

## Haunted by the Somatic Norm: South African Parliamentary Debates on Abortion in 1975 and 1996

No-one who visited the fortress-like and gloomy portals of Parliament before May 1994, can fail to be astounded by the atmosphere today. There's a cheerfulness, a greeting from the staff, a vibrancy in the corridors, laughter in the committee rooms, extraordinary art on the walls, groups of visitors at every turn (both locals and tourists)—in short, the buildings breathe with life.

—Hugh Corder (1996, 8)

Every respectable historical building has its own live-in ghost. The South African Parliament in Cape Town has several. In this labyrinth of hollow corridors, forgotten cellars, underground streams and echoing chambers, it's not very clever to burn the midnight oil. When the bells chime at St George's Cathedral . . . they say Parliament swarms with ghosts. "The old parliamentarians," the workers there maintain.

—Antjie Krog (1998, 122)

**I**n these epigraphs, Hugh Corder and Antjie Krog differ significantly over whether the corridors of the South African Parliament were filled with "new life" or "old ghosts" after the 1994 democratic elections. The related underlying question that social scientists have grappled with for years is, does an influx of new people transform an institution, and if so under what circumstances? An institution such as a national parliament might be understood in a number of overlapping ways: in terms of its function or purpose, personnel, formal rules of operation, internal culture or informal norms, or even its physical buildings. All of these aspects are subject to change. In 1994 the South African Parliament was transformed in terms of its purpose and function; it went from being an institution

My thanks go to the Leverhulme Trust, who provided funding for this research, which was conducted under the auspices of the Gendered Ceremony and Ritual in Parliaments programme. The research benefited greatly from early input from Sarah Childs and Joni Lovenduski and from the opportunity to present at the Women's History Network Conference 2010 and the European Conference on Politics and Gender 2011. Thanks go to all those who read and commented on earlier drafts of this article: Jonathan Saha, Georgina Waylen, Faith Armitage, and Laura McLeod, as well as the three anonymous reviewers for *Signs*, whose insights greatly improved the original.

[*Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 2014, vol. 39, no. 2]

© 2013 by The University of Chicago. All rights reserved. 0097-9740/2014/3902-0009\$10.00

representing a minority of the population, those defined as white by a system of racial classifications, to representing and legislating on behalf of all South Africans. The personnel of Parliament changed just as dramatically—both in its racial makeup and through a large increase in the number of women members of Parliament (MPs). At the same time, the rules of Parliament remained almost entirely the same, and MPs continued to meet in the same collection of buildings used prior to 1994, some of which had been in use since the first Parliament of the Union of South Africa met in 1910. This last fact provided observers like Corder and Krog with a powerful metaphor through which to explore change and continuity in the new South Africa.

Their observations also bring us to a consideration of the internal culture or informal norms of the institution. How did these change, and is there a simple relationship between, for example, changing the people in Parliament and transforming the way it operates? To put the question of institutional change another way, does the overwhelming presence of men make and maintain an institution as masculine? South Africa was praised internationally for the increase in the number of women MPs that accompanied its transition to democracy, and this praise was framed in ways that suggested these women could break down the historical domination of state institutions by men and foster a more inclusive democracy. It is this putative transformation I wish to reexamine here. By drawing on the metaphor of haunting, I suggest that the old norms of an institution never simply disappear during processes of transformation. As Avery F. Gordon has suggested, “to study social life one must confront the ghostly aspects of it” (2008, 7). Ghosts have caught the attention of Gordon, Jacques Derrida (1994), and others as a way of thinking about the relationship between the past and the present. Wendy Brown suggests that “ghosts figure the necessity of grasping certain implications of the past for the present only as traces or effects (rather than structures, axioms, laws, or lines of determination) and of grasping even these as protean” (2001, 146). In Gordon’s and Derrida’s work, ghosts are conceived as evidence of an injustice or a forgotten past.<sup>1</sup> In contrast, the ghost I am concerned with here is the remainder of an unjust and ever-present past. This article considers the haunting brought about by one particular ghost, that of an institutional somatic norm, for how it might shape the parliamentary representation of women and women’s interests in postapartheid South Africa.

<sup>1</sup> Gordon writes that her ghost stories “not only repair representational mistakes, but also strive to understand the conditions under which a memory was produced in the first place, towards a counter memory, for the future” (2008, 22).

The article begins by exploring the idea of a somatic norm within the South African Parliament and what happened to the previous parliamentary norms after 1994. It suggests haunting as a useful way of conceptualizing the continued effects of a now-discredited political culture on a new one. This idea is then explored further through one widely cited example of the success of South Africa's women's movement and new gender-sensitive institutions: the passing of the 1996 Choice on Termination of Pregnancy Act.<sup>2</sup> The parliamentary debate on the 1996 act is compared with the debate on its considerably less progressive predecessor, the 1975 Abortion and Sterilization Act.<sup>3</sup> The analysis of the two debates draws links between the ritualized forms of parliamentary debate and the constitution of an institutional somatic norm.

Through this comparison I wish, first, to draw attention to the ways MPs in the two debates laid claim to somatic authority and, second, to examine more closely how women were incorporated in the South African Parliament and performed as MPs. The analysis presented here aims to add to our understanding of the ways in which an informal institutional culture might be created, maintained, and changed through a particular focus on the somatic norm.

### **The ghost of the somatic norm**

In the study of informal norms, the boundaries between an institution and its cultural context appear porous. An institution such as a national parliament is a privileged site through which gender norms and other elements of national culture are constructed and tested. Gender, alongside race, class, and nation, is constituted through the practice of politics in parliaments. In her work on institutions and diversity policies, Nirmal Puwar has advanced a concept of the somatic or bodily norm as operating within such institutions (Puwar 2004, 8–10). The concept of the somatic norm is particularly useful because it allows the intersectionality of constructions of gender, race, and class to be discussed. Puwar argues that in twenty-first-century Britain, the somatic norm for political leaders is that of white, middle-aged, educated men. As such, white, middle-aged, educated men are the only bodies whose ability to be a politician is not doubted. The British parliamentary somatic norm thus relies on, and in turn creates, a powerful construction of white masculinity. As such this institutional somatic

<sup>2</sup> Republic of South Africa, Choice on Termination of Pregnancy Act, 1996, no. 92 of 1996, <http://www.info.gov.za/acts/1996/a92-96.pdf>.

<sup>3</sup> Republic of South Africa. Abortion and Sterilization Act, 1975, no. 2 of 1975.

norm is separable from, but intertwined with, wider constructions of hegemonic masculinity, as well as race and class.

