Abstract
In South Africa, where apartheid and its aftermath have provided both purpose and subject for artists, the intertwinements of whiteness and violence have proven a durable and important area of visual exploration. David Goldblatt and Hentie van der Merwe, two exemplary photographers who have dealt critically with the visual properties of whiteness in South Africa, have attempted to picture whiteness as a kind of violence done simultaneously to the other and to the self. These photographers, the first working in a documentary mode both during and after apartheid and the other pursuing more conceptual strategies in the present, work to uncover the links between the visual display of whiteness and violence grounded in militarism, masculinism and heterosexism.

In the work of Goldblatt, particularly the photographs found in Some Afrikaners Photographed (1975), Afrikaners, the white group most responsible for the creation of apartheid, are shown in a manner that subverts their own self-mythologies. Their claim to racial dominance is
shown by him not as a God-given right but as stemming from the barrel of a gun. Hentie van der Merwe also considers the connections between identity construction and violence, most notably in the series *Trappings* (2000-3). In these photographs, he depicts military uniforms from South Africa’s Museum of Military History, revivifying these artifacts and reinserting them into the contemporary historical moment, transfiguring the museum’s dry displays into apparitions, made ghostly by the photographs’ use of slow exposure times and a hand-held camera. Goldblatt and van der Merwe present visual imagery that articulates a politically productive critique of South African whiteness, a vision that assails the history of white dominance in South Africa and provides an intriguing model for future analyses of whiteness.
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In terms of methodology, the body of theory usually called ‘critical white studies’ provides an intriguing way to discuss certain works of South African art, especially art attempting to grapple with the violence that enabled and sustained colonization and apartheid.
Scholars pursuing this avenue of inquiry use the term whiteness to describe a socially constructed form of privilege and not the physiology of a biologically distinct group.¹ Therefore, in critical white studies, ‘the social reality of white skin privilege is now an underlying research assumption, a point of departure for investigations into how it was established and how it is maintained.’² One of the ways in which critical white studies works to undermine the ideological bases of white supremacy is by revealing the mechanisms through which it is constructed and by which it is maintained, a role which might also be filled by visual art. As cultural critic Maurice Berger points out in the catalogue prepared for his exhibition White: Whiteness and Race in Contemporary Art, ‘visual arts serve as an important catalyst for the discussion of race … because much of what defines race in culture is innately visual.’³ As the exhibition Berger organized endeavours to show, this is particularly true of whiteness, where visual art ‘can help us understand something that has ironically remained invisible: whiteness.’⁴ Looking at art through the lens of critical white studies might allow us to understand precisely how anti-racist art addressing itself to the theme of whiteness is able to speak critically about normative representations of whiteness and about those aspects of white supremacist ideology which articulate themselves visually. This essay considers the ways David Goldblatt (b. 1930) and Hentie van der Merwe (b.
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1972) have made South African whiteness visible through photography and worked to deconstruct the bases of its power.

Richard Dyer, a perceptive analyst of whiteness and its representation, argues that whiteness is a paradox in terms of visual culture. It is, he suggests, a strange kind of thing, at once embodied and disembodied, specific and general, and, in terms of visual culture, visible and invisible. So, on the one hand, there is the oft-forwarded claim that whiteness derives strength from its invisibility to its bearers. To quote Martha Mahoney,

> protection against seeing the mechanisms that socially reproduce and maintain privilege is [a] component of privilege … White privilege therefore includes the ability to not-see whiteness and its privileges.⁵

On the other hand, simultaneously, whiteness must be always visible to non-whites for it to function. As Dyer notes, ‘visual culture demands that whites can be seen to be whites.’⁶ This paradoxical entwining of visibility and invisibility is key to understanding how art can function critically within the social structure of whiteness, especially for white viewers, who are still, both in South Africa and in the United States, the main
consumers of art. Visual images can show, on the one hand, the usually invisible presence of privilege, and, on the other hand, critique the hyper-visibility of whiteness in society.

