by Afrikaner male identity, while manifesting violent and visceral identity incongruencies.

Homomasculinity vis-à-vis Heterosexuality

Homomasculinity can be understood as substantially different from homosexuality as it tries to maintain a veneer of heterosexuality in the male subject. The concept of homomasculinity is discussed in the work of Sonnekus (2013: 24) who defines it from the perspective of Afrikaner masculinities which are characterised by "a gender construct that 'allows no exceptions and disdains

10. For a detailed discussion on the construction of Afrikaner masculinity in film, see the work of Rickus Ströh (2017) who makes the argument for the manner in which recent Afrikaner films portray and destabilise hegemonic Afrikaner masculinity. Ströh's (2017) work focuses on three films, *Triomf* (2008), *Roepman* (2011) and *Faan se trein* (2014). Through work presented in Ströh's (2017) analysis, we can understand *Skoonheid* (2011) as similarly taking up the task of challenging hegemonic Afrikaner masculinities.

all contradiction' to the manliness it deems absolute". An example of homomasculinity can also be observed in the analysis of Siseko Kumalo and Lindokuhle Gama (2018) who discuss the contestations of manhood in the film *Inxeba* (Trengrove 2017) through the character of Vija. *Inxeba* (Trengrove 2017) explores notions of masculinity as they relate to and shape what these scholars define as "manhood proper"[11] in the custom of *ulwaluko* in Xhosa cosmology. Vija, who is one of the elders (*ikhankatha*) in the film, and whose role is defined as aiding the initiands (*amakrwala*) through their transitory journey from boyhood to manhood, maintains a sexual relationship with Xolani, another elder whose role is the same in the space of *entabeni* (the mountain). *Intaba* is defined by Xhosa cosmology as fundamentally reserved for men, with women and feminised bodies (queer bodies) being disallowed, as it is a site of culture, with culture associated exclusively with heterosexual men. Vija maintains this sexual relation with Xolani while also occupying a cis-heteronormative identity outside of *entabeni*, seen in his marriage to a female partner with whom he shares a life as a father and a husband. Vija, much like François, relates to his homomasculinity in ways that define this category of being as violent, exhibited in his attitudes to anyone who questions his "Manhood" (Kumalo & Gama 2018: 4). Furthermore, Vija, like François, only entertains and satiates his same-sex desire in darkened spaces, in the wilderness of *intaba*, outside of public view, which allows him to hold in check his performance of heterosexuality as defined by his Manhood. Homomasculinity as substantively different from homosexuality is characterised by secrecy, detailed by Sonnekus (2013) as discretion premised on a shared identity of existing in the shadows. Sonnekus stresses this point when he writes: "The threat of indiscretion is diminished, since both parties risk possible rejection from their possibly conservative communities ... in the event of disclosure" (2013: 35). Discretion in the case of François is witnessed in his interactions with the man he fucks in the darkened room of the farmhouse. In public spaces, the two men share a brief glance but do not acknowledge each other as homomasculinity, unlike homosexuality, denotes a relationship which is devoid of intimacy, with Andrews describing François as "incapable of intimacy" (2018: 42). Intimacy in the case of François would shatter the impenetrable/impregnable façade that the protagonist has curated throughout his life. Homomasculinity subsequently maintains the appearance of heterosexuality, with homosexuality defined as categorically outside of François's identity, which is immersed in Afrikaner patriarchy.

Prinsloo (1995: 323) shows some appreciations for these categorical distinctions witnessed in how he "prayed [that his latent homosexual desires] would go away and that [he] would like only girls", as he recounts his negotiated identity in the brief memoire "Promise you'll tell no-one".

11. For a more detailed discussion on the debate of "manhood proper", see the work of Kumalo and Gama (2018).

However, what are the implications of these categorical distinctions? In the brief analysis that follows, I look at the intersecting implications which include the legal status of same-sex relations in South Africa as it relates to a contemporary reading of Prinsloo's (1995) account of a negotiated subjectivity. This is further complicated by the vacillation experienced by Prinsloo and the fear of rejection owing to sexual difference.

