Singing in Prison – Women Writers and the Discourse of Resistance

Pamela Ryan

Summary

In this article I interrogate the position of the white feminist academic writing about black women, and examine various strategies which could be employed to avoid creating a fictional monolith of "third-world" women. In analysing the writing of resistance, epitomized by Caesarina Kona Makhoere's *No child's play*, attention is paid to the gaps in the discourse which reveal how Makhoere's political ideology overrules considerations of gender. Makhoere's text is used to explore the "matrix of domination" whereby the *postcolonial* feminist critic can avoid using terms of binary opposition and find new ways of perceiving the problems of submission and aggression.

Opsomming

In hierdie artikel word die stand van blanke feministe se akademiese geskrifte oor swart vroue ondersoek en verskillende strategieë wat aangewend kan word om die skep van 'n fiktiewe monoliet van "derde-wêreld" vroue te vermy, word ook bekyk. In die ontleding van geskrifte van verset soos vervat in Caesarina Kona Makhoere se *No Child's Play*, word aandag geskenk aan diskursiewe gapings waaruit dit blyk op watter manier geslagsoorwegings deur Makhoere se politieke ideologie oorstem word. Makhoere se teks word gebruik om die "matriks van oorheersing" te ondersoek waardeur die post-koloniale feministiese kritikus die gebruik van terme van binêre opposisie kan vermy en nuwe maniere kan vind om die vraagstukke van onderwerping en agressie waar te neem.

> From being an art of unbearable sensations punishment has become an economy of suspended rights
>
> (Michael Foucault)[1]

This paper focuses on the idea of resistance in the writing of (so-called) "third world women". As the quotation above suggests, the specific type of resistance I discuss is political in origin and punishable by imprisonment. There is, however, implicit in my discussion, another kind of resistance, my own, to the idea that in writing a paper one has to adopt a particular strain of critical discourse. Like Jane Tompkins (1987: 169), I also discover "two voices inside me": one which fearfully pays homage to the literary-critical establishment by ensuring that I use the "correct" discourse, show that I am familiar with the most recent theoretical terminology, and demonstrate that I am up-to-date with my references; and the other which feels more comfortable communicating my feelings. These two voices engage in a continual dialogue throughout my discussion.

In my first voice, I must interrogate the phrase "third world women" in terms other than "universal sisterhood", trying to avoid creating a fictional monolith of a homogenous group of women bound together by geographical location, race, class and gender.

In their introduction to *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism* (1991) Mohanty, Russo & Torres use the term "third world", even though it is maligned and contested, preferring it to "postcolonial". Mohanty admits

that it is just as difficult to erect a monolithic structure called third-world feminism as it is to speak of a "singular entity called 'Western feminism' ". She sees third world women's writing in terms of oppositional strategies of an "imagined community" of writers who collaborate across divisive boundaries in the common struggle against forms of hegemony and domination (1991: 4). As a white South African feminist, I find this a particularly comforting stance (second voice speaking) since I have frequently experienced guilt and anxiety over my subject-position vis-à-vis the black women writers whose work I write about. Mohanty elaborates on this common context of struggle which supersedes bonds of colour, religion and history and pits itself against "specific exploitative structures and systems" (1991: 4).

However, despite the comforting notion that one is part of a collaborative effort, there is no room for complacency for white feminists who must maintain their vigilance in regard to appropriating black women writers. Several writers have addressed themselves to this problem. While Ashcroft et al. ascribe to "a radical appropriation which can achieve a genuinely transformative and interventionist criticism. . ." (1989: 180), Mohanty focuses on the "political implications of *analytic* strategies" by western feminists. Mohanty discusses the problem of appropriation, emphasizing in particular the production by western feminists of the "Third World Woman" as a "singular monolithic subject" (1984: 335). Mohanty makes a distinction between "woman" which is "a cultural and ideological composite constructed through diverse representational discourses" and "women", real, material and historical subjects. The dangers are that white feminists tend to colonize the material and historical heterogeneity of black women in a number of ways, either by adding to their C.V.'s yet another article on black women (as I am doing) or reducing the variety of discourses by black women to a monolithic construct and so conveniently negating the complexity and the conflicts which are part of the lives of women of different language and culture groups, classes, and social positions. Ifi Amadiume endorses Mohanty's view and exposes the limitations in the idea of global sisterhood. She deplores the arrogance and imperialism of white western feminists who embark on research programmes on African women, in total ignorance of their knowledge and social positions:

