

https://dspace.org/

South African democracy in foreign policy: Response to the "Arab Spring" Uprisings

Ramsamy, Rebecca

2014-10-14
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/15726

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

University of Witwatersrand
Department of Humanities
Department of International Relations

MASTERS RESEARCH THESIS

MA International Relations

Title:

South African Democracy in Foreign Policy: Response to the "Arab Spring" Uprisings

Name: Rebecca Ramsamy

Student No.: 758301

Supervisor: Dr. Vishwas Satgar

17 February 2014

CONTENTS:

		Page
CHAPTER 1: Introduction		1
Research Question		2
Aim		2
Hypothesis		2
CHAPTER 2: Theory and Literature Review		3
(a.)	Democracy, Radical Democracy and Neoliberalism	3
(i.)	Democracy	3
(ii.)	Radical Democracy	8
(iii.)	The Neo-liberalism Challenge	18
(b.)	Democracy and Foreign Policy in Post-Apartheid South Africa	20
(i.)	Democracy in Post-apartheid South Africa	20
(ii.)	Foreign Policy in Post-apartheid South Africa	23
(iii.)	Foreign Policy during Mandela's Presidency	25
(iv.)	Foreign Policy during Mbeki's Presidency	26
(v.)	Foreign Policy during Zuma's Presidency	27
(c.)	The Arab Spring	28
(i.)	The Rise of Transnational Activism	28
(ii.)	Authoritarianism and the Arab World	31
(iii.)	Economic Dynamics of the Arab Spring	33
(iv.)	Islamism and the Arab Spring	35
(v.)	Social Agency in the Arab Spring	36
CHAPTER 3: Methodology & Limitations		42

CHAPTER 4: Radical Democracy to Neoliberal Market Democracy in South African Foreign Policy 45

(a.) South Africa's Transition: The Making of Radical Democracy 45
(i.) The Freedom Charter 1955 46
(ii.) Street Committees 46
(iii.) The United Democratic Front 47
(iv.) Reconstruction and Development Programme 48
(v.) Unionism in the Struggle against Apartheid 49
(vi.) The International Anti-apartheid Movement 51
(vii.) Analysis of Radical Democracy in South Africa's Transition to Democracy 52

(b.) The Discourse around the Role of Civic Movements and Civil Society in South Africa 54

(c.) The Shift from Radical Democracy to Neoliberalism in South Africa: The Influence on Foreign Policy 59

(i.) Radical Democracy Lost in Constitutionalism 59
(ii.) The Shift to Neoliberalism 61
(iii.) Neoliberalism in Foreign Policy 65
(iv.) South Africa's Foreign Policy in Africa 68
(v.) South Africa in the United Nations Security Council 71
(vi.) Analysis of South Africa's Post-apartheid Foreign Policy 72
(vii.) South Africa's Post-apartheid Response to the Middle East and Arab Countries 72
(viii.) Analysis: Domestic and International Meanings of South African Democracy 74

CHAPTER 5: CASE STUDIES: Tunisia and Egypt 76

(a.) Tunisia 76
(i.) Ben Ali's Regime 76
(ii.) The Revolution's Radical Democracy 80

(iii.) Analysis of Tunisia's Revolution 83
(iv.) South Africa's Response to the Tunisian Revolution 85
(v.) Analysis of South Africa's Response 87

(b.) Egypt 90
(i.) Mubarak's Regime 90
(ii.) The Revolution's Radical Democracy 93
(iii.) Analysis of Egypt's Revolution 98
(iv.) South Africa's Response to the Egyptian Revolution 100
(v.) Analysis of South Africa's Response 101

CHAPTER 6: Conclusion 104

Bibliography 109

List of Acronyms:

AAM	-	Anti-Apartheid Movement
AfDB	-	African Development Bank
ANC	-	African National Congress
APPO	-	Popular Assembly of the Peoples of Oaxaca
AU	-	African Union
AZAPO	-	Azanian People's Organisation
CDA	-	Critical Discourse Analysis
CODESA	-	Convention for a Democratic South Africa
COMESA	-	Common Market of Eastern and Southern Africa
COPE	-	Congress of the People
COSATU	-	Congress of South African Trade Unions
DA	-	Democratic Alliance
DBSA	-	Development Bank of South Africa
DFA	-	Department of Foreign Affairs
DIRCO	-	Department of International Relations and Cooperation
DRC	-	Democratic Republic of Congo
EAC	-	East African Community
ERSAP	-	Economic Restructuring and Adjustment Program
EU	-	European Union
FJP	-	Freedom and Justice Party
FOSATU	-	Federation of South African Trade Unions
GDP	-	Gross Domestic Product
GEAR	-	Growth, Employment and Redistribution
GFTA	-	Grand Free Trade Area
GNU	-	Government of National Unity
ICC	-	International Criminal Court
IFP	-	Inkatha Freedom Party

IMF	-	International Monetary Fund
MST	-	Movimento dos Trabalhadores Rurais Sem Terra (Landless Workers Movement)
NAC	-	National Association for Change
NCA	-	National Constituent Assembly
NEPAD	-	New Partnership for Africa's Development
NGO	-	Non-Governmental Organisation
NUMO	-	New Unity Movement
OAU	-	Organisation of African Unity
PAC	-	Pan-Africanist Congress
PRI	-	Panchayati Raj Institution
RDP	-	Reconstruction and Development Programme
SACP	-	South African Communist Party
SACTU	-	South African Congress of Trade Unions
SADC	-	South African Development Community
SADPA	-	South African Development Partnership Agency
SAIIA	-	South African Institute of International Affairs
SAWID	-	South African Women in Dialogue
TNC	-	Transitional National Council
TRC	-	Truth and Reconciliation Commission
UDF	-	United Democratic Front
UGTT	-	Union Générale des Travailleurs
UK	-	United Kingdom
UN	-	United Nations
UNSC	-	United Nations Security Council
US	-	United States
WTO	-	World Trade Organisation

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION:

The series of liberation movements in the Middle East and North Africa (in what has be become known as the "Arab Spring") has reignited the discourse on democracy and civil society engagement. The mass demonstrations on the streets of many countries in the Arab Spring have drawn the world's attention to a form of radical democracy that initiates regime change within an authoritarian state (Inbar 2012, 1). South Africa's transition from apartheid to democracy was equally 'radical' in nature; bringing down the apartheid government. This, in many ways, helped to construct the foundations of post-apartheid South Africa. South African post-apartheid foreign policy was largely influenced by the ideals of the African National Congress (ANC), Nelson Mandela's vision for foreign policy and other civil society organisations (Baiocchi and Checa 2009, 135).

This research report seeks to understand some of the influences in South Africa's response to the revolutionary movements in Egypt and Tunisia and in doing so, assesses South Africa's conception of democracy that is at work in its foreign policy. South Africa's foreign policy is complex and has many facets influencing it; however this research will engage in a discourse analysis to understand the extent to which South African foreign policy has taken radical democratic theory into its individual foreign policy actions. In a broader discourse, the research report will explore the clash of radical democracy and neoliberalism, and the implications for South Africa's conception of democracy.

The questions posed in this research report and the discourses it participates in, are relevant for the current international system and South Africa's engagement with the rest of the world. The phenomenon of the Arab Spring has brought new aspects to considerations of democracy and therefore this report seeks to highlight a new dynamic in the dialogue around democracy and the way it unfolds in South Africa's foreign policy. Much has been documented about South Africa's transition to democracy and its radical characterization; however there is a lack of literature and analysis about the changing conception of democracy in South Africa and how this translates into its foreign policy actions. The discourses around civic activism, the revolutionary tenets of radical democracy and other concepts such as neo-liberalism are assessed in relation to the Arab Spring and South African democracy.

Research Question:

What factors help understand the conception of democracy informing South African foreign policy in relation to the Arab Spring?

Sub-questions:

- What informs the conception of democracy in South Africa's post-apartheid domestic policies?
- What is the meaning of democracy in South Africa's post-apartheid foreign policy?
- What role does radical democracy play in South Africa foreign policy?
- To what extent does radical democracy influence South Africa's response to the Arab Spring?

Aim:

To determine to what extent radical democracy influenced South African foreign policy in its interaction with the Arab Spring and in doing so, understand South Africa's conception of democracy and its execution in its foreign policy.

Hypothesis:

South Africa's foreign policy response to the Arab Spring was not informed by radical democracy and the influence of radical democracy in South Africa's conception of democracy is less prevalent.

CHAPTER 2

THEORY AND LITERATURE REVIEW:

(a.) Democracy, Radical Democracy and Neoliberalism

(i.) Democracy

The concept of democracy is an expansive and contested concept that is rooted in ancient history. The idea and discourses around democracy are wide-ranging and have become a relevant topic for most issues in the international system. There are different theories and practices of democracy that are promulgated within the discourse of democracy; for example, neorealist theorist Kenneth Waltz presented anarchy as the single most important feature controlling international relations. However, events motivated by citizens in history have influenced the direction of democracy as well. One of the significant changes in the international system that consolidated the spread of democracy was the end of the Cold War in 1989; which saw the decline of communism as a viable theory and form of governance and the rise of democracy – and especially, the US's capitalist version of democracy (Braun 2004). The end of the Cold War had many effects on the development of democracy adopted in many countries around the world. Many point to the effects of globalization, the convergence of ideas and means of governance, and the expansion of the neoliberal free market economy. However, Milja Kurki (2010) also notes that after the Cold War, the expansion of the idea of liberal democracy crushed the appreciation for the many meanings of democracy that can be derived and applied in governance; authors exploring models outside of the liberal model of democracy have not really been given a voice. The ideal of democracy and perceptions of democracy have been largely influenced by a liberal model of democracy that many countries have adopted.

David S Meyer (2004) believes that ideas from Mary Kaldor should be considered in the post-Cold War analysis of democracy. Meyer mentions the rise of activism and peace movements in the 1980s were focused not only on gaining democratic reform but also to create proposals that controlled weapons and arms development. Kaldor brings forth the idea of a "global civil society" (Meyer 2004, 298) and emphasizes the importance of non-state actors in the international system, working toward a constructivist tradition of international relations. At the end of the Cold War, many activists proposed determinist and security-based explanations for the rise of democracy; however there was

a void in considering the important impact of Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and transnational networks.

Thomas A Koelble and Edward Lipuma (2008) present a thought-provoking argument in saying that different histories and cultures create different democracies. The conventional measuring models of democracy are inadequate in measuring the progress of democracy in postcolonial settings. They believe that countries developing in a postcolonial state are unique in constructing their state and developing their domestic capabilities. Their position as emerging market economies means that they have different perceptions of the relationship between the individual and community than Western and European countries. They also assert that increasing people's participation in their own democracy would require far more than liberalising the election laws or setting up effective institutions; it entails exercising control over the globalising political economy so that it does not weaken the prospects for democracy. They argue that after the Cold War, many postcolonial countries have been supporting a colonial-like authoritarian centralization of power to serve the interests of the elite in the liberal economies. The post-Cold War international system therefore, presents the challenge of countries at different stages of development integrating into a liberal political economy, while still trying to maintain people's participation in democracy.