Given the country’s history of white supremacist governance and the dramatic struggle undertaken by those opposed to this regime, South Africa offers numerous examples from both before and after the end of apartheid of artists and photographers investigating the paradoxical visual properties of whiteness. To grasp the variety of the work produced around this theme, one might compare the photography of Ernest Cole (1940-90) and the sculpture of Jane Alexander (b. 1959). A politically-active documentary photographer during apartheid, Cole is best remembered for his work from the 1967 book *House of Bondage*, produced after the photographer went into exile and never published in South Africa because of its anti-apartheid stance. This collage of photographs each image shows a sign in either Afrikaans or English, and every sign is a written articulation of the principle of racial segregation, each offering some variation of ‘Whites Only’ or ‘Non-Whites Only.’ Cole offers here a glimpse at the discursive power of whiteness, at the way segregation was enacted through the written language of street signs and the legal apparatus that required them. By contrast, ‘Butcher Boys’ (1985-6), Alexander’s more artistically-minded sculpture concretizes the monstrous, dehumanizing impact of the apartheid on whites themselves, rendering white bodies
literally transformed into vampire-pale, human-animal hybrids. Related to these sorts of efforts, the works under discussion here by Goldblatt and van der Merwe represent two of the more sustained investigations of this topic.

For example in the recent series *Trappings*, Hentie van der Merwe endeavours to reveal the paradoxical visual character of whiteness through the microcosm of military costume. A conceptually rigorous artist, who frequently places photography at the centre of his artistic practice, van der Merwe consistently engages with issues of identity and gender construction, considering thoughtfully the legacy of white rule on contemporary South African identity, especially white identity. In the photographs that comprise *Trappings*, van der Merwe depicts historical military uniforms from South Africa’s Museum of Military History in Johannesburg. This museum is the only one of its kind in South Africa, and it archives what, after the end of apartheid, has to be one of the most contested and controversial aspects of South African history.⁹

White rule in South Africa, as elsewhere, was underwritten by military power, by both modern technologies for killing and modern methods of organizing killers. Military uniforms are part and parcel of these innovations, a symptom of the massive economic, political and social changes which propelled the West to global power in the seventeenth, eighteenth and
nineteenth century. This historical context is clearly crucial to the meanings conveyed by van der Merwe’s photographs from this series. Each colour photograph from the series shows one isolated article of military clothing, usually a jacket, from the late nineteenth or the twentieth century. Often parade uniforms, the kind of colourful ceremonial costume designed solely for military pageantry, these garments recall an earlier era of military costume, before industrialized mass-killing bled all of the vestigial colour from the once-bright costumes of war. Rather than focusing generally on uniforms for fighting, with some exceptions, van der Merwe photographs uniforms associated with military spectacle, with the symbolic aspect of military power. In his photographs of these archived military artefacts—the ‘trappings’ of white rule—van der Merwe revivifies these uniforms and reinserts them into the contemporary historical moment, transfiguring the museum’s dry, academic displays into floating, blurred apparitions, made ghostly and dream-like by his use of natural light, slow exposure times and a hand-held camera.

In the photograph ‘Transvaal Horse Artillery (Colonial), Officer (1903-13),’ for example, van der Merwe photographs a jacket, brocaded and seemingly light-blue or light-green, hung in the military museum, apparently on some sort of unseen armature. Nothing is seen that would suggest to the otherwise uninformed viewer the original location of the jacket’s display.
Though clearly designed to encase the human body, it is strangely disembodied, a shell. Above the jacket’s high collar and below its flared tail, the jacket is headless and legless. Its arms hang limply at its sides. The dim light and the out-of-focus blur of the photograph make the jacket seem to emerge, hovering, into materiality, animated by something subtler and stranger than the flesh and blood of a human soldier. Now a nightmare image, the jacket seems to take on a kind of possessed quality. The once festive braiding that extends in horizontal rows across its surface begin to look skeletal or perhaps exoskeletal, giving the jacket a form that evokes death or that calls to mind something insect-like and inhuman.