> Once, in a seminar, I asked a young white woman why she was studying social anthropology. She replied that she was hoping to go to Zimbabwe, and she felt she could help women there by advising them how to organize. The Black women in the audience gasped in astonishment. Here was someone scarcely past girlhood, who had just started university and had never fought a war in her life. She was planning to go to Africa to teach female veterans of a liberation struggle how to organize! This is the kind of arrogant, if not absurd attitude we encounter repeatedly. It makes one think: better the distant armchair anthropologists than these "sisters".
>
> (1987: 7)

Radhakrishnan offers a solution to this problem of appropriation by suggesting that white women in South Africa who are in a dominant subject position but who are also feminists involved in the struggle against hegemonic

forms of institutionalized power structures, should be in the process of "de-authorizing" themselves. Black women in South Africa are "emerging revolutionary subjects" who need to affirm and legitimate their subject positions, so that we have a situation where "the dominant position requires acts of self-deconstruction [and] the subordinate position entails collective self-construction" (1989: 277). While I am uncomfortable with the words "dominant" and "subordinate", preferring Collins's (1990) idea of a non-hierarchical model which does away with such binary oppositions as dominant/subordinate, I acknowledge that this is useful advice. However supportive a white feminist might be of her black "sister", she is not an historical inhabitant of a black woman's subject position and needs to maintain a rigorous interrogation of her own subject position while listening to black women articulate their situation. Gayatri Spivak describes the condition which emerges when "basically benevolent impulses" become translated into "a ravenous hunger for Third World literary texts" (1987: 253). She has also recently spoken of the need to work for the subaltern rather than speak for her (New Nation Conference, Johannesburg, December 1991).

Black women in South Africa are beginning to voice their differences from white women and their growing dissent from the cultural traditions which bind them to their past, as Winnie Mandela explains:

> Looking at our struggle in this country, the black woman has had to struggle a great deal, not only from a political angle. One has had to fight the male domination in a much more complex sense. We have the cultural clash where a black woman must emerge as a politician against the traditional background of a woman's place being at home! Of course most cultures are like that. But with us it's not only pronounced by law. We are permanent minors by law. So for a woman to emerge as an individual, as a politician in this context, is not very easy. (1985: 83–4)

White women who have previously belonged to distinct, separate groups (Black Sash, Women's Bureau, National Council) and to academic organizations such as Women's Studies, and who have always been sympathetic to the struggle while perhaps hesitant to intrude on behalf of black women, have now joined together with black women's organizations in a common cause – the National Coalition for the Women's Charter. It is in this context of negotiation and co-operation that, following Cherryl Walker (1990), I tentatively suggest new areas for consideration when writing about women's resistance texts in South Africa.

Walker shows how an "over-concern with the correctness of one's theoretical position" in relation to the politics of race and gender has led to a reluctance on the part of feminist theorists and critics to enter into current debates. She explains how this sense of constraint

> . . .is a concern which can lead to a restrictive reluctance to question the authority of respected texts, even where these have little or nothing to say about gender; the construction of an adequate theory of gender requires not simply rigour but critical imagination and a willingness to rethink many of the assumptions of social theory as well. One cannot bend gender to fit the mould created by existing

> theories of class and race; issues like sexuality, the ordering and control of female fertility, patriarchal relations within the family, and sexual violence cannot be adequately accommodated in gender-blind theories.
>
> (1990: 314)

It is on this basis of a willingness to rethink old assumptions and to retain a vigilant awareness of gender in my reading of resistance texts that I offer the following analysis in which I focus on Caesarina Kona Makhoere's *No Child's Play* (1988).