Robert Dahl is seen a prominent author and analyst that influenced the discourse around democracy theory and practice. Dahl's book, 'On Democracy' published in 1998, describes his thoughts on democracy in the domestic and international system. Dahl briefly outlines the ancient assemblies of democracy in Athens and Rome; and then proceeds to explore the origins of representative democracy and differentiates it from assembly democracy. He deduces that when representatives replace the direct participation of the citizenry in an assembly, a new form of democracy is created. He asserts that the principle of 'majority rule' has become a feature of modern democracy (where the will majority determines the outcome). However, it becomes more complex when citizens elect representatives to express their needs – instead of participating themselves in an assembly form of democracy. Dahl shows how modern democracy develops from this form of representative democracy using universal franchise as its mechanism for representation; this is often referred to as the 'rule by the many' or "polyarchal" (Donohue 2000, 435) democracy. Dahl also considers political equality as a quality that is important for democracy to embrace; societies that support political equality have a higher chance of voluntary cooperation and participation from citizens, and he believes that it is a strong deterrent for authoritarian governments as it ensures that citizens' interests are considered. He considers the right of participation and the right to vote as fundamental to democracy but he also mentions that the freedom of speech is one of the most

important freedoms to be offered in a democracy, necessary for creating a culture of "human freedom" (Donohue 2000, 435-436). Jacinda Swanson (2007) critiques the link that Dahl makes between politics and economics. Dahl refers to the historical and political nature of markets; however Swanson (2007) thinks that Dahl tends to see the economy as an autonomous realm with its own rules and laws. Swanson believes that the "rules" and laws of the economy do not only have an impact on the political functioning of states, but it can limit the scope of democracy and permissible forms of political intervention. Dahl expresses reservations about economic inequalities and negative impact that it would have on democracy; he calls for a more decentralised economy and more democratic control over economic enterprises. He considers the historical nature of markets and reasons that there is a need for governments to intervene and regulate markets, providing conditions for market capitalism. Inequality created in the economy would undermine the democratic political procedures and his idea of a worker-driven democracy. Swanson however, argues that Dahl does not provide adequate mechanisms of dealing with the economic problems that he identifies. It is established that the nature of markets are complex, diverse and social and perhaps Dahl may over look some alterations that could be made to reassert the influence of democracy in the economy. Dahl recognises some of the advantages of market capitalism, but emphasizes the fact that it directly causes economic inequalities which also undermines political equality. The hierarchical organisation of private economic enterprises has a direct link to the problems of inequalities in income, status skills, control of information etc. He also observes that the United States' (US) acceptance of these hierarchical structures in business, its military and government bureaucracies goes against the ethos of democracy – despite the US being hailed as the torch-bearer for democracy. What emerges from this engagement between Dahl and Swanson is the fact that democracy in the international system and in specific states is inextricably linked to the dynamics of the economy. Dahl's arguments make it clear that is there is economic inequality, it will have negative impact on political equality as well – as is seen in the US and other Western countries. Swanson's argument has value however, in highlighting the complex nature of the international economy and that there is potential for inserting democratic elements into the economy of a state.

In an article about the formation of the European Union (EU) and the dilemma of citizen participation in democracy, Dahl (1994) explains that societies and economies have always been subject to external influences that are beyond their control. However, he believes that people have come to the realization that a country's decisive actions are not exclusively controlled by the people of the country either. In this way, transnational actions can be decided upon (in institutions such as the EU) without consent of the country's people; this reduces their autonomy and limits democracy. This feature of the international system has also put countries in difficult positions as they become

reliant on foreign investors who - if they do not please or make the right decisions- could withdraw their investment. This places control in the hands of the external environment of the state.

Hannah Arendt's ideas of democracy are also cited in the discourse around democracy. Arendt did not directly address theories of democracy; however aspects of her thoughts on the political and the social realm largely influenced and challenged the development of democracy in the modern day. Arendt focuses on the theory and practice of representative democracy. She poses her ideas of representative democracy for the masses of people; to be seen as a practical form of governance, not just a theory. Arendt rejected the notion of individualism and her works deal with aspects of power, forms of direct democracy, authority and totalitarianism. She asserted that totalitarianism developed as a result of the indifference from the majority of ordinary citizens and although it may seem that the majority supported totalitarian leaders such as Hitler and Stalin, they in fact, were a majority that did not participate in the political realm. Her conception of the 'political' has many aspects involving not just the state, but a determinate public space that any person could participate in (Wolin 1983). Author George Kateb (1983) argues that Arendt's idea of keeping representative democracy alive, would involve us assuming that representative democracy is completely legitimate and the politics of consent. The laws and policies of this form of representative democracy would have to be considered (by everyone) as an authoritative force, coming from a political authority and instructed by the people of the state. This could be seen as a challenge to implementing and fully realising representative democracy. In order for democracy to really function, electoral procedures as well as aspects of constitutionalism would have to be implemented in an environment where people also felt represented and would respect the decision-making of their representatives.

"Market Democracy", also referred to as "Capitalist Democracy" is a system proposed to be based on democratic principles in combination with a market-based economy. It encourages a capitalist free market system, liberalism and pluralism. In the post-Cold War era, this form of democracy has been implemented in many countries across the Western world and has been promoted and adopted in many other parts of the world as well (Shiva 2011). Dahl's arguments focus on the potential limitations of this form of democracy. Other contemporary analysts such as Vandana Shiva (2011) voice the same concerns; in an article entitled "The Lies of Free Market Democracy", he shows that this system of capitalist democracy is not working and recent protests against governments (in the US, Europe, Middle East and around the world) signal the people's cry for an alternative. He argues that the free market give the perception of a liberal society, but it allows freedom only for corporations and businesses that are given the freedom also to exploit other people and forms of governance.

John Mueller (2010) applies Dahl's idea of the "historical movement of ideas" to explaining the growing acceptance of capitalism and peace. Although he asserts that the aversion of war and free-market capitalism have overlapping trajectories, he does not try to suggest that the capitalism has helped avoid war. He does assert however, that peace or the aversion of war has facilitated capitalism and that has generated the perception that peace is more closely associated with capitalism rather than democracy. This can perhaps be seen as another way in which capitalist democracy has been entrenched in minds of people and politicians as the only form of democracy that is viable and encourages peace in the international system. It shows the tendency of states deviating toward capitalist principles rather than democratic principles because the propagation of capitalism has ensured that states are peaceful in their interaction with other states. However, Mueller does not present a case for how capitalism has facilitated satisfaction and peace in the domestic environment. Some might argue that capitalism has its merits in uniting a country and facilitating a good economy, increasing the standards of living for many people and allowing for social standards like education to flourish. Robert A. Packenham and William Ratliff (2007) for example, argue that in 1973, former Chilean President, Augusto Pinochet implemented a rigorous set of capitalist economic reforms that actually benefitted the country's development and significantly reduced the rate of inflation etc. They recognise the fact that many saw Pinochet's reforms as a harsh form of neoliberalism that eliminated any role of the state or regulation in the economy. However, they present evidences to show that Pinochet did go back and regulate some of the economic reforms and contributed to social programs. Despite their arguments, even they could not ignore the significant impact that the neoliberal policies has in ignoring degradation of human rights and liberties and the link of authoritarianism with neoliberal (or market democracy) policies.

The discourse on democracy has presented different arguments and theories, drawing on different ideas and analysts' opinions. In navigating the literature on democracy in the post-Cold War period, it is evident that the emergence and dominance of liberal democracy and what some authors call neoliberalism, is prevalent. Many of the articles address the effects of this kind of democracy which inevitably intertwines the political and the economic aspects of the domestic and international arena. It is interesting to note the effect that activism had in the post-Cold War period where new democracies were being formed. Mary Kaldor's work highlighted the fact that there has been a development of a "global civil society" (Meyer 2004, 298), which other analysts have used in their theories and discourse around democracy and how people participate in creating their version of democracy. Theorists like Robert Dahl and Hannah Arendt contribute to the discourse by highlighting ideas of representative and direct democracy that encourage a people-centred

democracy. Dahl aptly highlights the complexities in representative democracy and how the principle of a ruling majority can be meaningless without active and informed participation. Dahl touches on an important aspect of democracy when he considers political equality, as I think the lack of equality in the political and economic realm of a state or international system would not only cause a lack of legitimacy and political will. Dahl's emphasis on the importance of active participation the "culture of human freedom" (Donohue 2000, 435) perhaps can be linked to Mary Kaldor's idea of the significance of civil society in shaping modern democracy. Hannah Arendt's contribution to the discourse on democracy inspires us to consider the functioning of representative democracy and what it means to legitimately represent the will of the country's people. However, a common trait in the discourse around democracy emerges again in that Arendt also encourages a public space for all citizens and representative to engage in in order to secure the legitimacy of those making decision. One of the most prevalent criticisms of these theorists and authors are that although they recognise certain qualities of democracy and emphasize the importance of citizen participation and representation, many fall short of suggesting ways of implementing their ideas in practice. As Jacinda Swanson (2007) and George Kateb (1983) show, it may be difficult to incorporate political and economic reforms that ensure citizen participation, equality and justice; especially since Dahl himself notes that societies and economies have become subject to external influences that are beyond their control (Dahl, 1994). Packenham and Ratliff (2007) touch on the idea that neoliberalism and versions of market democracy are linked to negative consequences for the human rights of citizens and their legitimate representation.

(ii.) Radical democracy

In discovering the emphasis on citizen participation that many authors assert and the dominance of liberal democracy, the concept of radical democracy emerges as an important contributor to the discourse on democracy. The concept of radical democracy is also a contested concept, it has no definite boundaries. However, tenets of radical democracy can be identified in South Africa's transition to democracy as well as the Arab Spring movements. Exploring the characteristics of radical democracy, allows insight to be gained into South Africa's conception of democracy and whether it has changed since democracy in 1994.