Puwar argues that if and when the bodies of those who have been historically and symbolically excluded from an institutional space enter, then they will do so as “space invaders” (2004, 10). The processes of space invasion that occurred in the South African Parliament in 1994 are of course somewhat different from the entry of women and black and ethnic minorities into the British Parliament that Puwar has studied. Nonetheless her concepts of space invasion and the somatic norm help us to understand changes in the informal norms of the South African Parliament. As in Britain, white men were the somatic norm of state political power in apartheid South Africa. While the position of these white men was heavily contested outside state structures (on the streets, locally, or in forums like the United Nations, globally), white male authority was supreme within state institutions in 1975, the year of the first debate considered here. In postapartheid South Africa, the white male body lost its institutionally constituted moral authority. The political leaders of South Africa’s liberation struggle thus entered the corridors of power in a very particular kind of space invasion in 1994.<sup>4</sup>

Women’s position within liberation struggle politics and the new Parliament was far from straightforward.<sup>5</sup> The timing of South Africa’s transition to democracy and the actions of an (albeit briefly) united and powerfully positioned women’s movement resulted in a gender-sensitive and progressive constitution and in significant efforts to institutionalize the substantive representation of women through state bodies such as the Commission for Gender Equality and the African National Congress (ANC)’s adoption of quotas for the representation of women in Parliament (Hassim 2006). Discussion of South Africa’s transition was widely accompanied by a narrative of “gender victory,” the main achievements of which, outlined above, are difficult to dispute (Britton and Fish 2009, 3). However, women’s inclusion was by no means uncontested; there were, for example, allegations that sexual harassment in Parliament was rife and unchallenged (Geisler 2000, 618). In this context, a background in liberation politics seems to have offered some new women MPs scripts for claiming a somatic authority that challenged the previous parliamentary somatic

<sup>4</sup> For work on the masculinities of the liberation struggle, see Unterhalter (2000) and Erlank (2003).

<sup>5</sup> On women in the liberation struggle, see Walker (1982), Hassim (2006), and Gasa (2007). For a discussion of the major controversy in this literature, the widespread mobilization of women through discourses of motherhood, and how radical or conservative this was, see Walker (1995).

norm of the white male. However, I argue that these disruptive performances continued to rely on the previous parliamentary somatic norm by raising it as a specter. As such, these debates demonstrate the way performances of political authority can be haunted by a somatic norm even when it is no longer a physical reality.

Using the metaphor of haunting captures something about the way the somatic norm operates. The somatic norm inhabits the air of an institution—it lives in the building. It is the visible/invisible embodiment of an institutional past and haunts those who disturb it. In particular, I suggest that the ghost of the somatic norm is conjured and contested through the rituals of representation that comprise parliamentary debate.<sup>6</sup> Parliamentary debates and the repertoires of speech and gesture used by MPs are highly formalized, governed by written rules but also by conventional forms of behavior. This is not to suggest that MPs are performing a play of representation that disguises the true exercise of power. Rather, the focus on rituals of representation draws our attention to the performativity of political representation or, in other words, the making of a somatic norm. This understanding is directly influenced by the work of Judith Butler on the performativity of the gendered body. To argue for the performativity of the body is to “suggest that it has no ontological status apart from the various acts which constitute its reality” (Butler 1999, 173). The embodied performances examined in this article are not expressive of an essence of, for example, maleness or whiteness; they are what constitute maleness or whiteness.

MPs are embodied actors, located at a particular spot within wider social hierarchies, something that they and their political allies and opponents can, and often do, choose to emphasize in parliamentary debates. The South African parliamentary debates on abortion make clear that most MPs in both 1975 and 1996 derived a large part of their rhetorical authority from particular constructions of masculinity and femininity, intersected with race and class. This act of legitimizing oneself through constituting a somatic subjectivity I refer to as laying claim to somatic authority. The analysis presented here suggests that MPs constitute and reconstitute the institutional somatic norm through their performances of debate. MPs participate in debate not only by making speeches but also through interjecting, interrupting, jeering, clapping, laughing, and using humor, all of which

<sup>6</sup> Political ritual is defined, following Steven Lukes, as “rule-governed activity of a symbolic character which draws the attention of its participants to objects of thought and feeling which they hold to be of special significance” (Lukes 1975, 291). This approach also draws upon the work of Emma Crewe (2005, 2006).

are considered here. In these ways political authority is embodied through parliamentary debate, and MPs' performances overlay those of their predecessors.

The somatic norm is thus produced and reproduced in the moment, but, as Raewyn Connell has suggested, this production is not simply instantaneous; it is also "a deeply sedimented historical process" (2008, 245). It is in repetition or reiteration that the key to understanding the haunting effects of an institutional somatic norm lies. According to Butler, "As in other ritual social dramas the action of gender requires a performance that is *repeated*" (1999, 178). Similarly, Shannon Sullivan thinks of white privilege as "unconscious psychical and somatic habits" repeated in daily life (2006, 4). I suggest here that repetition, both unconscious and self-conscious, is also central to the making and unmaking of an institutional somatic norm and to the potential potency of an old somatic norm for a new institution. Sigmund Freud has suggested a relationship between repetition and the uncanny, arguing that "the factor of the repetition of the same thing will perhaps not appeal to everyone as a source of uncanny feeling. From what I have observed, this phenomenon does undoubtedly, subject to certain circumstances and combined with certain circumstances, arouse an uncanny feeling" (1955, 236–37). If somatic difference is made through ritual reiteration, it is perhaps little wonder that ritually repetitive parliamentary performances that disrupt an institutional somatic norm can be haunted by the image of that which they have replaced. Before exploring these ideas further through the analysis of two specific debates on abortion in the South African Parliament, however, I outline a brief sketch of the background to and content of the two bills under debate.

### **"Abortion" or "Choice on Termination of Pregnancy"?**

While the two debates are separated by twenty years and very significant contextual changes, the second debate considered here was in several ways a continuation of the first. In both 1975 and 1996 the South African Parliament was dominated by one party with an overwhelming majority. In 1975 this was the National Party, which had by that point been in government in South Africa for twenty-three years, elected by a franchise of men and women racially classified as white. In 1996, at the time of the debate on the Choice on Termination of Pregnancy Bill, the composition of the South African National Assembly had been transformed by the first democratic elections based on a universal franchise in 1994.<sup>7</sup> The ANC, pre-

<sup>7</sup> In 1975 the South African Parliament was a bicameral legislature. The lower house was named the House of Assembly and the upper house the Senate. In 1996 the South African

viously South Africa's most prominent antiapartheid political organization, held a large majority in the National Assembly, with the National Party and the Inkatha Freedom Party comprising the two next largest parties. There were 111 women MPs, making up 27 percent of the legislature.