Apartheid rule in South Africa has instituted a set of conditions in which political ideologies have overruled gender considerations. It has been common for black women activists and writers to excuse the patriarchal conduct of black men out of sympathy for their plight under white domination and out of a common loyalty to the struggle. Thus Caesarina Makhoere can make excuses for her father's betrayal of her which resulted in her being imprisoned for five years. In *No Child's Play* Makhoere explains, almost matter-of-factly, that her father was a policeman, that is, a member of the most hated and despised institution in South Africa. She describes him as a gentle man, respected by his community. Yet when he betrays his daughter, she says:

> Even today I don't really blame him for everything that happened to me. He never deliberately tried to hurt me or my mother. He was trapped and could not help pointing out where I was hiding when I was on the run.
>
> (1988: 1)

It is the "really" that is the slip in the discourse. Although she portrays her father's weaknesses and his inability to articulate his reasons for sending his daughter to prison, Makhoere refuses to criticize him openly. Instead, she allows the reader to witness her mother's condemnation of him when he tries to bully one of his son's into joining the police force. The son runs away from home rather than join and the mother blames her husband for trying to force his will on the family. By implicit comparison, Makhoere's mother is shown as a stronger and more caring person, and her father as a cowardly and authoritarian patriarch. Overt criticism of the father is subsumed within the safer agenda of the oppressive apartheid institutions which force him into compliance, even to the point where he will allow his own daughter to go to prison.

Similarly, no mention is made of the father of the child Makhoere has when she is sixteen years old. The bald statement "I became a mother" (1988: 2) implies independent agency on the part of the young girl. No blame is apportioned to the father of the child – we are not even told his name – but once again the suggestion is that it is the apartheid regime that is to blame. Makhoere describes how her mother was forced to enter domestic service, spending most of her time "slaving for them" (1988: 2). Without proper guidance, says Makhoere, the children did whatever they liked. This is a common thread connecting the narratives and autobiographies of black women in South Africa: there is usually early pregnancy and childbirth, with little or no help from the father, and no blame from the mother who is left to

raise the child (see also Sindiwe Magona's *To My Children's Children* (1990) and *Living, Loving and Lying Awake at Night* (1991)).

I am not suggesting that Makhoere does not support women in her narrative. On the contrary, her account of her time in prison is full of explicit praise for her fellow women prisoners ("the pillars of the struggle have always been the women, even though we were never given the accolades we deserved"), but she is caught in the traditional patterns of family and social interaction which do not allow her to criticize men to whom she is bonded in a familial way. While it is important for us to remember and to keep being reminded by writers of the resistance that oppressive regimes like to enforce hierarchized and rigid distinctions between colonizers and colonized, and between races and classes, it is also equally important that we take into account that colonial states make use of already existing patriarchal structures and transform already existing social and gender inequalities into their own hegemonic practices. This is evident in property rights which are granted to men and not women, marriage laws which empower men and not women, the patriarchal household in which the head of the house may beat his wife and rule over his daughters – all these are eminently suitable to the enforcement of colonial ideology. As Mohanty says, "racist ideology has the hegemonic capacity to define the terms whereby people understand themselves and their world" (1991: 27).

Black women in South Africa have traditionally been both the agents of resistance and the supporters of their menfolk. They have expressed their opposition to the legitimized forms of colonial rule by organized demonstrations, liberation struggles or by aligning themselves with such military structures as Umkhonto We Sizwe, the military wing of the African National Congress. Women's growing political consciousness and their sense of identity can also be identified in their everyday lives. The thoughts and feelings of domestic and factory workers, for example, have been given voice in such texts as Jacklyn Cock's *Maids and Madams* (1984), and Obery's *Vukani Makhosikzi* (1985). While Mohanty challenges the idea that simply being a woman, or being poor or black is sufficient ground to assume a politicized oppositional identity, Patricia Collins shows how resistance need not be organized along institutionalized lines. According to Collins, who describes the situation of Afro-American women whose socio-political conditions are very similar to those of black women in South Africa, black women's activist tradition has occurred along two primary lines. The first is the creation of female spheres of influence within existing structures of oppression, because direct confrontation is neither possible nor preferred. These oppressive institutions are opposed by a subtle undermining of the way they operate. The second option consists of institutional transformation consisting of direct challenges in the form of trade unions, boycotts, marches, sit-ins and so on (Collins 1990). Domestic workers frequently engage in the first type of resistance as is evident in the stories told by Sindiwe Magona in her book *Living, Loving and Lying Awake at Night*. Domestic workers assume servile and deferential roles, gratefully accepting old clothes in lieu of payment, adopting a child-like pose in front of their employers and so on.