In this photograph, van der Merwe cuts away any context—his scholarly, historically-minded title, taken from the museum’s taxonomic organization, only serves to reinforce the gulf that separates his poetic images from the museum’s model of presentation. Far from being a ‘museum piece,’ an object of passing historical interest whose meaning is derived from the institutional discourse of its display, in van der Merwe’s image this trapping of white rule becomes talismanic, magical. The uniform’s shell-like jacket effaces the humanity and individuality of the wearer. Dead as an individual, the wearer has become the bringer of death, a symbol of the violence that stakes out claims of colonial and racial dominance.
Hentie van der Merwe’s photographs from *Trappings* crystallize the military uniform as the articulation of a certain kind of white masculinity, one which is extrinsic rather than intrinsic, and one which is defined (and limited) by its accessories rather than by the intrinsic character of the white subject. This quality can be seen in a photograph like ‘TA Member of 32 Battalion Reconnaissance Wing,’ which shows the field dress worn by a member of one of the SADF’s most decorated units of the 1970s and 1980s. Ironically, despite this photograph’s importance in a body of images that dissects whiteness, the 32 Battalion was actually composed of Angolan soldiers and non-commissioned officers, and the unit was mostly deployed beyond South Africa’s borders in occupied Namibia and in Angola as part of the apartheid regime’s effort to destabilize its neighbours.11 Unusually for *Trappings*, which mostly focuses on jackets on headless mannequins, ‘Member of 32 Battalion’ depicts a camouflaged bush or boonie hat over a camouflaged mask which completely conceals the face. Below, dark, indistinct forms suggest a field jacket. This photograph is central to the overall power of the series in the way that it emphasizes the anonymity and lack of autonomous identity created the military uniform. If race, the differentiation of non-white from white, is read on the surface of the skin, then this uniform effaces that marker. By hiding that key marker of racial identity, the uniform depicted by van der Merwe
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Hentie van der Merwe captures the way in which racial identity, the way in which whiteness especially, can be created through costume—a variation on the cliché ‘the clothes make the man,’ wherein the clothes make the race. But a photograph like ‘Member of 32 Battalion’ also articulates the cost to the humanity of the wearer of the uniform. Obviously the ensemble depicted in the photograph is designed to conceal the presence or protect the anonymity of the wearer on dangerous missions. Though it differs in form, in function the mask in the photograph recalls the balaclavas often worn by soldiers conducting raids into the townships to terrorize residents.¹³

The mask in van der Merwe’s photograph is the mask of the torturer or the executioner, but, like the executioner’s mask, it is a mark of weakness, intended to protect the wearer from the taint of a taboo act. As these associations build, the mask of whiteness depicted by van der Merwe can be seen to encompass both the victimizer and the victimized, simultaneously a sign of strength and weakness, display and concealment.
Stylish and sinister, attractive and repellent, ultimately Hentie van der Merwe’s series *Trappings* are like whiteness itself, defined by paradox. In these photographs, whiteness is evident only through one of its facets, the military uniform. The macrocosm is visible solely through the microcosm. In this sense, *Trappings* makes an interesting complement to another series of photographs, *Some Afrikaners Photographed*, produced during the apartheid-era by David Goldblatt, arguably the country’s most famous photographer. In these works, Goldblatt tries to show viewers whites embedded within a society built on white privilege, revealing the operations of whiteness though the macrocosm of everyday life, though picnics or wedding celebrations. This series endeavours to show the pervasive character of a certain kind of whiteness and its universality in South Africa during apartheid, and the ways in which this made all whites culpable and none innocent.

For this series, done at the height of apartheid, Goldblatt photographed only Afrikaners, who see themselves as the descendants of Dutch settlers who arrived on the Cape of Good Hope in 1652 to establish a refreshment station for ships travelling east to trade for spices. In the twentieth century, the Afrikaner-dominated National Party, which ruled South Africa from 1948 until 1994, would create the policy of white supremacy called apartheid—which means ‘separateness’ in Afrikaans. Apartheid is an
outgrowth of a certain kind of Afrikaner nationalism. (It bears noting that South African whiteness was traditionally divided internally in a variety of ways, most importantly between Afrikaans- and English-speakers. As a Jewish South African descended from Lithuanian-born immigrants, David Goldblatt was an outsider to traditionally constructed white identity in several ways, which made him especially attentive to the mythology of Afrikaner nationalism.)