The largest opposition party in the 1975 Parliament was the United Party, but more often than not its members supported the National Party government's legislation. The much smaller Progressive Party held seven seats in 1975 and was the government's strongest critic. On the abortion bill the House of Assembly was divided. The 1975 bill was introduced after significant lobbying by the medical profession.<sup>8</sup> It provided for legal abortions in highly restricted circumstances and required that abortions be authorized by three medical practitioners and a hospital superintendent.<sup>9</sup> The National Party supported the passage of the bill and imposed a whip on its members, compelling them to vote in favor of the legislation. The United Party allowed a free vote, and all but two United Party MPs followed the party's leadership and voted in favor of the bill. The Progressive Party and the even smaller Reform Party both allowed a vote of conscience, but all members of both these parties voted against the bill and in favor of amendments put forward by the only woman MP at the time, the Progressive Party's Helen Suzman.<sup>10</sup> Their ground for opposing the bill was its restrictive nature, and Suzman's proposed amendments would have made abortion more easily accessible for women.

The 1996 Choice on Termination of Pregnancy Act aimed to make abortion available to all women upon request in the first twelve weeks of pregnancy and thereafter up to twenty weeks with the approval of a medical practitioner. A termination of pregnancy required only the informed consent of the pregnant woman, who was defined "as any female person of any age."<sup>11</sup> There existed a strong drive within the ANC to reform abortion law, but the issue was still controversial within a socially conservative,

---

Parliament operated under an interim constitution and was in the process of writing a new final constitution. The lower house was renamed the National Assembly in 1994; the upper house remained the Senate but became the National Council of Provinces in 1997.

<sup>8</sup> By the early 1970s, medical practitioners were increasingly performing therapeutic abortions for wealthy white women despite the fact that criminal law in South Africa outlawed abortion except when necessary to save the life of a woman. Worried by the legal uncertainty of their position, South African doctors advocated legislative reform. In 1972 a government-selected committee was appointed to inquire into abortion laws, and the 1975 bill emerged from this process (see Albertyn et al. 1999, 45).

<sup>9</sup> See Abortion and Sterilization Act, secs. 3–7.

<sup>10</sup> The Reform Party was formed by a splinter group of United Party MPs in the same weeks that the abortion debate was held. Later the same year the Reform Party merged with the Progressive Party to become the Progressive Reform Party.

<sup>11</sup> Choice on Termination of Pregnancy Act, sec. 1.

religious South Africa. The second reading debate for the bill was therefore an important occasion for the ANC to make the case for abortion on request to many of its own supporters. Organized opposition to the bill came largely from religious groups that were opposed to abortion outright, many based in the United States. While the funding and tactics of these groups undoubtedly had an impact on the debate, Cathi Albertyn and her coauthors argue that in the immediate postapartheid context, “the public face of these views tended to be white and male,” which prevented what would have been a very powerful alliance with conservative black South African spokespersons and groups (Albertyn et al. 1999, 72). The greater threat to the bill came from the possibility that the ANC would allow a free vote—and that there were enough ANC MPs who would stay away, abstain, or vote against the bill. Supporters of the bill within the ANC caucus argued successfully that “a conscience vote that had the effect of preventing the Bill from being enacted would nullify women’s choice” (Albertyn et al. 1999, 73). The ANC issued a three-line whip (instructing MPs to be present, not to abstain, and to vote according to the decision of the caucus) and the pro-choice Democratic Party and the Pan African Congress did the same. The National Party and the Inkatha Freedom Party allowed a conscience vote within their parties and largely spoke and voted against the bill. At the vote, one ANC member, Jennifer Ferguson, abstained in the chamber, and a further fifty-five ANC MPs stayed away. Some ANC women interpreted this as the party “back-sliding” on its support for the women’s equality agenda (Britton 2005, 75).

## **Rituals of representation and performances of somatic authority**

### ***The 1975 debate***

The Parliament of the Union of South Africa, established in 1910, and the Parliament of the Republic of South Africa, as it became in 1961, were important sites for the making and maintenance of white settler masculinities—not just through the laws that they enacted but also in the public performances of their representatives. Parliament was a vital stage for legitimizing the self-image of a white ruling elite, hence the somewhat ambivalent position of antiapartheid opposition within the all-white chamber. A similar ambivalence existed in the position of white women within Parliament. As many have identified, white women won the vote in 1930 largely thanks to an effort to strengthen the numerical position of the white electorate in relation to the limited number of black and colored voters included in the Cape franchise. In 1975, Parliament was an exclusively white space;



it was also almost entirely male. Whiteness and maleness were thus largely unspoken constructions constituted through MPs' performances of reasonable and articulate parliamentary debate.

In 1975 the Minister of Health, Dr. Schalk van der Merwe of the National Party, asserted in his opening remarks that "the hon. Members already agree that for obvious religious, ethical and moral reasons abortion on demand must not be allowed," establishing the terrain of debate as very narrow.<sup>12</sup> This putative consensus in the House was implicitly male, and this fact became visible at certain moments, most often when MPs completely ignored the presence of Helen Suzman and used the phrase "members of the House" interchangeably with "men." For example, in his summing up of the debate at the end of the third day, the minister of health praised the fullness of the discussion in which "everyone could express his opinion, each according to his feelings on the subject."<sup>13</sup> The minister's omission in his summation was particularly striking since Suzman had been by far the most vocal of all MPs during the debate. Aside from her own speech, she made forty-three out of the ninety-four interruptions recorded in *Hansard* over the three days.<sup>14</sup>

In the debate, male MPs laid rhetorical claim to a gendered somatic authority through statements that blended patriarchal authority, educational expertise, and rationality. Particularly noticeable was the use of "medical men" instead of "doctors." At one point "medical men" were directly contrasted with "emotional women" as the correct decision makers in relation to abortion.<sup>15</sup> The exception to this implicit understanding of a male somatic authority was one MP from the Reform Party, who, when discussing legislative authority, argued that men should not be the ones making decisions over abortion. The MP, Horace van Rensburg, argued that "it is morally wrong and in any other way wrong that we, as males, should sit here to pass judgement on the fundamental right of women to decide for themselves in regard to their bodies."<sup>16</sup> Elsewhere in the debate the ability of men to act as legislators and decision makers was continually reinforced,

<sup>12</sup> Republic of South Africa, Debate on Abortion and Sterilization Act, *House of Assembly Debates* (*Hansard*), vol. 55, February 10, 1975, col. 477 (hereafter cited as Debate on Abortion and Sterilization Act).

<sup>13</sup> Debate on Abortion and Sterilization Act, col. 720.

<sup>14</sup> *Hansard* is the edited verbatim record of debates in parliament (repetitions and redundancies omitted and obvious mistakes corrected). It is named as such after the printer who produced the record for the British Parliament in the nineteenth century.

<sup>15</sup> The speaker who did so was Dr. Lourens Munnik of the National Party. Debate on Abortion and Sterilization Act, col. 667.

<sup>16</sup> Debate on Abortion and Sterilization Act, col. 701.

often through male MPs' ritualistic praise of one another's speeches or of the role they played during the legislative process. Such praise reiterated the competent proceduralism of Parliament and the legitimacy that flowed from it. The nature of this debate and the criticisms of the all-male composition of the commission that drafted the legislation appear to have led MPs to emphasize qualities such as sympathy and compassion alongside the more usual checklist of responsibility and fairness. In this way it was stressed that male MPs were not precluded from representing women: indeed, it established them as the universal representative.