Origins and Influences of Radical Democracy:

Radical democratic theory is a fluid concept that provides a critique on dominant liberal conceptions of democracy. Authors such as William Connolly, Judith Butler and Wendy Brown, Chantal Mouffe and Ernesto Laclau have been the main contributors toward radical democratic theory. The theory challenges the dominant discourse surrounding democracy and highlights the complexity of

democracy which many liberal democratic institutions and countries do not consider (Little 2010). Therefore, a country could claim to have a democratic government based on the fact that they hold contestable elections and provide mechanisms for citizen representation and participation; however, radical democracy emphasizes the inequality that exists within a so-called 'democratic' state. Radical democracy has contributed to the recent debates in political theory which have focused on improving existing systems of democracy – including more deliberative and participatory aspects. Radical democracy emerges from various different influences; although only a few theorists identify themselves as radical democrats. It involves approaches like Agonism, Focauldian genealogy and Derrida's method of deconstruction. It is a theory based on the exclusions and inequalities that are characteristic of liberal democracy. Post-structuralist, Ernesto Laclau, mentions that there is a void at the heart of democracy and the concept of hegemony would help to fill, although neoliberals have established hegemony over the dominant interpretations of democracy. Wendy Brown asks the question of how radical democrats could reclaim the concept of democracy from these dominant neoliberal hegemonic forces. Brown sees radical democracy as creating attachments to democracy that enable freedom, equality and cultural inclusion – something which neoliberalism does not guarantee (Ibid).

William Connolly's (1999) contribution focuses on the limits of the conservative brand of liberal democracy that limits the cultural economy and economic culture of the international system. He supports a radical pluralist approach to governance; he seeks to make democracy more 'democratic'; therefore wanting democracy to have a more pluralist order. Wendy Brown and Judith Butler also critique liberalism, but do not directly tackle the problems of democracy. However, authors such as social theorist, Slavoj Žižek (2008) recognise that in liberal democracy there exists a certain 'violence' to how the rule of law is implemented; there is the exclusion of minority perspectives in creating popular sovereignty and there is the marginalization of various cultural and socio-economic inequalities. Clive Barnett (2004) recognises that radical democracy focuses on the contestation of the boundaries of "the political" (Barnett 2004, 504); therefore supporters of radical democracy see that a public space or political sphere that incorporates people's opinions and mechanisms of participation, is declining under the influence of liberal democracy. This idea of "the political" is drawn from authors such as Hannah Arendt and Robert Dahl who show a shift toward more representative and direct forms of democracy that has a space for ordinary people to interact and participate in governance (Wolin, 1983).

Simon Springer (2010) examines the concept of radical democracy by looking at this aspect of 'public space' or 'the political'. He concludes that when a society lacks a dynamic public space which

facilitates “agonistic” (Springer 2012, 525) engagement among different political groups and identities; the society will become more adverse toward each other. Radical democracy is not simply about the masses mobilising for a regime change; but it also advocates for the end of a systematic rule and dispersing power more evenly across the country. Powerful elites have based their power on hierarchical constructions which are rooted in moral, juridical and economic frameworks. Springer (2010) suggests that radical democracy may be the path toward social justice; a constant means without a particular end. He shows that the predominance of neoliberalism means that the public space has become the primary mode of representing the ordinary citizens’ interests in capital and economic structures of the state.

Other contributors and influencers to radical democracy theory include: Sheldon Wolin, Rosa Luxemburg, and Raya Dunayevskaya. Sheldon Wolin is an American political theorist that has contributed much to the discourse on democracy in general. He believes that true democracy is evident in its practicality; he sees it as a tool for concrete social change which keeps people in state of progression. Wolin thinks that there is much more pragmatic use of democracy than in periodic voting; active engagement in all matters of civic life would enable the society to grow a sense of community and solidarity. He believes that the current age of democracy lacks such form of engagement in the political processes of government; which limits the feeling of power that the people have within themselves. Wolin does not believe that achieving this form of engagement would require destroying the rich, but it would require providing each citizen with the power to determine the course of their own life in sovereignty of the self and self-determination (Henderson 2013).

Rosa Luxemburg, along with Antonio Gramsci was considered as a leading thinker on the European workers’ movement. Luxemburg wrote on the applicability of Marxism and democracy; she agreed with the Bolsheviks’ attempt in Russia to build a workers’ state that worked on workers’ and soldiers’ council; however she disagreed with the Bolsheviks’ crack- down on dissent. Although Rosa Luxemburg did not survive World War I, her ideas of a worker-based state- that involved the rights and consultation of ordinary people through councils- influenced authors such as Mouffe and Laclau who frequently cite her work (Custers, 2011).

Raya Dunayevskaya was an influential Marxist economist and philosopher. She introduced the developed a theory of state capitalism in the 1940s and eventually developed the theory of ‘Marxist Humanism’, focusing on Marx’s earlier work. She believed that state capitalism, whether appropriated by the West or East, generated forms of social resistance. Her work greatly influenced

socialist and Marxist theorists who would later use her ideas to also develop the idea of radical democracy (Anderson 1988).

Therefore, it is evident that the underpinnings of radical democracy and its influencers have been grounded in socialist and Marxist theory. These theorists emphasized the importance of a form of governance that incorporated the participation and interests of the ordinary people of the country – and especially the workers' interests. The prevalence of Marxist authors in the conception of radical democracy shows that democracy and Marxism (and forms of socialism) are not contrasting theories as many liberal democrats might view it to be. Radical democracy opens up preconceived ideas that democracy is inextricably linked to capitalism and liberal forms of democracy. According to these theorists, democracy has a meaning that fundamentally involves the people, their interests, equality their participation in the decision-making of the state. C. Douglas Lummis (1996) believes that radical democracy is democracy in its essential form; it places democracy at the centre of polity. He suggests that democracy in its essence has a 'leftist' or socialist influence as it stands in defence against forms of centralised power.

A Post-Marxist Aspect of Radical Democracy:

Chantal Mouffe and Ernesto Laclau (1985) are prominent authors and introduce a post-Marxist paradigm to the theory of radical democracy. In their book, 'Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics' they refer to radical democracy as a post-Marxist tradition, promoting discourses surrounding class, political identity and social self-understanding to be incorporated into democracy. Post-Marxism uses aspects of Marxist theory which has been rejected as a failed theory or method of governance because of the fall of Communism and the authoritarian and totalitarian tendencies that became associated with Marxism. The authors consider the future of the 'Left' after the Cold War, and the failure of a Soviet-style form of socialism. They consider the new wave of social movements that emerged among the protests of 1968 (in France, the US and many other countries) that advocated a post-Marxist reformulation of the socialist project in the form of radical and plural democracy. Mouffe and Laclau (1985) break away from contemporary leftist projects by not only recognising but including the dominance of liberal democracy in their analysis and theory-development. Their post-Marxist ideas looked at democratic struggles beyond the economy, class and Jacobin model of revolutionary politics and instead included struggles relating to race, gender and the environment. They saw democracy as a contingent, conflictual, constructive and open-ended project among many evolving identities of democracy. They also sought to incorporate a 'collective will' of old and new democratic struggles in forming the theory of

radical democracy. Their book also focuses heavily on 'the political'; focused on the struggle for hegemony and the need to create collective forms of political identities (Conway and Singh 2011).

Chantal Mouffe emphasizes the importance of democratic revolutions in diverse democratic struggles. She asserts that this would help to create a new "common sense" and a new creation of democracy that is more inclusive and allows for both individual and political liberty (Mouffe and Holdengräber 1989, 42). Mouffe also asserts that modern democracy (and the liberal democracy model which has been widely adopted) maintains that all human beings are equal and free, yet there are no radical principles for organising society. The problem is not the ideals of modern democracy, but it is the fact the principles which it promotes are far from being implemented effectively; therefore a new society needs to be initiated in order to see the basic principles of democracy unfold. Radical democracy aims to address the articulation of popular sovereignty, civic equality with liberal principles of natural rights, constitutional government and the separation of powers.

Ernesto Laclau (2005) presents the idea of populism and attempts to draw a relationship between populism and democracy. He makes a distinction between democracy as a form of rule (that includes the principle of sovereignty for the people) and democracy as a symbolic framework within which democratic rule is implemented. He claims that modern democracy has been largely influenced by the 'democratic revolution' and the emergence of the idea that power should be exercised by the people has become significant in the discourse around democracy as a symbolic framework. Laclau also distinguishes certain political identities in a democracy and claims that the people's (or the proletariat's) role is important in creating collective ideologies and representatives.

Critique of Mouffe and Laclau:

Janet Conway and Jakeet Singh (2011) make an assessment of different conceptions of radical democracy. They critique Chantal Mouffe's theoretical understanding of radical democracy, how it has evolved and then they assess new forms of radical democracy that have emerged in practice. The authors believe Chantal Mouffe's idea of democracy is rooted in a Western's conception of modernity; while the more recent "subaltern" movements of radical democracy are developed by the 'Third' and 'Fourth' Worlds. They identify three main manifestations of radical democracy;

1- The logic and manner of articulation among different struggles and movements
2- The orientation and aspirations toward the state
3- The relation to the idea of a global scale 'pluriverse'

Since the World Social Forum in 2001, there has been a change in the collective cry by the "global justice movement"; there is more radical awareness of pluralism along with a widely shared

desire for a more popular form of democracy. For global movements and forums such as the World Social Forum, radical democracy (in its varied forms) is a struggle against an authoritarian imposition of neoliberal globalization existing in almost every society in the world at the moment; this invokes new relations of imperialism. The export of a Western-style liberal democracy; which is widely seen as the only legitimate model of governance in the world, guarantees the procurement of recognition, aid and trade with the West. There are scholars such as James Tully that argue that dominant forms of representative democracy, self-determination and democratization are not alternatives to imperialism; rather they are a form of neo-imperialism operating against the demands of the majority of the population in the post-colonial world. The combination of democracy and the globalization of Western capitalist modernity have influenced new theories of "global democracy"; which many seen as a form of imperial domination over Third and Fourth world countries.

Self-sufficiency, autonomy and territory are the new "emancipatory" political demands emerging from opposition movements around the world that challenge hegemony within practices of Western capitalist modernity. Conway and Singh's (2011) critique and arguments are informed by Latin American "modernity/coloniality'; which asserts that coloniality still exists even in the present day and sees that coloniality and modernity are inextricably linked.

Conway and Singh (2011) argue that Mouffe and Laclau's assertions are situated in the history of Western modernity and its dominant political tradition of liberal democracy. They suggest that this conception of radical democracy became radical liberal democracy which included radicalization, democratization and a type of political regime that is associated with the modern West. They argue that this does not create a new society but rather it just adapts to the liberal democratic tradition. Mouffe and Laclau (2011) separate economic and economic forms of liberalism; treating capitalism as if it can be contained within the economic sphere.

Will Leggett (2013) describes Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe's propositions of radical democracy which embrace a discourse-centred politics. Leggett (2013) however, critiques' Mouffe's analysis by suggesting that although radical democracy and its post-structuralist formation allows important insights into political subjectivity and antagonism; it also weakens its own critical and strategic capacity. He suggests that radical democracy could be more theoretically and politically effective if it would "recuperate its Gramscian heritage". He believes Gramscian theory offers a more realist (yet non-determinist) account of the structural. Gramscian theory also allows for an institutional space for society. Leggett asserts (similarly to Springer) that society or the "public space" is where political

identities are created and expressed and from where power relations are challenged. However, Legett mentions that the conception of society also points to the institutional limits to politics.