Locating an "Authentic" Queer Voice

I should state categorically that the notion of an "authentic" queer voice is one fraught with varying problematics. As a queer Black man, whose identity is framed and informed by my belonging to Zulu culture and identity, some would suggest that I myself do not speak from a position of "authentic" queerness. My lack of authenticity would be informed by my belonging to a Zulu identity which itself denounces queerness as un-African and as a threat to Zulu masculinities.[12] Secondly, the project of locating an "authentic" queer Afrikaner identity presupposes an illegitimacy on the part of Afrikanerness. This illegitimacy would have us frame Afrikaner identities as fixed, stagnant and unchanging, which denotes an impossible position that *can* claim authenticity in relation to queerness, or any sexual identity for that matter. Kumalo and Gama (2018) showcase the inter-relationalities between Manhood and manhood proper, and frame the distinctions between the two categories as superficial and subsequently as eliding the reality that Manhood is a constituent/constitutive element of manhood proper, with manhood proper holding in check the violent manifestations which are defined as a *true* expression of Manhood. Queerness as such, and how I conceptualise and use it in this argument, suggests something similar to this notion of manhood proper in that it negotiates its existence while contesting injustices perpetrated by hegemonic identities. In this form, authentic queerness can be understood as a concern with justice as it relates to all subjectivities defined by their marginality and existence at the periphery of society. While the question of an "authentic" queer voice is useful, in that it aids our understandings of inter-subjectivities and how they relate to one another in the contemporary South African context, it is problematic. However, in what follows, I wish to highlight some of the potentialities embedded in asking this difficult and probing question. Here my aim is to showcase how queerness is rejected by all and sundry in South Africa, with Khumalo (2018: 214) responding to this rejection by arguing that "homophobia ... undermines constitutional freedoms

12. These claims of queerness as un-African are premised on colonialist impositions on African cultures with the scholarship of Busangokwakhe Dlamini (2006); and Leila Rupp (2001) challenging this narrative.

and democracy". The vacillation experienced by Prinsloo allows for an apt demonstration of this point.

Vacillating Between Homomasculinity and Heterosexuality

Prinsloo's account of his negotiated sexual identity explicitly evidences a vacillating existence between an attraction to women and same-sex desire. He recounts how in Standard 8 (grade 10) he "fell in love with a new Dutch girl in [his] school [who had] red hair and blue eyes" (1995: 324). When he approached the young woman to declare his love for her, he finds himself rejected by her and later in the same year turns his attention to a new English boy in Standard 9 (grade 11) for whom he found himself writing poetry. This vacillation prompts a contentious question that probes at the probability of homoeroticism as the result of a failed heterosexuality. This question is contentious as it frames homoeroticism as a socio-cultural deviant mode of existence that can be *corrected* by heterosexuality. The problematics of the question are further demonstrated by both the characters François and Vija who seem "incurable" of their homoerotic desires even as they occupy both the heterosexual and homomasculine spaces in their negotiated identities. The question, while indeed problematic in nature, is however important as it allows for a closer analysis of the vacillation experienced by Prinsloo (1995) as he negotiates his identity. The vacillation can be understood as emanating from two motivations; a) the desire to remain part of the social group to which one belongs, and b) not traversing the laws of the land as homosexuality was outlawed by the National Party which came into power in 1948. This desire for belonging is demonstrated in a very politically trite fashion when Prinsloo (1995) recounts an experience where he was teased by his cousins for being effeminate/weak. Prinsloo recounts how he was taunted by his cousin "Pietebaas, egged on by Robert [an older cousin who had tried to fuck him earlier on in the tale – with Pietebaas saying] 'you're a sissy, you're a sissy', and the eldest, Jannie [also intimidating him as he recounts how she] tried to strangle [him] with a tie one evening" (1995: 322). It is unclear to the reader whether the source of the taunting emanates from the other cousins being privy to the fact that Robert had tried to fuck Prinsloo "under one of the beds on the stoep" (1995: 322), or whether it was premised on the fact that Prinsloo exhibited effeminate behaviour which framed him as the underdog who was the target of the insults and violence he endured.