In direct contrast, male MPs attacked Suzman in ways that drew heavily on her gender and negative views of women's decision-making ability. Suzman was denigrated for her "customary flamboyancy," mocked for being "naive," and described by the United Party MP Brigadier Curt Von Keyserlingk as "irresponsible and frivolous."<sup>17</sup> Von Keyserlingk went on to say, "The attitude of the hon. Member is typical of some women; they like to have their cake but are not prepared to bake it."<sup>18</sup> Only this last comment drew a reprimand from the speaker: that the member was becoming frivolous himself. Suzman herself forcefully drew attention to the maleness of the consensus against her in the abortion debate. In the following passage, Suzman was already irritated by interjections to her speech when she was interrupted once more by a United Party MP:

*Mr G B D. McIntosh:* Mr Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question?

*Mrs H. Suzman:* No, you cannot; sit down. I am very ill-disposed towards men at this moment and I want to advise hon. members of this House—except those in my own party—that I feel equally cross about those who are going to support me and those who are not. *As far as I am concerned, I do not want anything to do with the men in this House.*<sup>19</sup>

At another time she reacted to comments with the retort "Male stupidity!"<sup>20</sup> However, this was not typical of Suzman in this debate or her parliamentary career more generally. Suzman more often used procedural

<sup>17</sup> The comments were made by Lawrence Wood and Brigadier Curt Von Keyserlingk, both members of the United Party. See Debate on Abortion and Sterilization Act, col. 510, 605–6.

<sup>18</sup> Debate on Abortion and Sterilization Act, col. 606.

<sup>19</sup> Debate on Abortion and Sterilization Act, col. 496–97; emphasis added.

<sup>20</sup> Debate on Abortion and Sterilization Act, col. 606.

grounds for interruptions and criticisms, to assert her seniority in the House and to demonstrate her mastery of the conventions and rituals of political debate.<sup>21</sup> For example, when she was later referred to by Graham McIntosh as “the member for Houghton,” she was quick to interrupt with “The ‘hon’ member to you!”<sup>22</sup> Later, in the debates during the bill’s committee stage, Suzman again clashed with McIntosh and asserted her seniority when he accused her of interjecting too much. She replied, “Perhaps I have a right to, having been here a few years longer than that brash young member.”<sup>23</sup>

Suzman’s prolific rate of interrupting during the debate again shows her adept use of the rules of debate. Colleagues of Suzman have noted her ease and familiarity with parliamentary procedure in their autobiographies. Alex Boraine, who was a Progressive Party MP between 1974 and 1986, commented: “Actually I think she liked the institution of parliament; she was very much part of the formality and traditions” (Boraine 2008, 134). Colin Elgin, leader of the Progressive Party for much of Suzman’s time as the lone Progressive Party MP, wrote: “In terms of ritualistic parliamentary politics she didn’t need to reach out [for support] beyond its parameters” (Elgin 2007, 220). Suzman herself wrote in her own autobiography about her attitude toward her gender and her place within Parliament: “I concentrated on making well-prepared and factually accurate speeches, and gradually won the respect of the House, albeit on occasion with unsolicited effects. Once, after a speech on economics, I was accosted by an MP who said to me in the Lobby, ‘Helen—you’ve got a man’s brain!’ His was not a brain I admired” (Suzman 1993, 26). In general Suzman adapted to the culture of the apartheid-era Parliament in ways very similar to Margaret Thatcher in the British Parliament. As Puwar notes, Thatcher’s political strategy was to “dress like a lady, act like a man” (Puwar 2004, 99). Like Thatcher, Suzman had a complex relationship with the somatic norm. She aimed to perform as an MP in a way that erased her gender in all but appearance. To many in her audience such performances were so successful that at times she was seen to have internalized the somatic norm—she was seen as having a man’s brain. However, another anecdote from Suzman’s

<sup>21</sup> Suzman was a member of the South African Parliament for thirty-six years, from 1953 to 1989. Between 1961 and 1974 she was the sole representative of the Progressive Party. The 1975 session was thus the first time in thirteen years that she had had parliamentary colleagues. The strategies she used during this debate had been developed during her solo years.

<sup>22</sup> Debate on Abortion and Sterilization Act, col. 645.

<sup>23</sup> Debate on Abortion and Sterilization Act, col. 870.

autobiography perhaps reveals the physical vulnerability of her position in this male space. She recalled another debate: “I was finishing my speech when my waist slip dropped to my feet. No-one would have known about it, as my desk screened me from view, if I hadn’t said ‘Oh God’ rather audibly and sat down and afterwards told one of my colleagues what had happened. Of course my gossipy colleague could not resist telling John Scott [of the *Cape Times*]” (Suzman 1993, 202). She describes being angry at the way the incident was reported in the press but then having “recovered my sense of humour . . . after receiving a sympathetic note, with safety pin attached, from one Nationalist MP and pair of braces from the Minister of Police and Law and Order” (Suzman 1993, 202). Although Suzman skillfully retells this incident as a comic tale, we might read her initial anger as the shame of having her somatic difference exposed. This is an anger that subsided when she received tokens of membership from male colleagues that would enable her to control her unreliable feminine costume. In the 1975 abortion debate her gender was similarly hypervisible, and Suzman forcefully laid claim to a somatic authority to legislate on this issue. This was an authority repeatedly undermined through the use of taunts that relied on a negative construction of women’s authority, decision-making ability, and morality, thus supporting Puwar’s suggestion that “the bodies of women MPs seem to be particularly vulnerable to abusive behaviour if they discuss issues that are explicitly related to sexual politics” (2004, 88).

Sexist or misogynistic humor was one of the principal means by which, in 1975, male MPs asserted a male authority to speak and thus maintained the parliamentary somatic norm in the face of Suzman’s challenge. Although I have no way of knowing how many MPs laughed at the following joke, the *Cape Times* parliamentary sketch writer reported that the joke teller and many of his colleagues “smiled broadly” upon hearing it (Scott 1975, 13). There is also a suggestion in the same report that Suzman was not in the chamber when the joke was told, reentering only to hear the very end of the speech. Suzman complained about this joke, but only some days later, during the committee stage of the bill, a detail similarly suggestive of her absence from the chamber for its telling. Dr. Wilhelm Vosloo, a National Party politician who had been on the commission that amended the bill, told the following “anecdote,” as he called it, to “add a light touch” to his words on the question of rape: “A young girl arrives at a hospital and asks for help. She says to the matron: ‘Oh mother, oh mother, I have been raped. Matron, please help me.’ The matron then says, ‘Yes, come in my child. Walk this way. Go straight through to the kitchen. On the shelf you will find a lemon. Squeeze out the juice and drink it.’ The girl then says, ‘oh matron will it really help me?’ And the

matron says: ‘Yes, it will help to remove that smile from your face.’”<sup>24</sup> The fact that Suzman may have been absent from the chamber during Vosloo’s anecdote potentially makes it an even stronger act of exclusion. Such a story, told behind Suzman’s back, would have hung in the air on her re-entry to the chamber, undermining her without her knowledge. Vosloo surely knew that had she been present Suzman would have interrupted him in protest. Sylvia Shaw, in her work on the British House of Commons debates, suggests that in the case of sexist jokes, MPs are using humor to “signal a shared membership in which adversarial norms are understood to be an accepted superficial enactment of the difference between MPs” (Shaw 2002, 211). This certainly seems to lie behind National Party and United Party MPs’ joint involvement in sexist humor during this debate, especially where male MPs from the United Party attacked Suzman, as in Von Keyserlingk’s taunts quoted earlier.