Meanwhile, they create a space for resistance in their shared stories about their "medems". As Collins says, they act in servile ways but refuse to relinquish control over their self-definition:

> While they pretend to be mules and mammies and thus appear to conform to institutional rules they resist by creating their own self-definitions and self-valuations in the safe spaces they create among one another.
>
> (1990: 142)

Collins refers to Cannon's discussion of the contradiction in being a valued person in a devalued occupation. This is particularly evident in Magona's stories of domestic workers who discuss their employers in their time off and who create a moral system of individual worth in their discussions with each other (Cannon 1988). The production of self-consciousness and self-worth as an oppositional stance – which is part of Radhakrishnan's plan for authorizing the subaltern – is also effected through the act of writing. There is, of course, an important corollary here which I have discussed in another paper (Ryan 1990); this is the necessity of having space and time in which to write and to articulate a conscientized and politicized identity. The social conditions of production of the black woman writer have not been conducive to writing novels (as Tlali has suggested in an interview with Cecily Lockett (1989)), and certainly black women's silence may, in part, be attributed to their harsh living conditions. But there is also another important reason why South African black women "have not had time to dream".[2]

bell hooks explains in her Introduction to *Aint I a Woman* (1981) that black women's silence in America was "the silence of the oppressed – that profound silence engendered by resignation and acceptance of one's lot". In South African texts by black women this resignation and acceptance are more characteristic of older women such as Frances Baard (1986), whose life story, as told to Barbie Schreiner, is remarkable for its understated sense of suffering and humility. From the description of her arrest in the middle of the night when she had to leave her children and not see them again for another 10 years, to her account of the year she spent in solitary confinement, Baard's control of tone and her sense of endurance defy the imagination. To spend a year without anything to read (she was refused a bible), no-one to talk to, and nothing to see (her cell was below ground level), would drive lesser mortals to madness. Baard's faith and her strong spirit help her to survive:

> I think they were trying to kill me somehow, but my spirit was too strong...I spent that whole year, a little bit of exercise sometimes, and then just sit and sit, and no-one to talk to, and nothing to read, and I try to look out of the window and watch the cars go past. Day after day with nothing to do. And so a whole year went by. And then after that year they took me to court now for my case.
>
> (1986: 74)

Baard's humility and sense of restraint make an interesting comparison with Caesarina Makhoere who comes from a younger generation of activists. She also undergoes solitary confinement under similar conditions – no reading material, one stinking pot in the room, half an hour for exercising and nothing

to see but a grey wall through the window. Makhoere does not simply endure passively. She goes out of her way to resist and antagonize, and she wins most of her battles. She describes how she likes to sing and how singing kept her sane. Singing was prohibited in this prison, but she sang anyway even when threatened by the station commander. This act of singing as a symbol of her resistance is only one of a number of strategies Makhoere adopts to assert a sense of self-worth. She organizes hunger strikes to protest against the inedible food; she refuses to wear the ridiculous prison garb with the iniquitous doek, a symbol of servility for black women given out to black prisoners; she refuses to perform the compulsory daily parade. When something in prison life seems anachronistic or unjust, Makhoere rebels. She ends her book with a validation of her behaviour and a testimony to the combined resources of her comrades in prison:

> We learned some lessons in their prisons. They thought they could attack us: they failed. We first learned that we could win against them. Even with nothing; even with only our hands and our comradeship and our determination, we could defeat them.
>
> (1988: 120–1)