Barnett (2004) also describes the exclusion of radical democracy; saying that radical democracy affirms the necessity of delimiting the political. Conceptions of 'us' and the 'other' are brought into his argument; radical scholars like Chantal Mouffe assert that constituting an 'us' without determining a 'them' would be impossible. Despite the fact that this principle is exclusionary, I think it is true to a certain extent. However, Barnett argues that this idea renders 'otherness' in a derivative term. Politics therefore, is seen by radical democratic theorists as a process of pacification between an 'us' and the 'other'.

Conway and Singh (2011) recognise that they favour conceptions of democracy that is rooted in the 'social'; therefore taking democracy seriously as ethics and practice, nurtured in relationships of respect and reciprocity and grounded in existing communities. They see radical democracy not as struggles over the politics of hegemony in the national political regime within the state; but as a reclaiming and defending communal commons against exploitations. They believe that democracy cannot be reduced to modern institutional forms; the concept of democracy is mobilised and struggled over many different actors. Walter Mignolo argues that democracy is a conception that encourages broader thinking or the practice of confronting, provincialising and displacing hegemony. I agree with the notion that democracy is perhaps broader than seeking institutional reform and displacing hegemony. I also think that radical democracy has evolved in the international system in a way that lends itself more to reclaiming and defending commons (and the rights of peoples) against exploitation. However, it is undeniable that radical democracy has a string Marxist influence in that it re-introduced aspects of socialism to the discourse around representations and democracy. Leggett (2013) and Barnett (2004) slow highlight an important strain that emerges from Mouffe and Laclau's literature; its capacity to alienate certain aspects of democracy.

Radical Democracy in Practice:

Since the late 1980s, Third World scholar-activists have been advancing notions of radical democracy; engaging in practices of grassroots movements with little or no influence from Western-centric political-theoretical tradition. The traditions of radical and participatory democracy are often referred to as "indigenous governance". One such scholar-activist is Gustavo Esteva, who describes the notion of radical democracy in the recent struggles on the state of Oaxaca in Mexico. In Oaxaca, the Popular Assembly of the Peoples of Oaxaca (APPO) was mobilised by a local teachers union under the harsh repression of Governor Ulises Ruiz. The APPO converged with many organisations

and movements to express their defiance against Ruiz's regime; which they essentially displaced for five months until their movement was repressed in 2006. However, the movement initiated changes and capacities for expressing plurality and voices against a repressive regime. Three levels of the struggle for democracy are identified within the APPO, which Conway and Singh (2011) find to be consistent within many other democratic movements in Third and Fourth world countries:

1 – The need to improve formal democratic processes by eliminating dysfunctional government systems such as corruption and electoral fraud.

2 – To introduce more levels of participatory democracy or citizen involvement into the government through mechanisms such as popular initiative, referenda and plebiscites, re-call, participatory budgeting, transparency and societal oversight of administrative processes.

3 – Institutionalize (formally and practically) radical democracy; which is derived from longstanding traditions of indigenous communities.

Esteva discovers that the struggle for radical democracy focuses on popular initiative; therefore on what people can do to change the conditions that they're living in.

(Conway and Singh 2011).

The theoretical foundations of radical democracy all focus on popular initiative. The APPO in Mexico is an example of people who have not necessarily been elected into positions of power, initiating a movement in defiance against a regime that they find to be corrupt and unrepresentative. The fact that the movement was mobilised by a teachers union, show how ordinary citizens that recognise a deficiency in their governance have made an effort to change it. The APPO is not a political party or opposition party that has a representative leader and would stand for elections. The repressive Ruiz regime could have possibly quelled such a political threat, but the fact that it is a grassroots movement that consists of different types of people, makes it more difficult for the Ruiz regime to target and repress. What also makes the APPO a mechanism of radical democracy, is the fact that the people have demanded change to introduce more participatory elements of democracy; the people of the Oaxaca state have demanded terms by which they want their state in Mexico to be run and they have demanded a radical conception of democracy that not only stands against authoritarianism and corruption, but also promotes the creation of a more horizontal leadership in the state where people have a say, not just elected officials. This goes beyond just the accountability of elected leaders, but actually integrates the participation of the people in decision-making (Ibid).

There are also new forms of social movements such as the movement in Kerala, India, where they have adopted a participatory budgeting or the "panchayat" system of village democracy. This system of governance promotes a unified civil society; it decentralizes democracy through local institutions

called Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) these play a role in protecting local citizens and local economies from the neoliberal market. Part of radical democracy is fighting against the effects of neoliberalism and the manipulation of the economy by elitists in the capitalist system. However, it is still to be seen as to how effective such experiments of these grassroot movements will be in broader contexts; states may react adversely to challenges to their sovereignty (Ibid).

In Brazil also, a workers movement called the Landless Workers Movement or '*Movimento dos Trabalhadores Rurais Sem Terra'* (MST) was formed by rural workers and by those citizens who wanted to fight against land reform and social inequality in rural areas in Brazil. The MST social movement occupied large landed estates and became a national movement in 1984. The movement has led over 2500 land occupations and have settled almost 370 000 families as a result of the occupations of millions of acres of land. They continue to fight for schools, credit for agricultural production and cooperatives as well as access to health care. They fight for the realization of their political, social economic, environmental and cultural rights in Brazil (Friends of the MST, 2014). This movement shows a form of radical democracy because it is a movement of people that have taken initiative against the land reform inequality in their country. The people feel oppressed and view their economic and social circumstance as a direct result of the policies implemented by a government that does not represent their interests and well-being. Many citizens all over the world may feel the same way in their own circumstances and similar local movements and campaigns may have the same grievances; however the MST movement have responded in a way that does not engage with the established form of governance – looking for representation and legitimacy from those in power – but rather, they have sought to rectify their situation through occupations. Many would contest the legality and legitimacy of this movement and their occupations of land. However, I think that traits of radical democracy are evident because the movement has created a public space where citizens can engage and react to the occupations.

Despite these challenges of radical democracy, evidence of radical democracy can be found in recent history where people present a form of radical democracy through protests which challenge the government. Kurt Anderson (2011) notes that Protesters were the "prime makers of history" (Anderson 2011, 2); where citizen activism in multitudes took to the streets without weapons to show their opposition, during the 1980's especially. These movements used to be considered as important and consequential for the dynamics of any country or indeed, global politics. Protest movements in Eastern Europe after the fall of Communism were among those significant movements. The protests for social change in Poland developed into the trade union, 'Solidarity', which advanced workers' rights and social change - not just in Poland, as it also inspired other

Eastern European countries too. However, he believes that these forms of protests receded after the dominant force of Western liberalism entered the international system. Anderson mentions that there were a few exceptions as in the case of South Africa where protests were a successful means of toppling a government (along with many other factors such as sanctions). For a time, the idea of a mass street demonstrations was seen as contradictory and essentially not possible. However, Anderson recognises the Arab Spring which has reignited this form of radical and populous protests that has been effective. The Arab Spring and many of the protest movements before it show a form of radical democracy as the protests have made a significant impact in shaping the policies and behaviour of governments. Many of these protest movements have been for social and economic change and many of them would have developed into influential political and non-governmental organisations which hold their governments accountable for decisions they make, but they also provide a platform for active participation and debate. These organisations even transcend the boundaries of states and mobilise international support.

An example of the influence of Non-governmental Organisations (NGOs) and International Organisations (developed by protest movements) is perhaps evident in the 'Greenpeace' Movement that campaign against climate change, nuclear power and the pollution and lack of protection for forests, oceans etc. Greenpeace often draws attentions to their campaign through means of protests which mobilise international citizens from all over the world on streets and at international state meetings (Greenpeace International, 2014).

Critiques of Radical Democracy:

Darrel Enck-Wanzer (2008) makes a theoretical analysis of the concept of radical democracy. He describes democracy as a broad category of inquiry; and we should not treat it like other rhetorical conventions (such as the realist style) or legal aesthetics which have definitive boundaries. He claims that we would risk deviating from the terrain of democracy by trying to organize radical democracy into a particular framework. He believes that democracy needs to be recognised as something other than a form of government. He essentially concludes that radical democracy should not be stylised as it is a hybridization of traditions and relations between others. However, I think that this way of thinking of democracy could also lean toward an essentialist perspective. I think that radical democracy has its limitations in being a so-called "hybridization" of traditions because it makes the concept less concrete. However, I think that the concept of democracy is fluid, changing and incorporating different perceptions of democracy into radical democracy is adding value to the concept.

Radical democracy however, may seem like an idealistic form of government that is never fully realised in practice.

Clive Barnett (2004) also provides a critique of the theory of radical democracy; assessing the differences that radical democracy makes between "politics" and "the political". Barnett refers to "destructive" themes present in the radical democracy. The author observes that politics can refer to a narrow range of practices like periodical elections, activities by political parties, and policy-making and legislation in government. However, a recent upsurge in the interest in elements of participatory democracy show the idea that there is a difference between routine politics and activities that define routine democracy. Various social movements have helped to redefine what counts as politics; these social movements have highlighted the necessity of visible public contention and developing new practices which pursue political objectives. Therefore, radical democratic theorists purport the idea that the "politics" exceeds its institutional forms. I think this is a valid argument to make as in contemporary international relations; conceptions of democracy and its execution have come from the rules and regulations of institutions rather than from popular and electoral decision-making. Theories of radical democracy tend to define "the political" as a realm of endless conflict, contestation and antagonism. Radical democracy critiques liberalism, and the author believes that tenets of deliberative democracy is overemphasized and valued too highly. The author believes that one cannot simply have liberal democracy and radical democracy in opposition to one another; they are not binary opposites. I agree with this sentiment however; I think that radical democracy's critique of liberal democracy is valid and even though many of radical democracy's principles are reactive to the shortfalls of liberal democracy – it is a necessary critique because of the dominance of liberal democracy in the international system today. I also disagree with the author that deliberative democracy can be always associated with the ethos of constant hostility. I think that perhaps the authors' perception of deliberative and participatory democracy is limiting his understanding of radical democracy and the values and principles that radical democracy promotes. The author also mentions radical democracy's suspicion of representation. However, I think that this should not be seen as a limiting factor when considering the quality or kind of democracy that a state supports. Representations should be contested in order to secure legitimacy – a characteristic of a state which influences the mechanism and success of democracy.

(iii.) The Neo-liberalism Challenge

South Africa and many other countries in the international system have to consider their need for financial resources and foreign investment; which influences its foreign policy. Neoliberalism plays a role in this respect, as it governs most countries' economic and foreign policies. Markets and

communication around the world have integrated with the development of technology. However, the global movement of capital has also limited social regulation mechanisms within states; mechanisms which were established through social and class struggles within the nation-state.