Twenty-one years later, in a rhetorical style strikingly similar to that of Vosloo’s, an ANC MP, Andries Nel, began a speech on abortion: “Mr Chairperson and hon. members, I would like to start off by relaying a little story that I have heard. I do not know, but members who have been in Parliament longer than I have could perhaps vouch for its veracity or otherwise.”<sup>25</sup> He went on to describe the all-male composition of the 1975 act’s drafting commission, telling the House that “when the hon. Helen Suzman objected she was informed by members of the NP that having women would be unacceptable as it would be like having a murderer hear his own case.” He then accused those speaking against the 1996 act of being “captives of the attitude which I have just mentioned.” The 1975 debate on abortion echoed in the South African Parliament in 1996. However, there were particular consequences for the ways in which black women MPs performed political representation during the debate.

### **The 1996 debate**

The opening of the 1994 South African Parliament marked a profound sort of space invasion. While there had been Indian and Coloured MPs and staff in the South African Parliament prior to 1994, they were present on a profoundly unequal basis, and Africans were excluded altogether.<sup>26</sup> The Tricameral Parliament established in 1984 had maintained apartheid

<sup>24</sup> Debate on Abortion and Sterilization Act, col. 502–3.

<sup>25</sup> Republic of South Africa, Debate on the Choice on Termination of Pregnancy Act, *Debates of the National Assembly (Hansard)*, vol. 10, October 29, 1996, col. 4831 (hereafter cited as Debate on the Choice on Termination of Pregnancy Act).

<sup>26</sup> In South Africa, Coloured was a racial category used by the apartheid state to refer to people of mixed parentage.

in its institutional arrangement, with separate chambers for whites, Indians, and Coloureds, and while joint sittings were held, these were under the auspices of the white chamber. The 1994 transformation was a sudden one, and bodies therefore became hypervisible and confusing for some time, a process Puwar has termed “disorientation” (2004, 41–44). This disorientation was perhaps most acute for continuing staff and for MPs who had been members of the former Parliament. It was particularly prevalent surrounding the bodies of the new women MPs. In her autobiography, Pregs Govender, a new ANC MP, tells the following story: “The day we were sworn in, the service officer guarding the entrance insisted that I walk upstairs to the ‘wives’ gallery,’ where he thought I belonged. He courteously invited Paul [her partner], who looked more the part into the National Assembly” (Govender 2007, 146). In May 1995, after nearly a year in office, Frene Ginwala, the first speaker of the new democratic Parliament and also South Africa’s first woman Speaker, was in one MP’s speech referred to as “Mr Speaker” or “Sir” thirty-four times, despite several warnings (Geisler 2000, 618). The MP in question, a member of the previous Parliament, excused himself by saying, “Madame Speaker, I ask you to bear with me. This is how it happened through the years. I am not used to it, but I shall try to get used to it” (South African Parliament 2006, 70).

Race was clearly also a major issue in the new Parliament. I have explored in greater detail elsewhere the tensions surrounding racial language in the 1994–99 Parliament as the boundaries of what was “sayable” in the new South African Parliament were tested (Johnson 2013). In 1998, calling another member of the house “racist” was expressly ruled unparliamentary. However, racialized bodies were hypervisible in this fiercely policed nonracial space. This was, unusually, even the case for white bodies, in an inversion of the invisibility usually associated with whiteness. Samantha Vice has recently suggested that, “In South Africa, whilst one’s whiteness might still constitute the unacknowledged norm, as the invisibility thesis claims, *that one is* white rather than black is always present to oneself and others, barring an impressive feat of willed self-deception” (Vice 2010, 326). In the new South African Parliament whiteness was imbued with political meaning. For example, Andrew Feinstein, a white ANC MP, wrote in his autobiography: “One of my first parliamentary speeches was during a debate on the budget. No sooner had I started speaking than a member began muttering, ever louder, ‘Jou Kommunis’ (‘You communist’). Since he was clearly basing his assumption not on the orthodox economics I was discussing but rather on the fact that I am white, Jewish and a member of the ANC (and therefore obviously a communist), the rotund, pink-faced Willem Odendaal was attacked in turn by my ANC colleagues” (Feinstein

2010, 58). There is evidence too that a somatic language of political allegiance has persisted. For example, in his 2007 novel *Primary Coloured*, based on his experiences running the 2004 election campaign of the Independent Democrats, Brent Meersman details the hostility directed toward Joel, his alter ego in the book: "As Joel turned the corridor, he passed a group of black office workers in plain shirts and flannels. He smiled and greeted them with a nod. They gave him a hostile momentary look. At first, this behaviour in Parliament had dismayed Joel. Until . . . Joel gathered . . . that it was assumed that any white person in the corridors of the Marks Building belonged to the Conservative Alliance, and were for that reason snubbed" (Meersman 2007, 64). This is a complex social drama since, as Vice suggests, the visibility of whiteness in postapartheid South Africa coexists with a continuation of whiteness as the unacknowledged norm and within a global context structured by white racism. The South African Parliament was in 1994 a profoundly disorientating place for everyone in it.

New black women MPs' discomfort in Parliament has been widely noted: "When I came to Parliament I was afraid of it" (Geisler 2000, 617); "When I came to this office six years ago, after the 1994 elections, I didn't stay long—I walked out. I couldn't on a psychological level, come to grips with the fact that I was in Parliament" (Smith 2002, 108); "Parliament is like a dead place" (Britton 2005, 64). These statements convey more than disorientation; they border on the terrified. Puwar argues that the bodies of "space invaders" can provoke fear within an institution because they are incongruous and perceived to threaten the status quo. This she terms a fear of the monstrous (Puwar 2004, 50). However, the above statements from MPs new to Parliament in 1994 show that these space invaders felt fear themselves. Rather than a fear of the monstrous, I argue here that this is a fear of ghosts. Parliament was "like a dead place" to some, but it was also a place *of* the dead. The fear that the 1994 space invaders felt was a fear of the buildings themselves, the history contained within them, of the ghosts that lived there, and their possible transformative powers. This was a fear of becoming fully incorporated into that which they had previously despised. I argue here that this fear had profound effects, particularly on some black women MPs and how they performed representation.