From this perspective the reader can begin to understand more clearly the notion of shame felt by the man who is penetrated by another, even though in the case of Prinsloo (1995: 322) the penetration was unsuccessful, as Robert's "cock wouldn't go in" when he attempted to fuck Prinsloo. The impenetrable male figure, who is subjected to penetration is rendered the "butt of the joke" so to speak among those who are privy to this information; a reality which

can be understood as the source of the shame/embarrassment and fear felt by the penetrated. This warped reality is premised on the very rigid strictures of the heterosexual economy of desire that defines the man as the subject who penetrates and the woman as the subject to be penetrated by the male figure using his penis/spear. It is this economy of desire that is derived from a cis-heteronormative conception of society that instils the sense of vacillation between homomasculinity and heterosexuality as witnessed in Prinsloo's work. As per the preceding discussion, I would suggest that this vacillation is the root of the desire to be included in collective communal identities and not rejected for one's sexual preferences, however, this aspect needs further examination.

I have characterised the manner in which Prinsloo (1995) writes in his short narrative, "Promise you'll tell no-one", as politically trite, inattentive and dismissive of the racial and socio-political realities in which he was located. However, if one takes a position of generosity towards Prinsloo (1995), one can otherwise understand that his writing is fleeting over complex social issues owing to the fact that he does not wish to be vulnerable. This phenomenon is described best by Duncan Forrester who writes about *Human Worth* (2001), wherein he points to the fact that if one's audience is held/understood to care for the speaker, the speaker reveals their true selves to their listener, thus beginning the journey of genuine communication. In light of the realities that inform the place-identity from which Prinsloo (1995) was writing, one can better appreciate the constrictions within which he was operating.

Collective Identities and the Desire to Belong/Fear of Being Caught Out

One might suggest that the manner in which Prinsloo (1995) writes is telling of his fear of being rejected by a community that defines masculinity as inherently separate from queerness and as unlawful. Even in the reality of homomasculinity – a space we can understand Prinsloo to be occupying as he pens his memories – Afrikaner patriarchal identity jettisons and abjects queerness and gayness from its definitions, rendering it incapable of (same-sex) intimacy as discussed by Andrews (2018). It is this fear of group rejection that informs the decisions taken by Vija in *Inxeba* and François in *Skoonheid*; a fear which is ultimately expressed as violence towards oneself as much as towards others. In the case of Vija, Kwanda – the initiand who discovers his secret, namely his sexual relations with Xolani – is killed, all in the name of the silence that shrouds the deeds of initiation *entabeni* (see for instance Kumalo and Gama 2018). In the case of François, the violence is manifested as the (attempted) sexual assault of Christian, who rejects the sexual advances directed at him by François, even though he is open to same-sex desire

relations and lives his life in a way that challenges the compartmentalised identity of François (Andrews 2018; Sonnekus 2013). Both François and Vija go to elaborate lengths to keep their homoerotic identities concealed from public view, with *Inxeba* ending with the (attempted) death of Kwanda – by Xolani's hand – and François buying Christian's silence after attempted rape (forced penetration).

In the case of Prinsloo, the fear of group rejection is negotiated through a mode of writing which does little to interrogate the privileged position from which Prinsloo speaks, rendering his work, in this instance, flippant and dismissive of the very real politics of queerness in South Africa. However, with vacillation attempting to shield Prinsloo from group identity expulsion and homomasculinity that tries to repress homosexuality, in the short story, and portends an affinity with heterosexuality, how can we begin to understand the place and role of Afrikaner queer male identities in contemporary South Africa?