In broad terms, neoliberalism is a set of economic policies that a 'new' kind of economic liberalism. Liberalism has been documented and propelled by the theorists such as Adam Smith who essentially rejected government intervention in state economic affairs. No restrictions on manufacturing, limitations in commerce, no tariffs and the advancement of free trade was promoted by Smith and many other authors. They believed that free (or limitless) enterprise and free competition would be the best way for a country's economy to develop. Economic liberalism succeeded in the US and European countries during the 1800s and 1900s. During the 1930s however, the Great Depression signalled the capitalist crisis and new ideas critiquing capitalism and liberalism emerged. Despite this, the corporate elite revived economic liberalism over the last 25 years and the "new" form of liberalism emerged as neoliberalism on a global scale. Neoliberalism involves: the rule of the market in free enterprise; cutting public expenditure for social services; deregulation; privatization and eliminating the ideas of "public good" and "community". Institutions like the IMF, World Bank and Inter-American Development Bank have become synonymous with creating, supporting and enabling neoliberal policies (Martinez and Garcia 2014).

Public regulation has been considered as less important in neoliberal policies because the ambition toward successful capitalism has become more influential in a state's policy and decision-making. Although neoliberalism intended to create a free market order, it also facilitated inhumanity and exploitation of the free market – which seeks to gain maximum profits as its primary goal. Political democratic and regulatory rule therefore also suffers and the struggle of the working class is neglected. Global democratic rule under the supervision of neo-liberalism is threatened, and it has also thrown the democratic principles of the nation-states into uncertainty as well (Cho 2000). Therefore, it is apparent that neoliberalism directly affects important aspects of democracy. Neoliberalism and its capitalist policies redirect a state or country's attention toward attaining maximum profits.

Stephen Gill (1998, 21-22) brings forth the idea of a "new constitutionalism" that has been a feature of the international system since the 1990s, when the emergence of democratization and many new constitutions developed. New constitutionalism describes a mechanism to impose political neo-liberal reforms in the international system. New constitutionalism allow privileged rights of citizenship and representation to be subjected to corporate capital and large investors within the

country's Constitution or policy orientation. This emphasis on capital has limited the democratization process which has sometimes involved centuries of struggle for representation (Gill 1998). New constitutionalism locates democracy within the limited framework of a country's Constitution, while also justifies the implementation of neoliberal policies. Therefore, it puts the rights and representation of the people under the authority of a Constitution that may not be geared toward implementing social and economic justice and equality.

Neoliberalism and aspects of new constitutionalism can be located in many Africa countries' process of democratization. Rita Abrahamsen (1997) assesses the transition to democracy in Sub-Saharan Africa and recognises the relative importance of both internal and external causes of democratization. She asserts that in order to understand the African transitions to democracy and competitive politics, one has to consider the role of donors and creditors as actors. The promotion of democracy is highly valued, however it also competes with other foreign policy concerns, and often these other concerns has taken precedence. Donors of aid and investment are more concerned about the continued economic adjustment of a country than its quality of democracy (Abrahamsen 1997).

Alison J. Ayers (2009) identifies a 'new' imperialism in which a regime of democratization has allowed for a new form of imperial rule. She believes that the process of democratization inevitably incorporates neoliberal conception of democracy into its development. Neoliberal policies therefore, constitute as a new form of colonialism and imperialism, as the internationalization of the rule of capital is enforced in domestic regimes with specific conditions. By promoting 'democracy' and 'good governance', it legitimizes the neoliberal capitalist regime; however the neoliberal aspect of the economic policies adopted by the state does not engender social and economic justice. Therefore, democratization involves imposing a Western neoliberal procedural form of democracy on the imperialised people.

(b.) Democracy and Foreign Policy in Post-apartheid South Africa

(i.) Democracy in Post-apartheid South Africa

In 1994 South Africa began to establish its version of democracy in the country after being under the rulership of the authoritarian apartheid government. South Africa joined the 'third wave of democracy', and since then, there has been much debate about the consolidation of democracy in the country and the kind of democracy that it has produced. The consolidation of democracy

depends on the definition or conception of democracy that the country has employed, and South Africa is still developing that identity (Garcia-Rivero 2010).

South Africa has made much progress in eliminating racial inequality in its domestic politics and in 1996, adopted a Constitution that promised much for the social and economic injustices in the country as well. It is also important however, that the citizens who trust in institutions, have political tolerance and perceive their rights as protested. This would create democratic consolidation. There have been findings that show South African citizen are willing to extend political rights to their political opponents, which may show a certain level of political tolerance. However, there is also a perception from South African citizens that the institutions of government to whom they extend their rights to are not performing their tasks properly. Therefore, many analysts and citizens believe that institutions of government need stronger engagement with the rights and participation of citizens. If mistrust of the government continues, especially among minority groups, legitimacy would weaken and this may lead to instability, withdrawal or mobilisation outside of parliament. South African citizens have a strong culture of political protest and could easily be mobilised by populist leaders. Considering this, some authors believe that South Africa could follow the path of many Latin American countries where the lack of trust has degraded legitimacy and led to overthrowing their governments (Garcia-Rivero 2010). This shows that aspects of procedural democracy, involving electoral success and the creation of laws that allow for freedom, justice and equality are only one indicator if the state of democracy in a country. Garcia-Rivero (2010) highlights the fact that South Africa needs to work on its substantive aspects of democracy that would implement its socio-economic policies. He also suggests that the elected political party, the ANC is at risk of losing its legitimacy if it does not provide for the needs and interests of the people. It is encouraging to note however, that South Africa's strong political protests culture could affect the leadership of the government if the people are dissatisfied, as it shows a form of accountability and political participation in civil society.

David Saks (2009) mentions that following the fourth successive free and fair elections in 2009, there is a sense of cautious optimism about the path of South Africa's democracy. There are still many questions surrounding the corruptive forces of government and the legitimacy of President Zuma, given the cloud of controversy and corruption that surround him and some of his actions. There is also an encouraging sign from the reasonable performance and support given to the opposition parties such as the Democratic Alliance (DA) and the and the Congress of the People (COPE) parties; a competitive political may develop after many years of relative stagnations because of the

dominance of the ANC in gaining electoral votes and making decisions in parliament and government.

Despite the fact that South Africa is considered to have a vibrant modern democracy and although South African Constitution has been viewed as the world's most democratic (promising the right to water, food, education, security and healthcare); South Africa's democratic credentials are not entirely clear. It can be argued that to a certain extent, South African politics has degraded into an elitist system that is based more on patronage than the provision of services such as the access to water, electricity, healthcare and the social services that provide for social and economic equality. Although South Africa has elections that are held frequently and are contested, South Africa has a de facto one-party state ruled by the ANC. Although it has overcome racism, ethnicity and violence in legal terms, instances of race-based and ethnic-based violence continues (Raenette Taljaard 2009).

Despite some of these criticisms, many also assert that a people-centred form of governance is a fundamental principle of the ANC. The tripartite alliance of the ANC, the South African Communist Party (SACP) and the Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU) has a deep commitment to the people which many see as a populist aspect that is an advantage and disadvantage in policy formulation. Some speculate that this principle is promoted by the ANC only to gain popular support for a form of governance that in fact, only benefits an elite few. However, the fact that the tripartite alliance exists, contributes to accountability and a more diverse democratic society because the voices of other prominent organisations are being incorporated into governance. In the tripartite alliance, Nel and van der Westhuizen believe that in order for a more people-centred form of governance, the trade union movement, COSATU needs to play a more prominent role in the governance of the country (Nel and van der Westhuizen 2004).

Therefore, it is perceived that South African democracy has been successful in liberating the country from the apartheid regime; it has adopted several legal policies and frameworks that promise political, social and economic rights to all its citizens. The South African Constitution is seen to be the fundamental pillar of these changes since 1994. However, as analysts have shown in their assessment of South African democracy, the country's government needs to work on consolidating more participative and substantive elements of democracy. This needs to be done by delivering social and economic services and not limiting the decision-making processes to parliament. The dominance of the ANC political party is also seen to limit the competitive nature of South Africa's democracy and decision-making process to some extent as well. However, most authors and

analysts also show that the culture of protests and political engagement among South African people could hold the government's actions accountable.

(ii.) Foreign Policy in Post-apartheid South Africa

Foreign policy is usually considered to be the total of official plans and initiatives that the country is meant to adhere to when engaging with its external environment. Certain values and principles are also meant to be reflected. Analysts such as Philip Nel and Janis van der Westhuizen (2004) do not rely solely on this definition, as this state-centric definition cannot accurately capture all the dimensions of how South African citizens respond to their global environment. The state provides its citizens with security, and responds to external challenges; however foreign policy has a broader meaning for Nel and van der Westhuizen (2004). These authors consider democracy in foreign policy in the broader context of social responses to global economic and political patterns; they combine a procedural and substantive understanding of democracy in their navigation of South Africa's foreign policy. Other analysts such as Audie Klotz (2004) show that the international system has shaped and guided the development of South African foreign policy in the post-apartheid era. South African post-apartheid foreign policy is complex and is shaped by its domestic and international influences. Foreign policy shows South Africa's response to its external environment, but it is also an example of the domestic values and principles of the country. They believe that South Africa's commitment to the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) in 2001 is reflective of what Africa leaders called a "people-centred and democratic" foreign policy; all its member states agreed to reflecting and promoting these principles in their cooperation with other African countries. Therefore, just as the concept of democracy has more meaning in it that its procedural aspects, I think foreign policy too can be reflective of the deeper values and principles that a country is committed to n its engagement with the international system.

It is also important to remember that South Africa's transition to democracy was influenced by the international system, which impacted its foreign and domestic policy. South Africa cannot be an isolated protagonist in developing its foreign policy; its domestic parties and movements have gathered and still gather social and material resources from the international system. Therefore, we cannot separate the international sources of foreign policy as it is reflected in domestic policies as well. South Africa would continue to affect and be affected by the forces of globalization (Klotz 2004).

Ian Taylor (2004) mentions that many perceive South African foreign policy to be innately democratic because if the nature of its domestic transition to democracy. The former Department of

Foreign Affairs (DFA) - now referred to as the Department of International Relations and Cooperation (DIRCO) - claimed that South Africa's special position in the international system is reflective of its democratic transformation and the prestige of Nelson Mandela. The DFA's policy document always reiterated the country's deep commitment to consolidating democracy. Much of these commitments and proclamations to consolidate democracy came from Mandela's foreign policy document. Thabo Mbeki made similar claims and commitments, linking democratic governance to all African countries. However, Taylor (2004) mentions that there are doubts as to whether this commitment has been genuine on the African continent, especially considering the highly procedural and neoliberal form of democracy that has been implemented and promoted in African countries in the 1980s and 1990s.