Norma Kitson, a white activist, is also arrested by the security police. Her account of her experience in *Where Sixpence Lives* (1987) is just as horrifying as the testimony of the two previous writers, but it is obvious that white prisoners are treated differently from black detainees. On her first night in prison Kitson starts vomiting from the smell of the "broken stinking loo" in her cell. Within hours a frightened doctor enters the cell and transfers Kitson to the hospital as a suspected appendicitis case. This collusion from a basically sympathetic doctor is unthinkable for the black detainees. When Kitson is transferred back to jail, her cell mate, Pixie, is on hunger strike. Kitson cannot understand why she is doing this and tries to persuade her to eat. Pixie has to tell Kitson sternly that she is not to join forces with the oppressors in trying to undermine her effort to resist. The sense of immediate understanding and support, evident in Makhoere's text for hunger strikers, is missing here because Kitson has not been brought up with a sense of community. I do not intend to diminish in any way Kitson's part in the struggle. She was brutally interrogated, on one occasion being held out of a high building by her ankles, and her courage in continuing with her resistance despite intimidation is obvious from her account in *Where Sixpence Lives*. Analysis, however, must take into account the significant differences in socio-economic background between Kitson and Makhoere, differences which play themselves out in their texts. One major difference between privileged white activists and oppressed black women as revealed in their testimonies[3] is the latter's stated aim to communicate a communal ethos, whereas white women tend to record the consciousness of an individual. Both kinds of testimony are important in creating a self-conscious political identity. Yet, as Mohanty points out, the mere record of experience is not in itself of interest or significance; more important is how that experience is recorded and how it is received.

This point brings me back to the issue of mutual collaboration between writer and critic in postcolonial cultures. White feminist critics have to move away from responses of denial and guilt, which promote immobilization and passivity, toward responsibility, action, and mutual exchange with women of colour: we have to act as responsible feminist critics when we analyze texts of resistance by responding to the inherent subversive indicators that operate in the text. Life stories, narratives and testimonials can serve several functions at once. They can record the past (which may have been destroyed or forgotten) as Sindiwe Magona does in *For My Children's Children* (1990); they can incorporate images and events which undermine the hegemonic recording of history as is most strongly evident in the praise poems (imbongi) and oral poems recorded and translated by Jeff Opland in his book *Words That Circle Words* (1993), in which the teller can be openly subversive because he or she knows that certain white onlookers will not understand the language in which the praise poem is articulated; or they can create a communal political consciousness in the mode of Miriam Tlali's stories. Testimonials by black South African writers often set out to record a past way of life as a reminder for future generations. Ellen Kuzwayo's *Call Me Woman* (1985) and Miriam Tlali's stories and novels are written in the mode of testifying to the black women's experience of living under a repressive, racist regime, while Sindiwe Magona wishes to preserve the memory of a pastoral existence in the Transkei.

There is yet another dimension to an analysis of the discourse of resistance, one which enters the realm of psychoanalysis: the problem of domination and the role of gender. In what ways do women resist authority and domination and what analyses of power are most useful to deconstruct the oversimplified idea that women are simply victims of male abuse. In her book *The Bonds of Love,* Jessica Benjamin (1988) analyzes the structures of domination and submission from a psychoanalytical framework, showing how it is necessary to avoid seeing the problem of domination and submission simply as a "drama of female vulnerability victimized by male aggression" (1988: 9). Benjamin refers also to the weakness of radical politics in which it has been a tendency "to idealize the oppressed" as if their politics and culture were untouched by the system of domination, and if people did not participate in their own submission (1988: 9). Audre Lorde (1984) suggests much the same thing when she says that "the true focus of revolutionary change is never merely the oppressive situations which we seek to escape, but that piece of the oppressor which is planted deep within each of us".

Patricia Collins (1990: 225) also suggests new ways of thinking about the politics of power when she talks about "the matrix of domination", a means whereby the critic can escape from thinking in terms of binary oppositions such as black/white, master/slave, oppressor/oppressed. Feminists who are attracted by postmodernist forms of knowledge and who are repelled by essentialist notions of the self, identity, woman, and so on, have articulated the need to expunge binary thinking from our various epistemologies. The term "matrix" is ideally suited to a new way of regarding systems of domination since it comes from the word womb, a place in which something

is developed, or a substance between cells. A matrix then is neither one thing or the other, but a space in between. Collins suggests replacing "additive models of oppression with interlocking ones" (1990: 225). By this she means rejecting those models which are rooted in either/or dichotomies and which emanate from Eurocentric masculinist thinking, and replacing them with the assumption that, for example, race, class and gender belong to interconnected and interlocking systems of oppression. This she says indicates a paradigm shift which applies to other oppressions such as sexual orientation, religion, age and ethnicity. Such a paradigm shift from dichotomous thinking to interconnectedness affects all knowledge systems that involve the "other".