Queerness and Constitutionality

Democratic constitutionalism in the South African context came with and from the imposition of western laws, morals and values that erased the place of Blackness in our context. This position is substantiated through the argument presented in the first section of the paper using Coetzee's (1988) work who maintains that the Calvinism of Dutch colonial settlers defined the Hottentot and the Kaffir as idle and indolent. With this came the systematic erasure of African categories of gender that saw women removed from the status that they previously held in African societies, as seen in Ifi Amadiume's (1988: 132) contention that "colonial rule on the African continent came with the disempowerment of women", specifically in the case of Igbo-land, the ethnographic locale that facilitated Amadiume's seminal analysis titled *Male Daughters and Female Husbands*. Amadiume's position is substantiated by Oyèrónkẹ́ Oyèwùmí (1997) through her work on *The Invention of Women*.

The relegation of women to second class-citizens saw the African continent buying into predefined notions of beauty and femininity as detailed by J. Konadu Fokuo (2009) who explores the phenomenon of skin bleaching among Ghanaian women. The underlying assumption behind this phenomenon is the supposition that beauty is associated with the white woman, whose hair is predominantly straight and whose skin is milky white. Fokuo argues that with marriage viewed as a status symbol in Ghanaian society, women aspire to this social institution as being single is seen to be a form of "social deviance" (2009: 48). These attitudes and mores signify the long-lasting effects of colonial incursion on the African continent with the remnants of colonialism and coloniality seen in contemporary society. In the case of South Africa, Roman-Dutch-English Law is privileged while

customary law is viewed as an appendage, although decolonial scholars are doing much to contest this reality. While constitutional democracy has arguably been a western imposition on the African continent, with the borders of the continent being the relics of European men who forcefully penetrated the continent using arbitrary measures best epitomised by the Berlin Conference of 1884-1885 (see for instance the work of Asiwaju 1985; Chamberlain 2014; Mazrui 1980; Wesseling 1996), these relics – specifically in South Africa – birthed the constitution.

The new South African constitution secures the rights of all, empowering women, queer bodies and minority communities, through having the rights of these identities enshrined and protected by the constitution. These constitutional freedoms threaten characters such as François and Willem (François's friend in the film) – a friendship characterised by their mutually threatened masculinity with the two men exchanging their racist bigotry in a scene that depicts them at dinner, in Hermanus's (2011) *Skoonheid*. Willem is of the view that their power and, by extension their masculinities, are threatened by these "minorities" when he asserts, "I know that things were bad in the old days, but at least we felt safe. Now they force you to be racist" (Hermanus 2011). Andrews (2018: 38) argues that owing to the feeling that their sense of self is being threatened, "[t]hese men cast their racism and homophobia as the fault of the *Other*, legitimizing their hostility towards people of colour and queer men due to the perceived threat that these groups pose". The constitutionality that undergirds South African liberal democracy secures the rights of these minorities, which unearths an uneasiness with these identities as they relate to (Afrikaner) male identity. This uneasiness is rooted in the reality that historically − Afrikaner male identity − enjoyed these freedoms, singularly, with democracy now demanding that these freedoms be shared and respected by all.

The homophobia and racism depicted through François and Willem's characters – while fictional in the film – denotes a very tangible reality for a number of South Africans, with queer and straight women facing the eminent reality of rape from men who feel that their masculinity is threatened by women who do not frame themselves as appendages of men (see for instance Moffett 2006; Gqola 2001, 2007). This threat is also experienced by queer male bodies who exhibit characteristics that are associated with effeminate identities; queer effeminate men are thus subjected to physical violence owing to their life choices (see the work of Graziano 2004 and Wells and Polders 2006 for a detailed discussion on this phenomenon). The tangible reality of rape for queer and straight women, the eminent threat of bodily violation of gay men in South Africa are genuine realities for historically disempowered groups, who are protected by constitutional freedoms that ought to be enjoyed by all. It is on the basis of this reality that Khumalo (2018) suggest that "homophobia" – and I would also add the category of racism as seen through François and Willem's comments in *Skoonheid* – undermine constitutional-

ism and therefore curtails the possibilities of authentic queer voices. Through liberal constitutionalism, which Prinsloo (1995) during his childhood did not enjoy, queer subjectivities in our context can finally claim legitimate citizenship. With his writing premised on constrictions which signal dogmatic ethics devoid of aesthetics, with Louw suggesting that, "ethics without aesthetics produces legalism, moralism and fanaticism" (2012: 191), we can better understand why Prinsloo as writing in an indolent fashion. However, we ought to understand his work in the contextual specificities within which he was writing.