From the outset of the 1996 debate on the Choice on Termination of Pregnancy Act, newspaper reports described an intense atmosphere in which "Health Minister Dr Nkosazana Zuma faced a chorus of jibes as she stood up" (*Cape Times* 1996, 7). In response, Zuma used an image in her opening speech that invoked a silent horde of ghosts within the legislative chamber: the poor black women who died from backstreet abor-



tions and from whom, she argued, her authority was drawn. “The vast majority of poor and mainly black women,” she said, “resort to backstreet terminations because the present law is only accessible to the affluent. Hundreds of women—more than all the members of this Assembly—die annually from these unsafe and illegal terminations of pregnancy.”<sup>27</sup> These specters crowded the chamber, outnumbering the MPs present. The specter of poor black women appeared in many ANC MPs’ speeches as the ultimate source of authority for the bill, and by referring to this figure while profusely using “we” and “us,” black women MPs speaking in favor of the bill constructed a somatic authority for themselves. As part of this performance these women raised the ghost of the apartheid-era Parliament’s somatic norm, pointing out how male and pale he was and simultaneously laying claim to their own somatic authority.

Zuma did not directly lay claim to a somatic authority during her opening speech, but she did so indirectly by quoting a letter she had received from a woman priest. The letter made the case for women’s authority to decide on the issue of abortion based on shared female experiences. Crucially, in light of the religious opposition to the bill, the letter also made clear that Christian women could, based on their experiences as women, come to support legalized abortion: “All the major theological contributions on abortion have been written by males, mostly arguing against abortion on request. This does not imply that all women are prochoice, but many Christian women have arrived at that conclusion. Many have witnessed the horrific consequences of an incomplete abortion. Others have seen young mothers bleeding to death. This trauma is difficult for males to comprehend.”<sup>28</sup> Speeches like this constructed for women a somatic authority to legislate abortion based on the trauma of illegal abortion and a female ability to comprehend such experiences. This somatic authority was maintained by attacks on women who opposed the legislation. What is most striking about the nature of these attacks is that women MPs who opposed the bill were attacked as traitors to their gender. The following is from the speech of ANC MP Pregs Govender: “This debate is not about the legalisation of abortion. Abortion has been legal in South Africa for over two decades. [*Applause.*] When the NP passed the Abortion and Sterilization Act of 1975 . . . we did not have women apologists for the male NP raising their voices in shrill protest.”<sup>29</sup> Another ANC MP, Mavivi Myakayaka-Manzini, made similar com-

<sup>27</sup> Debate on the Choice on Termination of Pregnancy Act, col. 4759.

<sup>28</sup> Debate on the Choice on Termination of Pregnancy Act, col. 4762.

<sup>29</sup> Debate on the Choice on Termination of Pregnancy Act, col. 4792.



ments in her speech. She mentioned the 1975 debate, saying that perhaps members of that Parliament should be forgiven since they were “all white males who did not understand or have a clue about women’s rights.” She went on: “Our debate today takes place in a totally different context. It is therefore shocking for me to hear, from the other side, *women speaking with the male voices* of 1975.”<sup>30</sup> In this way, Govender and Myakayaka-Manzini suggested that women opponents of the bill were possessed by the ghost of the 1975 somatic norm.

ANC MP Thandi Modise criticized the National Party’s Shelia Camerer in the following terms: “It is not possible for anybody who has never gone to Soweto or Phola Park to stand here and tell us what we believe in and what we do not believe in, especially a person who sat right here in these benches and looked at black women being reduced to animals, to little things that make tea for madam in the morning.”<sup>31</sup> Camerer had been a National Party MP since 1987, a fact Modise drew attention to by saying that she “sat right here in these benches” under apartheid. Camerer’s link with the apartheid-era Parliament removed, in Modise’s view, any moral authority she had or any ability to understand the ANC’s position on abortion. Modise thus alluded to Camerer as being on the wrong side of a racialized class divide, with black working women (now regaining their dignity and freedom) opposed to the implicitly white madam, a configuration that marked Camerer as unable to truly represent women. To Modise, Camerer looked like a ghost. Camerer herself spoke early on in the debate; she was the third speaker and the first from the opposition. Her speech was full of technical references to the legislative amendments that the National Party was proposing. She did not lay claim to any somatic authority to speak about abortion. Camerer mentioned “women” only seven times and “girls” twice, whereas the health minister (whose speech was a few minutes longer) used the words “woman” or “women” thirty-two times and “girl” twice.

In 1996, MPs made recourse to the same rituals of praise used in 1975. ANC MPs, male and female, almost all praised the minister of health and the chairperson of the Portfolio Committee on Health for their leadership in their opening remarks. However, women MPs across party lines also used the same style of praise regarding other women MPs. Opposition MP Patricia de Lille began with the following compliment: “Mr Chairperson, I firstly want to congratulate my colleague Pregs Govender on a

<sup>30</sup> Debate on the Choice on Termination of Pregnancy Act, col. 4848; emphasis added.

<sup>31</sup> Debate on the Choice on Termination of Pregnancy Act, col. 4809–10. Soweto and Phola Park are both large townships in South Africa.

well-researched speech.”<sup>32</sup> In addition to this parliamentary praise, women also used demonstrative displays of congratulation. John Scott described the reaction in the chamber to Govender’s speech: “The ANC burst into applause. Women ululated. As Govender returned to her seat, female colleagues competed with one another to kiss her. Health Minister Nkosazana Zuma kissed her and hugged her” (Scott 1996, 8). During the 1996 debate women MPs did not straightforwardly perform parliamentary rituals and thus erase their gender, as in Suzman’s masterful performances of procedure. Their reiteration of this parliamentary ritual had a self-conscious and uncanny feeling to it. Their use of ritual praise as well as hugging and kissing was part of a self-conscious representation of women as a united group within Parliament, united against the ghosts of 1975.

ANC women also displayed solidarity in attacks on a particular black male MP who gave a virulent antiabortion speech. As Shaw has pointed out, in these situations the laughter of MPs recorded in *Hansard* is not so much a spontaneous response to humor as it is part of the “verbal assault on an opponent” (2002, 209). Colonel Nyambeni Ramaremsa, a black National Party member and a strident critic of the bill, was interrupted by women MPs from the outset of his speech. He was first interrupted by Manana Catherine Mabuza of the ANC, who asked, “Who wrote that speech for you?”<sup>33</sup> He reestablished his control over the floor with “Listen, Listen!” *Hansard* records more interjections, after which he was interrupted once more by “an Hon Member” echoing the first interruption, asking, “Who wrote that speech bossboy?” It is clear from his reaction—“I urge that member to listen with her ears not her mouth”—that this was also a woman MP.<sup>34</sup> “Bossboy” is a derogatory term in South Africa, referring ostensibly to the foreman of a gang of workers, and it suggests notions of racial collaboration—a black man working for white masters. The suggestion made here was that Ramaremsa was not representing his race and that he could and should be. The ghost of the somatic norm hovered over him. The speaker who came immediately after Ramaremsa, Ethesian Fazzie, was another ANC MP, and she began by criticizing Ramaremsa as someone who bore “false witness against thy neighbour.” She was backed up by a chorus of “Mxelele, mama!” (“Tell him, madam!”), thus completing the women’s display of authority over Ramaremsa.<sup>35</sup>

<sup>32</sup> Debate on the Choice on Termination of Pregnancy Act, col. 4810.