Philip Nel, Jo-Ansie van Wyk and Kristen Johnsen (2004) assess democracy, participation and foreign policy making in South Africa. They reiterate the fact that the rhetoric used by many ANC leaders and former President Thabo Mbeki used in describing foreign policy, came from the ideals of the Freedom Charter. The authors show that Mbeki, on several occasions, mentioned the need to entrench the opinions and gains of the people and that the people should "be their own liberators" (Nel, Wyk and Johnsen 2004, 39). The authors agree that there remains much to be done in gaining higher levels of participation in South Africa. They refer to the participation gained during the liberation struggle as "empowered participatory governance" (Ibid). They believe that a more participatory form of democracy failed in the post-apartheid era because of the government's intention to exclude civil society from governance and because of the neoliberal reforms.

In an interview on the 28 August 2013 with political analyst, Steven Friedman (2013), he mentions that it is a false assumption that South Africa should include or promote democracy in its foreign policy because the ANC was first and foremost, a liberation party and nationalist movement that sought to liberate the majority from the rule of the apartheid government. He believes that perhaps the South African foreign policy could be better characterised by its commitment to African solidarity. He mentions that this does not mean that the ANC and South African foreign policy adopted an anti-democratic identity, but it is not one of its primary goal to promote democracy in the international system. Although South Africa has adopted procedural aspects of democracy such as the implementation of free, frequent and fair elections, Friedman (2013) believes that the ANC had little commitment to principles of democracy in the international system. However, I think that the democratic foundations of the country go beyond the initial principles of the ANC. I think that other documents that are representative of the peoples' interests such as the Freedom Charter

(which is the foundation of the 1996 Constitution) better reflect the substantive aspects of democracy.

(iii.) Foreign Policy during Mandela's Presidency

Under the leadership of Nelson Mandela, the new South Africa faced the tensions developing an activist role in foreign policy based on its belief in the compatibility of human rights norms, the promotion of democracy in the international system, solidarity politics and its own development needs. As a result of its experience in peaceful transition to democracy, South African foreign policy emphasizes human rights, development, the support and promotion of democracy, multilateralism and pursuing the role of the leaders of the African continent's interests (Alden and Le Pere 2004). Nelson Mandela outlined the principles which the democratic South Africa would support in foreign policy in the document called "South Africa's Future Foreign Policy" (Mandela 1993, 86); emphasizing the centrality of human rights and democracy. Mandela's approach to foreign policy can be viewed as idealistic approach; the pillars upon which he based the post-apartheid foreign policy were:

- The importance of human rights, embracing the political, economic, social and environmental aspects of foreign policy.
- The promotion of democracy to address problems and solutions around the world.
- Justice and respect for international law.
- Peace as a goal for all nations and the break-down of peace to be addressed through non-violent means.
- South African foreign policy reflecting the concerns and interests of Africa.
- Economic development requiring international cooperation in an interdependent world (Mandela, 1993).

Human rights featured prominently in Mandela's foreign policy because post-apartheid South Africa was created on the foundations of human rights campaigns led by NGOs and other anti-apartheid movements from Third World countries that were willing to fight for South Africa's liberation. South Africa felt morally obligated to protect and promote universal human rights government (Youla 2009).

Analyst in South African foreign policy, Chris Landsberg (2010) mentions that part of Mandela's goal for South African foreign policy was for the country to become known as a "responsible global citizen" (Landsberg 2010, 95) and therefore its foreign policy goals are set in terms of diplomacy.

Mandela signed a number of international agreements and instruments of human rights support such as the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the African Charter on Human and People's rights, to show its commitment to the values and principles of human rights and democracy. However, Landsberg (2010) mentions that in practice, establishing ethical values and principles proved to be more difficult. For example, although South Africa promoted the principle of human rights, it still engaged with states that were human rights violators such as Indonesia and Turkey in order to establish stronger economic ties. He believes that South Africa struggled to find its way in foreign policy, in a changing environment of the post-Cold War global order. Mandela's government wanted show that South Africa was committed to the accepted practices of international law and diplomatic conventions. However, it became difficult to manage their ethical and moral principles while also seeking economic self-interests. This drew criticism from analysts, commentators and the media during Mandela's term in office, and many called for a codified foreign policy doctrine.

(iv.) Foreign Policy during Mbeki's Presidency

During Mbeki's tenure, specific interest is given to the agenda of Africa (and especially Southern Africa) in South African foreign policy. Laurie Nathan (2005) describes Mbeki's foreign policy as having three important elements: being democratic, Africanist, and anti-imperialist. Nathan believes that these elements combine easily and foster coherence, although when these elements do come into conflict in any way, democracy usually suffers. Mbeki's policy coherence is evident in the 'Strategic Plan' published by the Department of Foreign Affairs in 2004, in which Mbeki reiterated South Africa's commitment and promotion of human rights and democracy (Nathan 2005). However, many scholars perceived Mandela to promote an idealist foreign policy, and Mbeki, a realist one. According to Youla (2009), Mbeki sought to promote South Africa's international profile to be able to produce material pay-offs; therefore he promoted foreign investment. Mbeki initiated a new "integrated planning framework" (Youla, 2009:52) to determine strategic national priorities that the executive found important. Many also believed that Mbeki executed his own individual beliefs and perspectives into policy-making and foreign policy, rather than the broad foreign policy framework that Mandela introduced.

Mbeki promoted the concept of the 'African Renaissance' which supported a common African effort to achieve stable democracies, respect for human rights and an end to violent conflict. These principles may seem to reflect Mandela's foreign policy objectives which also emphasized human rights and democracy. However, the African Renaissance centralised the African continent in South African foreign policy and implied that South Africa would serve as the intermediate power between

African countries and the world. This feature became an important part of Mbeki's contribution to foreign policy during his administration, and it fuelled many agreements and operations such as the NEPAD and APRM mechanism (Youla, 2009).

(v.) Foreign Policy during Zuma's Presidency

Following the departure of Thabo Mbeki, the ANC won the 2009 general election, Kgalema Motlanthe occupied the position of President for a short period and then the ANC elected Jacob Zuma as the president of South Africa. Zuma's own foreign policy agenda is still seen to be in development and has essentially continued on the path of Mbeki's foreign policy principles. However, some have recognised a decrease in emphasis on the 'African agenda' which was promoted by Mbeki (Pillay 2011).

Chris Landsberg (2010) shows that Zuma focused less on policy and diplomacy, but stressed state identity and national interest in foreign policy. This perhaps indicates that like Mandela, Zuma wanted to show a values-driven approach to foreign policy, incorporating democracy into foreign policy as well. However, Landsberg points out that Zuma's term in office differs very little form Mbeki's term in office. There has been little reinvention of the state , but Zuma's government is caught between Mandela's morality and promotion of human rights and democracy, and Mbeki's pragmatism in attaining strategic partnerships, cooperation and a developmental focus. In terms of the endeavour to strengthen South-South relations in recent years, the pragmatist approach has become important in developing strategic partnership and trade agreements; this is evident in South Africa's increased relations with China (Landsberg 2010). This is perhaps reflective of a neo-realist approach to foreign policy; reacting to the national interests of South Africa's interests. Chris Landsberg (2005) also mentions that South Africa's position in the international system has increasing been identified as a mediator the 'Global North' and the 'Global South'. This has become a feature since Mbeki's term in office.

The '*Strategic Plan'* for 2010-2013, published by the Department of International Relations and Cooperation set out the foreign policy principles which South Africa endeavours to achieve, as well as national interests which the country pursues. The Plan highlights goals such as South Africa becoming a "performance-orientated state" (Department of International Relations and Cooperation Republic of South Africa 2010, 2) that improves planning, playing a significant role in African advancement, creating an environment that accommodates economic growth and development (especially in Africa); promoting regional economic integration through the organisations of NEPAD and the South African Development Partnership Agency (SADPA). Additionally, South Africa still

seeks to reform or restructure the organisation of the United Nations (UN) and specifically the United Nations Security Council (UNSC), for it to be more representative (Ibid).

(c.) The Arab Spring

In 2011, Arab countries in the Middle East and North Africa became immersed in political protest in the streets; demanding regime change. Social media was alive with activity, engaging the youth to participate in the search for political freedom and economic opportunity (Ajami 2012). The uprising in Tunisia was said to have started the series of uprisings across the Middle East and North Africa. Countries like Egypt, Libya, Syria, Jordan, Yemen, Morocco, Bahrain, Saudi Arabia, Iran and Turkey all experienced forms of protest against their established authoritarian regimes. These protests have in many cases been expressed through mass demonstrations, including hundreds of citizens mobilised in various ways against the authoritarian regimes. Their uprisings elicited new discourses around democracy in Arab states, and the form of democracy that they would eventually implement with a new elected party or leader. In assessing the literature and discourse surrounding the Arab Spring, this research report intends to identify tenets of radical democracy that emerges from the processes of the uprisings.

It is important to understand that the context in which the Arab Spring has emerged, and note several themes that are evident when assessing the Arab Spring and the contemporary international system. The Arab Spring has contributed to a global challenge of conceptions of democracy that has not only permeated the Middle East and North Africa, but the rest of the international system as well. This research report will explore some of the many dynamics of the Arab Spring; it will assess the Arab spring emerging from a growing culture of transnational activism, authoritarianism in the Arab Spring countries, the economic aspects leading to the Arab Spring, the role of Islam and religion in developing the new governments of the Arab Spring, the role of social agency in the Arab Spring and will finally assess the prospects for the kind of democracy that is emerging from the global systems and the Arab Spring.

(i.) The Rise of Transnational Activism

Activism on the streets by ordinary citizens that recognise and challenge the faults and injustices in their governance, has been an important part of the world's history and in many instances this activism has changed the course of history (Shah 2011). Many authors and analysts have studied the potential for this kind of activism - that often transcends political and state boundaries – to create a "global civil society" (Del Felice 2012, 304). Even those that doubt the possibility of a global civil

society, Del Felice (2012) notices that there is a trend toward new forms of mobilisation against transnational issues of debate and contention. Many authors present activism and this kind of radical democracy as a counter force to neoliberal globalization.

Protest movements in the US such as the 'Occupy Wall Street' movement, according to Shiva (2011), are directed against the unequal distribution of wealth evident in capitalist systems employed in countries. The power of corporations and the small percentage of the rich elites (allowed to exist by the capitalist system) have overwhelmed the rights of the people and democratic principles. Protests against this system and its failures have transcended state boundaries and have become a global struggle. This protest has manifested itself in many different forms; but what has become most evident is the mobilisation of street protests against governments and financial institutions that monopolize trade and the market economy. Shiva (2011) believes that a form of direct democracy is sweeping across the international system as ordinary citizens are organising themselves to challenge those who monopolise the capitalist system and who have a negative impact on those who are not in power. He believes that representative democracy has reached its limits and rather than having the mantra: "by the people, for the people, of the people", democracy has become about governance "by the corporations, of the corporations, for the corporations" (Shiva 2011, 1); therefore money now drives government instead of the people. Those who are accustomed to dominance and hierarchy do not understand this horizontal form of organisation and call the movements "leaderless". The new protests and movements, show the peoples' will to create a "living democracy" (Ibid) that is people-centred.