In an image like ‘Picnic on New Year’s Day, Hartebeespoort Dam, Transvaal, 1965,’ for example, Goldblatt depicts as deeply bizarre one element of Afrikaner national identity considered normal, even laudable, during apartheid: the tight linkage of violence and whiteness. In this photograph, viewers are shown disturbing evidence of self-destructive violence: the self-inflicted wound of racism is portrayed. This unnerving image is dominated by three children. In the foreground, an incongruously pale child lays splayed-out, corpse-like. Behind, a somewhat older child cradles a diapered infant in his arms. The baby sucks at a bottle while the child who holds him takes careful aim at his right eye with a toy revolver. As a viewer, we understand immediately that the gun is a toy, but this does nothing to limit the disturbance this image creates. The extremity of hard-line Afrikaner attitudes, an extremity which would find its counterpoint in the ‘one bullet, on settler’ slogan of its most vociferous black opponents, is envisioned here as
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a kind of minor domestic drama. The Afrikaner ideology of strength, individuality and force of arms is revealed to be a drive for death, leading inexorably to a zealous culling of the weak. The ritualized nationalism depicted in Goldblatt’s is unmasked in this photograph of a New Year’s picnic as a shocking ritual sacrifice, an infant sacrifice of profound (if metaphoric) barbarity and an eradication of innocence.

As Goldblatt’s friend and colleague, the Nobel laureate Nadine Gordimer, makes clear, the question of innocence is one Goldblatt ponders very seriously. Comparing whites who lived during the apartheid regime to Germans alive during the Nazi-era, she acknowledges that all ‘bear responsibility for the acts of their fellows.’ But she is still left wondering whether there were ‘some who were innocent.’ If so, what are the grounds for this innocence? She asks, ‘is ignorance, nurtured by political and social brainwashing, a form of innocence to be claimed by its recipients?’ For Gordimer, a particular Goldblatt photograph from another, similar series (In Boksburg) is a focus for these questions. In it, a young white girl in her tutu balances on her toe, arms aloft, eyes closed. A look of pure joy brightens her face almost magically. Gordimer wonders: ‘Is the aspirant dancer innocent? Could she be? If so, for how long, in and after apartheid South Africa?’ Reading this image against the one showing the picnic, one is forced to conclude that this girl’s innocence can only be preserved
wilfully. By confronting his viewers again and again with the problem of childhood innocence, Goldblatt tries to make the wilful blindness inherent to whiteness both manifest and unnatural.

Within this discursive regime, whiteness is always already a visual phenomenon, and it is presumed that racial distinctions are made through the visual perceptions of bodies. Like apartheid’s legal apparatus, the technology of photography also participates in the manufacturing of these perceptions. The ability to see whiteness, and by extension document it photographically, therefore involves a problem of perception and representation, a problem foregrounded by Goldblatt in ‘Wedding on a farm near Barkly East December 1966’ from Some Afrikaners Photographed.

In this photograph, we see, from behind, a photographer (perhaps a professional, perhaps an amateur). Bending over, he leans over his camera to capture a woman in her Sunday best holding a bouquet, performing her bourgeois respectability on the occasion of the celebration of a marriage, that most eminently bourgeois ritual. To her left, stand the bride and the groom, and one supposes that the older woman is one of their mothers. The bride awkwardly smiles (this is supposed to be the happiest day of her life, of course) and looks at something outside the frame of the photograph (or is she scanning the periphery of the crowd for an avenue of escape). For once in her life she is dressed like a queen, but it is not clear if she plays
the role comfortably. It is clear that the queen is always subordinate to the king: the groom demonstrates his mastery, grabbing his new bride’s wrist and neck roughly. The image clearly offers a catalogue of middle class, middle-brow patriarchy.

On the other side of the image, however, race intrudes unexpectedly. A black woman walks nervously out of the frame of the image. Though none of the whites spare her a glance, she looks over her shoulder at them nervously. She doesn’t matter to them. But she can’t afford to ignore them. In her white coat and against a whitewashed brick backdrop, the darkness of her skin stands out. We therefore see her through the lens of the mug shot and of ethnographic photography, in which blackness is always established through extreme contrast.