Eviscerating Elisions of Queerness – A Narrative

With queer identity in South Africa protected by constitutional freedoms, founded on principles of impartiality, one cannot deny the partiality that the politics of queerness produce in our context. Acceptable queerness signifies – to a large extent in South Africa – a kind of invisibility typified by the white homosexual men presenting as cis-gendered males. Recently, the Black queer muscular male body has also been added to this category and as such can be construed as enjoying constitutional freedoms. This identity is curated through a consumerist culture that presupposes a Virgin-Active membership, weight lifting, and a culture of machismo portrayed on social media platforms such as Instagram through hashtags that go along the lines of #Gains, #Aesthetics, #Fitness, and #Running. Many white homosexual bodies presenting as cis-gendered fit this category perfectly, occasionally transgressing gender norms publicly by, for example, cross-dressing for Halloween and office parties confined to the privileged communities such as Sandton, Umhlanga and Constantia. This identity does not recognise any other identity and can otherwise be viewed as a mode of homomasculinity as it is protected and even shielded from social harassment because it performs masculinity superbly.

I should not be misunderstood here as suggesting that any "body"/identity ought to be the target of the bigoted vitriol that is spouted by social groups who frustrate the lives of those who are visibly queer in our society. Rather, I stress this position as a mode of highlighting how the queer subject has different positions of power depending on locality and social positioning. In line with this, I reiterate what I asked earlier: Can Blackness/Indigeneity, speaking from the perspective of the queer womxn, ever expect whiteness in the South African context to speak with an acknowledgment of the power dynamics that structurally predefine the social economy framing South African reality? I leave the reader to answer this question as they deem fit. Having asked this, I argue here that both Black and white male subjects masquerading under the pretence of heterosexuality might be protected from social harassment, but fail to "authentically" live out the constitutionally

enshrined rights and freedoms of all queer subjects, thus making it harder for those in more vulnerable positions to do the same. This reality renders the queer community fractured and plagued by incongruent realities, built on a pyramid that favours queer male subjectivities presented as cis-gender *and* as gay, and rests on the shoulders of Black queer female subjectivity. The erasure of Black female subjectivity in this instance prevents all queer subjectivities from speaking with any mode of authenticity, since the oppression of one ought to be understood as the oppression of all.

Conclusion

Using Koos Prinsloo's (1995) "Promise you'll tell no-one", I attempted in this analysis to explore the question of whether Afrikaner male identity can ever speak from an authentically queer position. While I trouble the notion of authenticity, I do bring to the fore a number of social issues within the queer community in South Africa that remain unaddressed, often rendering queerness a single-issue politics, or even a pursuit of limitless hedonism that absconds from social and political solidarity. Through Prinsloo's (1995) work, which I characterised as glib in the first section of the article, I was able to interrogate the native subjectivity of Afrikaner identity in the South African landscape. This identity ought to be understood as continuously negotiating its place-identity, although it is originally grounded in the view that whites have the God-given right to forcefully penetrate the South African landscape while eliding the existence of Blackness/Indigeneity. The forced penetration of the South African landscape facilitated an analysis that shows how the notion of a penetrable place informs queer Afrikaner identity and to understand how Prinsloo (1995) uses and conceptualises Blackness/ Indigeneity in his writing. The (ab)uses of Blackness/Indigeneity in "Promise you'll tell no-one" suggest an uncritical position in terms of race on Prinsloo's part; an uncritical position which is also surfaced in *Skoonheid* (Hermanus 2011). Using Sonnekus's (2013) work, the analysis proceeds to interrogate the root causes of this latent and overt racism, which I linked to the genitalia of Blackness as contaminant. In the third section of the article, I reposed the question, of an "authentic" queer voice in South Africa and challenged the erasure of Black womxn owing to the hypervisibility of queer bodies that pass for heteronormative. This capacity to pass obscures the capacity of an authentic queer voice in our context, as the oppression of one, ought to be viewed as the oppression of all. In sum I argue that an authentic queer identity can only ever be articulated once the least well-off in society are free to truly enjoy and relish the freedoms and liberties enshrined in our country's constitution.