More evidence of people wanting to take ownership of their own governance, rights and freedoms can be seen in recent protests against financial institutions. Activists have been protesting against the principles and policies of the institutions like the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank for many years. Most of the protests are part of the anti-corporate and anti-globalization movement that have different grievances that they protest against. However, the protestors are unified in aiming to stop the institutions from making policy decisions that entrench the capitalist democratic rule in the international system (Shah 2011). Protests on the streets against these institutions have been progressive over the years. One of the most famous anti-globalization protests took place at the World Trade Organisation's (WTO) headquarters in 1999, which became known as the "Battle in Seattle" in the US (Dwyer 2013). In 2009, the IMF and World Bank annual session took place in Turkey where they were also met with protestors on the street (CNN 2009). In 2013, Greek protestors rallied against the IMF and EU that came in to inspect the Greek economic crisis. People against the austerity measures and policies that the IMF and World Bank implemented

in Greece were amongst those protestors. Many of these Greek citizens felt they were affected by the public sector dismissals that the EU, IMF and European Central Bank demanded. The Greek police clashed with the protestors that brought international attention to the complexities and consequences of the Greek economic crisis and the financial institutions' ways of dealing with it (Smith, 2013).

Kurt Anderson (2011) wrote an article in Time magazine, published on 14 December 2011, discussing the protestors of the Arab Spring and the broader implications of the impacts of street protests. He mentions that throughout history, news was transmitted only through printed newspapers and professionals and protestors were considered important "makers of history" (Anderson 2011, 1) that made a significant impact on domestic and international issues. Generally, protestors took to the streets unarmed but their demonstrations were not only important, but had consequences for governments and those in power. In the 1960s, the American civil rights movement marched against racial inequality and the Vietnam War; in the 1970s, protestors in Iran and Portugal rose up against their governments; in the 1980s, US citizens protested against the development of nuclear weaponry; many in Europe protested against the Israeli dominance in the West Bank and Gaza; significant protests against communism in China's Tiananmen Square and Eastern Europe also dominated headlines. Anderson suggests that protest was a "continuation of politics by other means" (Ibid). By 1989 however, the era of protest died down significantly and the reason for this was the emergence of "Western liberalism" that began to dominate the ideological field in the international system. The two decades that followed 1991 saw a high rise of living standards and accumulating credit was easy; however this also came with the price of complacency and apathy in the political realm. Street protests became almost obsolete and were perceived as an outdated form of voicing opinion and concern. The few demonstrations that did occur were viewed as largely ineffectual – with only a few exceptions such as the protests that helped end apartheid in 1994.

According to Anderson (2011), the idea of effective mass street protests has been reignited. From Tunisia, Egypt and other neighbouring Middle East countries in the Arab Spring, to countries like the US, Russia, Spain, Greece, England, Mexico, India and Chile, thousands of protestors mobilised on the streets against crime, corruption, elitism and cronyism. In the Arab Spring, the corruptive forces in elections, economic governance and the oppressive brutality of the regimes were the reason for the protests emerging on the streets. Similarly, protests against the financial crisis and corruption that has been allowed to creep into the Western liberal ideology emerged in European countries like Spain and Greece. In Russia, protests emerged against the government under Vladimir Putin as many believed that greater prosperity and democracy would not be possible with his leadership. In South

America too, protests against corruption and the systematic failure of the international economic system has played out onto the streets from ordinary citizens that feel the everyday effects of their governments' decisions (Anderson 2011). Recent protests emerging from Brazil against corruption and the effects of economic policies that have not benefitted the peoples' standard of living, testify to the ongoing effects of the systematic failure of the liberal economic systems and the consequences that have now arisen on the streets (Panja and Biller 2013). Anderson (2011) believes that these protests and the discontent that drives it, has been simmering for years with minor protests and disagreements in parliament and government.

However, Kurt Anderson (2011) also notes that the stakes in each country and continent are different. In Europe and the US, there are no dictators and those protesting are not under threat of being shot or beaten as they are under the authoritarian governments of the Arab Spring. The protestors in the Middle East and North Africa are paying a high price and experience a high death toll in order to gain political systems that vaguely match those of North America and Europe – yet those in North America and Europe seem to be undemocratic and dysfunctional as well.

(ii.) Authoritarianism and the Arab World

Political analyst, Amichai Magen (2012) believes that the series of uprisings across North African and the Middle East are the "simultaneous unfolding of three grand, historic political processes: democratization, authoritarian adaptation/succession; and the state failure" (Magen 2012, 9). The idea that the Arab Spring is a delayed arrival of democracy for North African and the Middle East is popular among many scholars. The Arab Spring seems to represent a milestone in the long struggle against authoritarianism and norms that have been gathered through conquest, trade and diffusion of ideas in the area. Historically, liberal political reforms have not failed in the Middle East, having one authoritarian government replace another. Through centuries of authoritarian rulership and only a few periods of democratization, by the 2000's, eighty democracies were created in Eastern Europe; it seemed that for the first time, democracy became a near universal aspiration for a form of government. The elimination of bipolarity in the Cold War seemed to eliminate the support for authoritarian regimes in the Middle East – especially for Egypt, Sudan and Syria. However, the form of procedural and capitalist democracy that was employed in these countries has supported regimes that have not captured the necessary economic, social and cultural prerequisites for political freedom. As a result, authoritarianism still flourished in the Middle East and North African area; many thought that the Mediterranean and Arab heartland was resistant to norms of political accountability and institutions of political competition. Autocrats have managed to maintain their regime by allowing for controlled liberalization rather than true democratization. Magen (2012)

believes that the Arab Spring has managed to bring down one authoritarian government but it could just be replaced by theocrats (or another form of autocrat) instead of democrats.

Middle East was considered as the only region where autocracy dominated, along with serious other socio-economic problems such as poverty, non-functional political institutions, ethnic differences and corruption. The ethnic, tribal and religious divisions have to be taken into consideration in analysing the Arab Spring. These divisions have made it more difficult to implement a democratic society and have made it easier for authoritarianism to become entrenched. Many Arab countries may seem to offer weak forms of democracy, yet their citizens suffer under immense repression of human rights, freedoms, justice and political freedom. In many Arab countries like Libya, the price for opposing the established regime could include arrest, economic exclusion and violent reactions from the state. In Eastern Europe during the 1980s, their heterogeneous societies proved to be the most challenging aspects that brought about violent clashes. The Middle East faces the same challenges, for example, Iraq has yet to create a successful democratic society that satisfies the Sunni, Shi'ite and Kurdish religious and ethnic groups and many of the Arab Spring countries would experience the same problems in creating their version of democracy (Puddington 2011). Arch Puddington (2011) has noted that the Arab Spring has brought about a strengthened independent society in countries like Tunisia and Egypt, and the role of civil society has proven to be effective in mobilisation for political reform. He also notes that the new generation of democracy favours a traditional Western style of democracy; with parliaments, elections and a broad variation of civil liberties, an independent judiciary and equality under the law. He sees this conception of democracy as encouraging compared to the weaker version of democracy that the Middle East promoted. Freedoms such as freedom of speech and freedom of association are the easier projects to implement in democratic reforms; however there are still major challenges for implementing the rule of law and elimination of corruption. These challenges fuelled much of the scepticism around democracy in countries like Latin America during the 1980s.

It would seems as though a culture of authoritarianism has developed in the Middle East and North African region throughout the centuries; a culture which has been difficult to combat because of the many divisions in the Arab countries. The Arab Spring has definitely challenged this 'culture' or predominance of authoritarianism in the region; however the future of democracy in the Arab Spring countries would be challenged by the legacy of centuries of authoritarianism.

(iii.) Economic Dynamics of the Arab Spring

Besides the legacy of authoritarianism, another important factor contributing to the emergence of uprisings, revolts, strikes and the mass demonstrations on the streets in the Arab Spring; was the economic pressures experienced by the ordinary citizens in the Arab Spring countries. Dietrich Jung (2011) emphasizes the fact that the uprisings of the Arab Spring are a direct result of the character of the political economy of the region. The uprisings were about both political and economic exclusion as it was about the transition to democracy. He believes that the economic resources of the Middle East have been used and allocated in unproductive ways, and corruption enriched only the elite few and the authoritarian government. The mechanism of economic exchange employed in the Middle Eastern countries excluded most of the youth and many of the educated population for the economic life. More than 60 percent of the Middle East's population is under the age of 30 and therefor the young were affected the most from the economic exclusion.

The revolutions and unrest in three of the Arab Spring countries; Libya, Egypt and Syria occurred after reforms made the countries' economies more liberalised, open and privatised. He recognises that this may not be a direct cause of the uprisings; however it will have an impact on how the newly elected governments manage economic issues. He cites corruption as one of the other major causes of the uprisings; it motivated protests against the governments' acts of money laundering and other forms of elitism. Many of the corruption charges in countries like Egypt come from recent privatization efforts which have fuelled crony capitalism (Vaughan 2013). Josh Vaughan (2013) predicts that nationalization could be used as a political tool after toppling the crony capitalist systems.

The corruption charges show the conflict between international investors and local governments; arbitration to manage these relations after the Arab Spring would have to take this into consideration. The people among the protestors ranged from young liberals to Islamists that have many differing ideologies that they want to build their new democracies on. However, there does not seem to be one overriding ideology that all the protestors rally behind; and they are driven primarily by their opposition to the existing regimes. Although many of the protestors support the notion of a democratic society that has more freedoms and justice, there is no consensus as to how to achieve these goals and the ideology that would be used to attain them either. This leaves countries of the Arab Spring and especially in Egypt, with an ideological vacuum that also does not address the economic problems and inequality gaps in their countries. Groups like the Muslim Brotherhood could take advantage of this situation and increase their influence and ideologies to rally behind in opposition to the Mubarak regime; however groups like these do not seem to have a

clear plan of action to redress the economic issues in the country. Vaughn (2013) thinks that perhaps the Muslim Brotherhood would push back liberalization and replace laws with some that are influenced by Islamic Shari 'a law. Settlements could be difficult to me made between International investors and these kinds of new governments (Ibid).