Goldblatt’s image would not be as powerful an articulation of race relations in apartheid-era South Africa were it not for the inclusion of the figure of the wedding photographer, who serves as an avatar for the other photographer on the scene, Goldblatt himself. The wedding photographer’s image would presumably not include this black passerby. Goldblatt’s photograph cannot avoid her. The presence of the photographer within the image establishes for the viewer the place of representation in the construction of racial identity in South Africa and acknowledges Goldblatt’s own culpability in this regime. The act and effect
of representing race make this image a kind of shorthand account for photography’s history in South Africa: whiteness appears as innocence, blackness as marginality, and the entire edifice tries madly and desperately to ignore its own construction and operation.

The usefulness of considering the pervasive representations of whiteness in visual media from the standpoint of critical white studies is that, once whiteness is revealed to be as raced as any other subject position, it might cease to function as hegemonic. The recognition and identification of visual strategies that accomplish this task of ‘racing’ whiteness is evidently an important task. The employment of such a strategy might allow one to strip away some of the aura of invulnerability that is bestowed by the mantle of normalcy, to undercut the universalizing authority of a humanism that is, in fact, specifically raced, gendered and classed. I believe the work of Hentie van der Merwe and David Goldblatt offer an intriguing model of how such a practice might be undertaken by socially-engaged artists.

Notes


4 Ibid.


6 In 1948, the Afrikaner-dominated National Party instituted apartheid, an intricate legal framework which formalized and extended an already-existing system of racial segregation in South Africa. The system officially ended in 1994, when South Africans voted in their first universal suffrage general elections, electing Nelson Mandela president. For accessible general histories of South Africa which describe the apartheid system and put it into a broader historical context, see Leonard M. Thompson, *A History of South Africa*, third edition (New Haven: Yale Nota Bene, 2001) and Iris Berger, *South Africa in World History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

7 In addition to uniforms, the museum’s collection includes the official war art, photographs aircraft, armored fighting vehicles, small arms, edged weapons, medals, flags, etc. See *South African National Museum of Military History*, revised (Johannesburg: South African National Museum of Military History, 1983).

8 The ensuing discussion is adapted in part from material prepared by me for the catalogue of the exhibition *Snap Judgments* (see Okwui Enwezor, ed., *Snap Judgments: New Positions in African Photography* (New York: ICP/Stiedl, 2006), 166-73, 372), which was based on email communications with the artist. In conjunction with the exhibition, I also moderated an artist panel in which the artist participated. Useful accounts of van der Merwe’s artistic practice include: Rory Bester, “Raiding the Archive,” *NKA Journal of Contemporary African Art*, no. 6-7 (summer-fall 1997): 64; Hentie van der Merwe, with an essay by Rory Bester, *Trappings* (Johannesburg: Goodman Gallery, 2000); Tracey Murinik, “Hentie van der Merwe,” in 10 Years 100 Artists: Art in a Democratic South Africa, ed. Sophie Perryer (Cape Town: Bell-Roberts, 2004), 386-389. A selected bibliography on the artist should also include an essay prepared by him in response to criticism from artist and critic Kendall Geers: Hentie van der Merwe, “The Difference between Colonisation and Desire,” in *Grey Areas: Representation, Identity and Politics in Contemporary South African Art*, eds. Brenda Atkinson and Candice Breitz (Johannesburg: Chalkham Hill, 1999), 283-6.


10 The post-apartheid experience of the former members of 32 Battalion suggests that the link between this largely-Angolan unit and South African white power was evident to the ANC, which insisted that the unit be disbanded as part of the negotiations that led to the end of apartheid. Unable to return to Angola, soldiers were given South African citizenship and resettled in a squalid, dilapidated town on the edge of the Kalahari Desert. Feeling abandoned, many of the soldiers eventually found employment as mercenaries, working as members of the notorious Executive Outcomes. Several were jailed for alleged participation in a failed coup directed at oil-rich Equatorial Guinea (Craig Timberg, “African Coup Plot Leaves Kin Bereft: 65 Jailed for Role Were Poor Ex-Soldiers,” *Washington Post* (September 25, 2004), A13).

11 See, for example, the sequence of photographs taken by Themba Nkos in 1985 of balaclava clad security personnel killing a young activist during a raid (Themba Nkos, *The Time of the Comrades* (Johannesburg: Skotaville, 1987), 4-5).


13 Ibid., 438.
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