References

Andrews, G.
2018 The Boundaries of Desire and Intimacy in Post-apartheid South African Queer film: Oliver Hermanus's *Skoonheid*. *Image and Text* 31(1): 30-47.

Asiwaju, A.I.
1985 *Partitioned Africans: Ethnic Relations Across Africa's International Boundaries, 1884-1984*. London: C. Hurst & Company.

Behr, Mark
1993 *Die reuk van appels*. Strand: Queillerie.
1996 *The Smell of Apples*. London: Abacus.

Chamberlain M.E.
2014 *The Scramble for Africa*. New York & London: Routledge.

Coetzee, Ampie
2000 *'n Hele os vir 'n ou broodmes: grond en die plaasnarratief sedert 1595*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Coetzee, J.M.
1980 *Waiting for the Barbarians*. London: Secker & Warburg.
1988 *White Writing: The Culture of Letters in South Africa*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press.

Collins, Patricia-Hill
2000 *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness and the Politics of Empowerment*. New York & London: Routledge.

Crenshaw, Kimberle Williams
2008 Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Colour. In: *The Feminist Philosophy Reader* edited by A Bailey and C. Cuomo. New York: McGraw-Hill Publishers.

Dixon, J. & Durrheim, K.
2000 Displacing Place-Identity: A Discursive Approach to Locating Self and Other. *British Journal of Social Psychology* 39: 27-44.

Dlamini, B.
2006 Homosexuality in the African Context. *Agenda: Empowering Women for Gender Equity* 67: 128-136.

Fokuo, J.K.
2009 The Lighter Side of Marriage: Skin Bleaching in Post-colonial Ghana. *Research Review* 25(1): 47-66.

Forrester, Duncan, B.
2001 *On Human Worth: A Christian Vindication of Equality*. London: Westminster John Knox Press.

Gqola, P.D.
2001 *Ufanele uqavile*: Black Women, Feminisms and Postcoloniality in Africa. *Agenda: Empowering Women for Gender Equity* 16(50): 11-22.
2007 How the "Cult of Femininity" and Violent Masculinities Support Endemic Gender Based Violence in Contemporary South Africa. *African Identities* 5(1): 111-124.

Graziano, K.J.
2004 Oppression and Resiliency in a Post-Apartheid South Africa: Unheard Voices of Black Gay Men and Lesbians. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology* 10(3): 302-316.

Hermanus, O. (dir.)
2011 *Skoonheid* [Beauty]. [Film]. Swift Productions.

hooks, bell
1992 Black Looks: Race and Representation. Boston, Massachusetts: South End Press.

Khumalo, Siya
2018 *You Have to be Gay to Know God*. Cape Town: Kwela Books.

Kumalo, S.H. & Gama, L.B.
2018 Interrogating Conceptions of Manhood, Sexuality and Cultural Identity. *Image & Text* 31(2): Forthcoming.

Louw, D.
2012 The Aesthetics of "Manhood" Within the Paradigmatic Framework of Theopaschitic Theology. From Brett Murray's Painting "The Spear" and the "Opened Fly" to the Iconic View of "The Anchor" and the Spiritual Art of Male Genitals. *Deel* 53(3-4): 180-193.