<sup>33</sup> Debate on the Choice on Termination of Pregnancy Act, col. 4822.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid.

<sup>35</sup> Debate on the Choice on Termination of Pregnancy Act, col. 4825.

Male MPs' reactions to women's assertion of the somatic authority to legislate abortion and to the ghost of the 1975 somatic norm were mixed. Some followed Van Rensburg's 1975 arguments and disqualified themselves from speaking about or deciding on the issue of abortion. The first to do so was Jan Hendrik Momberg, a white ANC MP, who commented during his speech: "As a male I hesitate to take a stand here regarding a matter which mainly affects females."<sup>36</sup> The second was the minister of Water Affairs and Forestry, Kader Asmal, who stated: "As a man I am basically disqualified from speaking on this issue . . . because I do not have the pain and the humiliation of having to go through this."<sup>37</sup> Both of the men who made such disclaimers then went on to speak about the subject. Nel, whose speech is quoted above, while raising the ghost of 1975, did not lay claim to any somatic authority of his own. There was a sense that these men could speak of maleness but have their own performances of political representation remain unaffected.

In apparent contrast, a number of MPs who were vocal opponents of the bill spoke in terms of men's rights being taken away. One such speaker was Desmond Padiachey of the National Party, who claimed that "none of the women who have spoken here today in favour of this Bill are of child-bearing age."<sup>38</sup> He was interrupted several times by unnamed members before Hemanthkumar Neerahoo of the Inkatha Freedom Party rose and interjected: "Mr Chairman, on a point of order. I do not think that the hon. member is qualified to speak on this subject—he has never been pregnant. [*Laughter*] [*Applause*]." Warming to the theme, Nkenke Kekana of the ANC then rose to ask a question: "Mr Chairman, is the hon. member of child-bearing age? [*Laughter*]."<sup>39</sup> Despite the fact that the questions primarily ridiculed Padiachey, they also parodied the broader standpoint of somatic authority to represent taken by some women MPs. Both discourses, that of an attack on men's rights and of ANC men's claim to be gifting the right of representation to women on the matter of abortion, reiterated the normative position as one in which political power and decision-making ability rested with men.

Male MPs participated in a smattering of joke telling during the 1996 debates. One ANC MP began his speech: "Mr Chairperson, it is clear from the National Party's input that they are pregnant—pregnant with ignorance! I am now aborting their ignorance! [*Laughter*]."<sup>40</sup> Arguably this

<sup>36</sup> Debate on the Choice on Termination of Pregnancy Act, col. 4812.

<sup>37</sup> Debate on the Choice on Termination of Pregnancy Act, col. 4838.

<sup>38</sup> Debate on the Choice on Termination of Pregnancy Act, col. 4834.

<sup>39</sup> Debate on the Choice on Termination of Pregnancy Act, col. 4835.

<sup>40</sup> Mthawelanga Mfebe, Debate on the Choice on Termination of Pregnancy Act, col. 4832.

joke diminished the seriousness of the issue in exactly the same way as the more overtly misogynistic jokes of male MPs in 1975 had done. The minister of justice made a very similar joke at the start of the following debate: “I also want to take part in termination. However, I want to terminate corruption [*Laughter*].”<sup>41</sup> This quip made startlingly clear a difference between a women’s issue (abortion) about which men could joke and the resumption of (men’s) serious parliamentary business (“I want to terminate corruption”). The haunting effects of the 1975 somatic norm were felt differently by male MPs in 1996. While black opponents of the bill were accused of betraying their duty to represent their race in the same way that women opponents of the bill were accused of a dereliction of their duty to represent their gender, other male MPs could quite comfortably cede a “male” right to represent on the issue of abortion and continue to perform in Parliament unaffected.

### A potent invisibility

Without recourse to the white middle-class ideal, politicized identities would forfeit a good deal of their claims to injury and exclusion, their claims to the political significance of their difference.

—Wendy Brown (1995, 61)

In South Africa . . . the nonracial could be heralded only insofar as it took its leave from the racial, but in doing so [it] has kept the ghostly terms of race ironically alive as implicit yardstick.

—David Theo Goldberg (2009, 311)

Was the successful passage of the 1996 Choice on Termination of Pregnancy Act in itself evidence of the substantive representation of (black) women in a historically (white) masculine institution and therefore of a change in the somatic norm of parliamentary politics in 1990s South Africa? A number of academics and activists, some of whom were deeply involved in South Africa’s transition to democracy, have begun to reappraise the main elements of the transition’s narrative of gender victory. Shelia Meintjes has argued that discourses around gender located it as a “women’s issue,” as women’s responsibility, and suggested that the solution to the problem of gender equity and equality was to promote “women’s empowerment” in South Africa’s state institutions (Meintjes 2009, 75). The 1996 debate on the Choice on Termination of Pregnancy Act saw the issue

<sup>41</sup> Debate on the Choice on Termination of Pregnancy Act, col. 4856.

of abortion framed in just these terms. The effect, according to Meintjies, was “to open spaces for women’s participation in the public sphere in the context of a particular configuration of androcentric (male-centred), heteronormative, gendered power that did not lead to a more inclusive transformation of gender power relations in society” (76). Here I have argued that the form that representation took in the postapartheid Parliament was one haunted by the somatic norm of apartheid politics—in other words, that the representation of women in Parliament was shaped by their previous exclusion. This argument illuminates Brown’s characterization of identity politics as “frequently recycling and reinstating rather than transforming the terms of domination that generated them” (1995, 7).<sup>42</sup> The epigraphs above from Brown and Goldberg remind us of the multiple theoretical hauntings of postapartheid South Africa. Goldberg has described apartheid as having an “afterlife” (2009, 309), a term also used by Phillip Manow when describing the “afterlife of the [concept of a] body politic in our supposedly depersonalized, disembodied times” (2010, 89). The suggestions here about the haunting of the post-1994 South African Parliament by the ghost of the apartheid-era institutional somatic norm adds to these ideas that blur the “epochal demarcations” of narratives of political change (Manow 2010, 89).