Instead of an either/or situation, Collins advocates the both/and position. For example, "white women are penalized by their gender but privileged by their race" (1990: 225). In addition, the matrix of domination excludes one-dimensional tropes of domination such as the idea that domination operates from the top down by "forcing and controlling unwilling victims to bend to the will of more powerful superiors" (1990: 227). It includes the idea of sustained resistance by victims who refuse to allow themselves to be dominated and who reverse the movement back up the scale. Caesarina Makhoere, for instance, by consistently analysing the psychology of her oppressors, assumes superiority over them and enters the matrix of domination by making her oppressors her political and moral inferiors. Taken almost at random from her book is this passage:

> I never did work again. From March 1979 until my release, I never again touched their prison work. I am not a prisoner, I am not a slave; I am just on holiday because they have decided to take me away from my public life.
> They thought they were going to work me; I made them work thoroughly instead. Everyone who thought of me during my imprisonment ended up shivering, because they thought I was a very difficult person to control. Which of course I was; you cannot just make life easy for them. I told myself and I told them that I was not in prison to work for them. They took on that employment, which was to look after me. So they worked for me. And I made sure that when they got their salaries they felt that they had really earned that money, in a very difficult manner.
>
> (1988: 95)

"I am not a prisoner, I am not a slave". With these words, Makhoere redefines herself, empowers herself, and reverses the process of domination. Collins explains this phenomenon as follows:

> . . .domination operates not only by structuring power from the top down but by simultaneously annexing the power as energy of those on the bottom for its own ends.
>
> (1990: 227–8)

By altering the pattern of power relations from a hierarchical, vertical model to a more fluid model of interrelatedness, we can begin to analyze the dynamics of domination and resistance in new ways and, as Collins says, we can give women the conceptual tools to resist oppression (1990: 228). When we shift from a one dimensional paradigm of domination to multiple systems

of oppression, we acknowledge that we belong simultaneously to multiple dominant groups and multiple subordinate groups. This takes Radhakrishnan's ideas a step further, since this more dynamic and flexible paradigm is a transformative model which is a means of empowering the oppressed. In Collins's view, empowerment means that we reject those dimensions of knowledge that perpetuate objectification and dehumanization. In this regard, *No Child's Play* is an empowering text since it refuses to acknowledge any interaction that dehumanizes or objectifies the individual. Makhoere insists on being a fully human subject.

Singing in prison becomes another transformative metaphor in Makhoere's text.[4] Much more than a token of resistance, it is a sign of her personhood, a means of communication, the sound of solidarity, and a message of hope. Singing occurs again near the end of Makhoere's text when it is expressly forbidden in Pretoria Prison. When the authorities tell her that singing is a punishable offence she becomes angry, ("the only freedom I was left with"), and she sings louder than before. As she says, "One needs strong lungs for the struggle ahead, after all – 'VICTORY IS CERTAIN'" (1988: 95). The singing is extended from the lone voice to a choir of solidarity as the prisoners teach each other political songs:

> Some days the prison walls just echoed defiance, back and forth; oppression or no oppression, exploitation or no exploitation, imprisonment or no imprisonment, a luta continua, until final victory.
>
> (1988: 97)

Into the hegemony of prison regulations and male domination, Makhoere inserts a self that will not be cowed. Her singing brings down, symbolically, the walls of the prison. In forcing the prison staff to recognize her as a human subject, Makhoere breaks the cycle of domination in which subjugation by the master ensures the dehumanization of the slave. She replaces the closed structure of subjugation and submission with the principles of self-determination, individual power and freedom. In Benjamin's terminology, Makhoere alters the paradigm of power to make a space in which the mutual recognition of subjects can compete with the relationship of domination (1988: 220).