Magubane, Z.
2001 Which Bodies Matter? Feminism, Poststructuralism, Race, and the Curious Theoretical Odyssey of the "Hottentot Venus". *Gender and Society* 15(6): 816-834.

Mazrui, A.A.
1980 *The African Condition: A Political Diagnosis*. Cambridge University Press.

Mercer, Kubena
1994 *Welcome to the Jungle: New Positions in Black Cultural Studies*. New York and London: Routledge.

Moffett, H.
2006 "These Women, They Force Us to Rape Them": Rape as Narrative of Social Control in Post-Apartheid South Africa. *Journal of South African Studies* 32(1): 129-144.

Olivier, Gerrit
2008 *Aantekeninge by Koos Prinsloo*. Stellenbosch: Rapid Access Publishers.

Oyèwùmí, Oyèrónkẹ́
1997 *The Invention of Women: Making an African Sense of Western Gender Discourses.* Minneapolis & London: University of Minnesota Press.

Prinsloo, Koos
1995 Promise You'll Tell No-One. In: *Defiant Desire: Gay and Lesbian Lives in South Africa* edited by M. Gevisser & E. Cameron. New York & London: Ravan Press, pp. 319-324.

Ratele, K., Fouten, E., Shefers, T., Strebel, A., Shabalala, N. & Buikema, R.
2009 Moffies, Jocks and Cool Guys: Boys' Accounts of Masculinity and Their Resistance in Contexts. In: *From Boys to Men: Social Constructions of Masculinity in Contemporary Society*, edited by T. Shefer, K. Ratele, A. Strebel, N. Shabalala & R. Buikema. Lansdowne: UCT Press, pp. 112-127.

Rupp, L.T.
2001 Toward a Global History of Same-Sex Sexuality. *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 10(2): 287-302.

Salo, E
2007 Social Constructions of Masculinity on the Racial and Gendered Margins of Cape Town. In: *From Boys to Men: Social Constructions of Masculinity in Contemporary Society*, edited by T. Shefer, K. Ratele, A. Strebel, N. Shabalala & R. Buikema. Lansdowne: UCT Press, pp. 160-180.

Schneider, V., Cockroft, K. & Hook, D.
2008 The Fallible Phallus: A Discourse Analysis of Male Sexuality in a South African Men's Interest Magazine. *South African Journal of Psychology* 38(1): 136-151.

Schreiner, Olive
1883 *The Story of an African Farm*. Boston: Roberts Brothers.

Simone, Nina
2009 *Strange Fruit*. Online: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BcCm_ySBslk>. 20 June 2015.

Smith, Pauline
[1926]1983 *The Beadle*. Cape Town & London: David Philip Publishers.
[1925]1997 *The Little Karoo*. Cape Town & London: Transaction Publishers.

Sonnekus, T.
2013 "We're not Faggots!": Masculinity, Homosexuality and the Representation of Afrikaner Men Who Have Sex with Men in the Film *Skoonheid* and Online. *South African Review of Sociology* 44(1): 22-39.

Ströh, R
2017 Destabilisering van hegemoniese Afrikanermanlikheid deur middel van die randfiguur in drie onlangse Afrikaanse films. Vanderbijlpark: NWU (Verhandeling – MA).

Sullivan, Shannon
2006 *Revealing Whiteness: The Unconscious Habits of Racial Privilege*. Bloomington, Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Trengove, J. (dir.)
2017 *Inxeba* (The Wound). [Film]. Urucu Media.

Wells, H. & Polder, L
2006 Anti-Gay Hate Crimes in South Africa: Prevalence, Reporting Practices, and Experiences of the Police. *Agenda: Empowering Women for gender Equity* 20(67): 20-28.

Wesseling, H.L.
1996 *Divide and Rule: The Partition of Africa, 1880-1914 (No. 275-95133)*. Praeger Publishers.

Yancy, George
2008 *Black Bodies, White Gazes: The Continuing Significance of Race*. London and New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.

Siseko H. Kumalo
Philosophy Department, University of Pretoria
jdd@up.ac.za