What processes are at play in black women’s performances of political representation in the post-1994 South African Parliament? The answer from the analysis of just one debate held in 1996 is that a complex set of claims, in the very process of challenging an apartheid-era somatic hierarchy, reinstated and relied upon some of the same somatic binaries. Whereas white men’s somatic authority was largely invisible in 1975, black women’s somatic authority was hypervisible in 1996. Women clung to a constructed somatic authority because, as Brown suggests, here lay the “political significance of their difference” (1995, 61), but also, I have argued, because of their fear of the transformative power of Parliament. Exploring Puwar’s concepts of the somatic norm and space invasion in a context very different from the British Parliament has shown that we must be attentive to the ways in which a somatic norm can continue to affect representation when it has ceased to be a physical reality. Ghosts of the somatic norm possess a “potent invisibility,” a phrase that Butler has used to describe “the soul” (1999, 172). Puwar has argued that a fear of the monstrous shapes the inclusion of black and ethnic minority bodies into white

<sup>42</sup> This is, as Brown herself notes, a deeply Foucauldian point. See, e.g., Michel Foucault’s discussion of the “failure” of the prison and his argument that attempts at reform only reinforce its network of power and thus the production of the delinquent (Foucault 1979, 264–71).

spaces in Britain (2004, 50). I have argued that under different circumstances a fear of ghosts can affect those who take over an institution from which they were previously excluded.

*School of Social Sciences*  
*University of Manchester*

## References

- Albertyn, Cathi, Beth Goldblatt, Shireen Hassim, Likhapha Mbatha, and Sheila Meintjes. 1999. *Engendering the Political Agenda: A South African Case Study*. Johannesburg: Centre for Applied Legal Studies, University of the Witwatersrand.
- Boraine, Alex. 2008. *A Life in Transition*. Cape Town: Zebra.
- Britton, Hannah Evelyn. 2005. *Women in the South African Parliament: From Resistance to Governance*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Britton, Hannah, and Jennifer Fish. 2009. "Engendering Civil Society in Democratic South Africa." In *Women's Activism in South Africa: Working across Divides*, ed. Hannah Britton, Jennifer Fish, and Sheila Meintjes, 1–42. Scottsville: University of KwaZulu Natal Press.
- Brown, Wendy. 1995. *States of Injury: Power and Freedom in Late Modernity*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- . 2001. *Politics out of History*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Butler, Judith. 1999. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Cape Times*. 1996. "Vote on Abortion Bill a 'Formality.'" October 30, 7.
- Connell, Raewyn. 2008. "A Thousand Miles from Kind: Men, Masculinities and Modern Institutions." *Journal of Men's Studies* 16(3):237–52.
- Corder, Hugh. 1996. "Parliament's Democracy in Action." *Cape Times*, November 4, 8.
- Crewe, Emma. 2005. *Lords of Parliament: Manners, Rituals and Politics*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- . 2006. "Rituals and the Usual Channels in the British House of Lords." In *Rituals in Parliaments: Political, Anthropological, and Historical Perspectives on Europe and the United States*, ed. Emma Crewe and Marion G. Müller, 83–109. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1994. *Specters of Marx: The State of the Debt, the Work of Mourning, and the New International*. Trans. Peggy Kamuf. New York: Routledge.
- Eglin, Colin. 2007. *Crossing the Borders of Power: The Memoirs of Colin Eglin*. Johannesburg: Jonathan Ball.
- Erlank, Natasha. 2003. "Gender and Masculinity in South African Nationalist Discourse, 1912–1950." *Feminist Studies* 29(3):653–71.
- Feinstein, Andrew. 2010. *After the Party: Corruption, the ANC and South Africa's Uncertain Future*. 2nd ed. London: Verso.

- Foucault, Michel. 1979. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Freud, Sigmund. 1955. *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. Vol. 17. Ed. James Strachey. London: Hogarth.
- Gasa, Nomboniso, ed. 2007. *Women in South African History: They Remove Boulders and Cross Rivers = Basus'iimbokodo, Bawel'imilambo*. Cape Town: HSRC.
- Geisler, Gisela. 2000. "‘Parliament Is Another Terrain of Struggle’: Women, Men and Politics in South Africa." *Journal of Modern African Studies* 38(4):605–30.
- Goldberg, David Theo. 2009. *The Threat of Race: Reflections on Racial Neoliberalism*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Gordon, Avery F. 2008. *Ghostly Matters: Haunting and the Sociological Imagination*. 2nd ed. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Govender, Pregs. 2007. *Love and Courage: A Story of Insubordination*. Auckland Park: Jacana.
- Hassim, Shireen. 2006. *Women's Organizations and Democracy in South Africa: Contesting Authority*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Johnson, Rachel. 2013. "Disrupting the South African Parliament: Performing Opposition, 1990–2010." *Democratization* 20(3):478–500.
- Krog, Antjie. 1998. *Country of My Skull*. Johannesburg: Random House.
- Lukes, Steven. 1975. "Political Ritual and Social Integration." *Sociology* 9(2): 289–308.
- Manow, Philip. 2010. *In the King's Shadow: The Political Anatomy of Democratic Representation*. Trans. Patrick Camiller. Cambridge: Polity.
- Meersman, Brent. 2007. *Primary Coloured*. Cape Town: Human & Rousseau.
- Meintjes, Sheila. 2009. "Gender Equality by Design: The Case of the Commission on Gender Equality." In *Women's Activism in South Africa: Working across Divides*, ed. Hannah Britton, Jennifer Fish, and Sheila Meintjes, 73–95. Scottsville: University of KwaZulu Natal Press.
- Puwar, Nirmal. 2004. *Space Invaders: Race, Gender and Bodies Out of Place*. Oxford: Berg.
- Scott, John. 1975. "Notes in the House." *Cape Times*, February 11, 13.
- . 1996. "Notes in the House." *Cape Times*, October 30, 8.
- Shaw, Sylvia. 2002. "Language and Gender in House of Commons Debates." PhD dissertation, Institute of Education, University of London.
- Smith, Charlene. 2002. *Patricia de Lille*. Kenilworth: Spearhead.
- South African Parliament. 2006. *South Africa's Parliament since 1994: Achievements and Challenges*. Cape Town: Parliament of the Republic of South Africa.
- Sullivan, Shannon. 2006. *Revealing Whiteness: The Unconscious Habits of Racial Privilege*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Suzman, Helen. 1993. *In No Uncertain Terms: Memoirs*. London: Sinclair-Stevenson.
- Unterhalter, Elaine. 2000. "The Work of the Nation: Heroic Masculinity in South African Autobiographical Writing of the Anti-apartheid Struggle." *European Journal of Development Research* 12(2):157–78.

- Vice, Samantha. 2010. "How Do I Live in This Strange Place?" *Journal of Social Philosophy* 41(3):323–42.
- Walker, Cheryl. 1982. *Women and Resistance in South Africa*. London: Onyx.
- . 1995. "Conceptualising Motherhood in Twentieth Century South Africa." *Journal of Southern African Studies* 21(3):417–37.