Notes

1. Michael Foucault, *Discipline and Punish : The Birth of the Prison.* Translated by Alan Sheridan. (Harmondsworth: Penguin 1977).
2. This phrase is Tlali's in her interview with Cecily Lockett.
3. I use the word "testimony" as it is explained in John Beverley's article "The Margin at the Center : On Testimonia (Testimonial Narrative)" (Modern Fiction Studies, 35, Spring 1989). Testimonio is discussed as resistance literature by Beverley who defines it as "a. . .narrative in book or pamphlet. . .form, told in the first-person by a narrator who is also the real protagonist or witness of the events he or she recounts, and whose unit of narration is usually a 'life' or a significant life experience" (pp.12–13). Beverley's explication of testimonio demonstrates that it is primarily an act of bearing witness with an urgency to communicate "a problem

of repression, poverty, subalternity, imprisonment. . .and so on" (p.14), moreover, it is "concerned with sincerity rather than with literariness" (p.14). Following Beverley, therefore, I distinguish testimony from autobiography, as a resistance narrative whose author may or may not be literate, and which is concerned with a "problematic collective social situation" (p.15). I therefore distantiate myself from the comment made by Gitahi Gititi that *No Child's Play* is not "necessarily most remarkable for stylistic power or clarity of ideological enunciation" ("Self and Society in Testimonial Literature : Caesarina Kona Makhoere's *No Child's Play: In Prison Under Apartheid*", *Current Writing*, pp.42–49), but endorse her statement that it is "remarkable for its articulation of anger. . . ." (p.43).

4. Singing also occurs in prison literature by male authors, for example, Hugh Lewin's *Bandiet : Seven Years in a South African Prison*, (London: Heinemann Educational Books, 1983.

References

Amadiume, Ifi
1987 *Male Daughters: Female Husbands: Gender and Sex in an African Society*. London & New Jersey: Zed Books.

Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G. & Tiffin, H.
1989 *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures*. London & New York: Methuen.

Baard, Frances
1986 *My Spirit is Not Banned*. Harare: Zimbabwe Publishing House.

Benjamin, Jessica
1988 *The Bonds of Love*. New York: Pantheon.

Cannon, Katie
1988. *Black Womanist Ethics*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Cock, Jacklyn
1984 *Maids and Madams*. Johannesburg: Ravan.

Collins, Patricia
1990 *Black Feminist Thought*. Boston: Unwin Hyman.

hooks, bell
1981 *Ain't I a Woman*. Barton: South End Press.

Kitson, Norma
1987 *Where Sixpence Lives*. London: Hogarth.

Kuzwayo, Ellen
1985 *Call Me Woman*. London: The Women's Press.

Lockett, Cecily
1989 Interview with Miriam Tlali. In: Mackenzie, Craig & Clayton, Cherry (eds). *Between the Lines*. Grahamstown: National English Literary Museum.

Lorde, Audre
1984 *Sister Outsider*. New York: 1984.

Magona, Sindiwe
1990 *To My Children's Children*. Cape Town: David Philip.
1991 *Living, Loving and Lying Awake at Night*. Cape Town: David Philip.

Mandela, Winnie
1985 *Part of My Soul Went With Him.* London: Norton.
Makhoere, Caesarina
1988 *No Child's Play.* London: The Women's Press.
Mohanty, Chandra
1984 Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourse. *boundary 2*: 12 (3/13).
Mohanty, Chandra, Russo, Ann & Torres, Lourdes (eds)
1991 *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
Opland, Jeff
1993 *Words That Circle Words.* Johannesburg: Ad. Donker.
Radhakrishnan, R.
1989 Negotiating Subject Positions in an Uneven World. In: Kauffman, Linda (ed.). *Feminism and Institutions.* Oxford: Blackwell.
Ryan, Pamela
1992 Black Women Do Not Have Time to Dream: The Politics of Time and Space. *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature* 11(1).
Spivak, Gayatri
1987 *In Other Worlds.* New York: Methuen.
Tompkins, Jane
1987 Me and My Shadow. *New Literary History 19.*
Walker, Cherryl
1990 *Women and Gender in Southern Africa to 1945.* Cape Town: David Philip.