Marion Dixon (2011) analyses the Arab Spring as a revolt against neoliberalism as wealthy businessmen and the ruling parties in the Arab Spring countries have created monopolistic and oligopolistic economies; which has cause the rising food and housing prices, cut wages and eliminate protection for workers in rural areas, it has weakened public welfare programmes and dropped the standard of living. The increased "reign of terror" inflicted on the people is due to the restricted rights and liberties. Dixon (2011) argues that the help that the Western world is offering is more of the same policies that have been offered before; pre-packaged, "trickle-down" (Dixon 2011, 309) recommendations for private sector growth. Dixon refers to the Arab countries' "time of shock" (Ibid) that the Western world has taken advantage pf in order to further their imperial neoliberal agenda in responding to the uprisings. The uprisings are clearly a sign that people want popular democracy that is grounded in social and economic justice; however assessing the way the West and outside forces have responded to the uprisings, it seems that neoliberal agendas will succeed and be implemented. Although it may seem that the Western and European countries have reacted to the upheavals in the 'Global South' according to protocol; by urging restraint and dialogue between the parties involved in the uprising, Dixon (2011)believes that the Western agenda will eventually be implemented. Despite the US having previously supported regimes like Mubarak's regime in Egypt, after the Arab Spring the Obama administration encouraged democratic elections to be held and urged Mubarak not to stand for re-election. However, the US planned to intervene in countries like Libya when mass protests continued and supported a 'No-Fly Zone' UN proposal.

Theses authors bring to light some of the important issues about the impact of the economic crises and inequality that has fuelled much of the Arab Spring uprisings. It is clear that the economic inequality experienced in the Arab Spring countries and the neoliberal policies that have thus far been implemented are linked to the country's lack of political and economic freedoms. It is interesting to note that what some of the authors term 'neoliberal' or 'capitalist democratic' policies that have been used in countries like Egypt, Tunisia, Libya and Syria have worked in tandem with authoritarianism. The idea of elitist groups in countries that benefit the most and the corruptive forces like 'cronyism' is a common trait of authoritarian rulership and much of this seems to be enabled by the economic policies employed in these countries. Marion Dixon (2011) also touches on the influences of Western and European powers such as the US in exploiting and controlling the

economic agenda of the Arab countries. I think the Arab Spring shows a step forward from this dominance of the US; it shows the initiative of the common, ordinary people on the street in creating their own democracy and eventually their own economic agenda that is more equal. I do however; also share some of Vaughn's scepticism as to whether opposition groups in the Arab Spring would be capable of addressing the economic inequality as well as the democratic gaps in their society.

(iv.) Islamism and the Arab Spring

A recurrent subject in the literature of the Arab Spring is rise of Islam and in particular, radical Islam, being possibly implemented after the Arab Spring. Kurt Anderson's (2011) general findings are that secularists within the Arab Spring countries are worried about the rise of so-called 'moderate' Islamists like the Muslim Brotherhood that are sure to gain political power in Egypt. He implies that US foreign policy and much of the Western and European world are uneasy about the rise of Islamic-dominated governments that pose a potential threat to the Western countries because of the threat of terrorism from radical Islamic-related groups like al-Qaeda. This is reflective of how the US "War on Terror" has influenced the Western (especially the US's) conception of democracy, as it implies that there is no room for accepting a democratic government that is influenced by the religion of Islam. However, Anderson dismisses the emergence of Islamism in governance as an undemocratic phenomenon as he believes that Islamists in the Egypt and Tunisia would be willing to make compromises with other secular and liberal groups. However, he does emphasize the fact that many within and outside of the Middle East are threatened by the so-called moderate Islamic forces that could become their new oppressors. Borna Zguric (2012) agrees that the West, being the so-called torch bearers of democracy and human rights would normally encourage such uprisings as the Arab Spring; however the West previously supported the former regimes because it feared the Islamic surges that could have affected the Middle East countries without those authoritarian regimes. For example, the US supported the Egyptian regime under Mubarak for many years before the Arab Spring.

Amichai Magen (2012) gives an analysis of the threat if Islamism in Arab Spring countries; he links the threat of a radical Islamist government to authoritarianism. Authors such as Khaled Abu Toameh (2011) warn that these popular revolts could bring about an even harsher "Islamist Winter" (Toameh 2011, 10) which would see the Arab Spring countries dominated and oppressed by an Islamist movement that is just as repressive as the governments they have toppled. He argues that the lack of security, legitimacy and capacity has disintegrated many Arab states and that they left a power-vacuum to be filled by pre-modern and neo-medieval rulers as well as modern transnational terrorist

networks such as al-Qaeda. Failed states existing after the uprisings of the Arab Spring mean that there could be a proliferation of unconventional threats, terrorist networks and arms smuggling.

Religion played a significant role in mobilising the masses in Turkey, Iran and Egypt. In addition to being a useful tool of mobilisation, religion and specifically, Islam, has brought a greater ideological and philosophical aspect to the democratic reforms that the people are demanding. Fred Dallmayr (2011) believes that the uprisings (especially evident in Egypt) are not aimed at enhancing the military or the country's geopolitical power. Instead, he sees them as a yearning for a better life, with a pluralistic democratic society with freedom and justice for all. There were many insurgents in the uprising in Egypt relied on non-violent and peaceful means of protest. Many of these protestors joined forces and received aid from the Iranian Green Movement and many other fellow Muslim organisations in Turkey. The aim these movements hoped to achieve was not to remove religion from public life and government, but to rid religious affiliations from autocracy and theocracy. Dallmayr (2011) believes that religion can serve a rightful peace among freedom and peace in democracies in the Middle East.

There are many different opinions and predictions made by authors and analysts about the possibility of Islamist and radical Islamist governments coming into power after the Arab Spring has ousted the exiting regimes. Many Western and outside powers are sceptical about the stability and development of democracy under an Islamist government for fear that it would encourage terrorism and undemocratic laws. I think that perhaps much of this scepticism could be fuelled by the Islamaphobia that has been advanced by the "War on Terror" campaign and the Western countries' desire to control the governments of the Middle East and North Africa. However, I also recognise that there is a real threat that radical Islamic groups could dominate and overpower the influences of different religions and ethnic groups in the Arab society of these countries. However, the prospects of democracy have shifted from the hands of autocrats to the people during the Arab Spring and despite the influence and control from outside forces; the people would become accountable for the kind of governments that replaces the previous regimes.

(v.) Social Agency in the Arab Spring

The discourse surrounding the Arab Spring emphasizes the impact that the uprisings have in enhancing the social agency of the citizens of the countries involved. The mass demonstrations and strikes showed the will of the people to act independently of their authoritarian governments and create their own form of governance. This social agency developed through various means such as

social media, new political organisations and platforms, the freedom of speech and media and protests on the streets.

Magen (2012) believes that the revolts in the Arab Spring, like the revolutions in Latin America, Eastern Europe and sub-Saharan Africa are a result of the gradual socioeconomic and cultural change in their society. The combination of urbanization, higher levels of literacy, social mobilisation through the internet, attitudinal changes and expectations of a better standard of living have all contributed to the uprisings according to the author. Social media in particular, seems to have played a critical role in mobilising ordinary people on the streets, and their voices have been heard on platforms such as news channels (like Al-Jazeera), Facebook and Twitter. These platforms have particularly engaged the youth with political organisation and self-expression. These platforms of social media cannot be underestimated because although these platforms themselves may not have directly changed the governments of the Arab Spring countries, they have given all citizens the opportunity to express their concerns and ultimately, delegitimize the monarch-like regimes, and even seemingly "benign dictatorships" (Magen 2012, 13) like Jordan and Morocco have been challenged by the new wave of democratization.

Magen (2012) mentions that unlike the revolutions and democratization in the 1980 in Eastern Europe, there is no official opposition that is capable and prepared to succeed the old regimes in the countries of the Arab Spring. This perhaps can be seen as one of the downfalls of the Arab Spring, as there is no equivalent (that has emerged thus far) to the Polish Solidarity movement. However, it could be argued that the Arab Spring was ignited by ordinary people that managed to mobilise themselves against the government without being limited within the confines of a political party; many different people of different ages, political affiliations and identities mobilised together to topple an authoritarian regime. Furthermore, the Arab Spring countries were politically-closed countries where political opposition parties and leaders were prevented from gaining influence and many opposition leaders were arrested. However, Magen (2012) shares the concern with many other analysts that the new leaders and newly formed political parties from the Arab Spring could bring about new autocrats, not democrats.

One of the most important elements that have emerged from the Arab Spring is the sense that ordinary citizens felt that they could change their environment and leave behind years of exclusion. It also shows that social movements and creative popular protests are not a privilege of the 'Global North', but in fact has changed and shaped much of the political and social dynamics of the 'Global South'. They mention that the Arab Spring has thus far been an "urban phenomenon" (de Souza and

Lipietz 2011, 620), but it has mobilised many different sectors in society; the poor and unemployed as well as employed workers and professionals (Marcelo Lopes de Souza & Barbara Lipietz, 2011).
Borna Zgurić (2012) believes that the Arab Spring would not have been possible without the grassroot, leaderless movements that represented the peoples' voices through new communication technologies. However, the author also mentions that the Arab Spring uprisings would not have been possible without the help of the military. He believes that the uprisings were not 'true revolutions' but a call for transformation of the existing regimes to have different institutional patterns. Simply toppling regimes and holding elections, would not consolidate the young democracies; therefore he implies that social agency and the role of the peoples' participation in developing their own form of governance is important to sustain democracy. Certain political actors such the military – especially in countries in Egypt - could also hinder the process of democratization as armed forces are likely to impose a regime that is just as oppressive as the previous authoritarian regimes. Part of the reason for Zguric's assertion that the Arab Spring uprisings were not revolutions, was because they did not yield a 'new society' that shows new paths or social reforms politically and economically. He believes that the Arab Spring uprisings could be seen more as 'transitions' which are radical in nature and are aimed at breaking away from the '*ancien regime'* or former regime. He believes that a democratic culture needs to be learned in order for the Arab Spring to be considered as a successful revolutionary democratic movement.

The Arab Spring uprisings have a certain pro-democracy character and he believes that they were not necessarily unpredictable. The Arab Spring has arisen from the backdrop of the growing divide between ruler and the rules, political repression, social and economic inequalities, demographic changes, unemployment and foreign policy crises. Amin Saikal (2011) believes the Arab people have sought self- determination and a politically pluralist future - and that they have a difficult journey in fully realising this goal. He argues that the Arab people throughout the centuries, had their fate determined by outside powers, whether it be the Ottoman, the European colonial powers or the United States which has dominated the political arena in Middle East since after the Second World War. The Arab Spring therefore, is an opportunity for the Arab people themselves, to shape their own polities without the dominance of outside powers. The Tunisian and Egyptian revolutions especially have challenged not just their authoritarian regimes but outside forces such as the United States and its allies. Saikal (2011) sees outside forces like the US and other governing elites as having failed to deliver their version of democratic reforms and good governance. Saikal (2011) believes that the Arab Spring has created three forces which would greatly influence the future of the Arab world: pro-democratic pluralism, secular (or semi-secular) authoritarianism and Islamism. Although the Arab Spring itself may not be considered as unpredictable considering the context and

circumstances in which it arose, the outcome and future of the Arab Spring is unpredictable. The uprisings have marked a new awakening for the Arab world; however outside powers need to recognise that it is an Arab initiative. I agree that it will be the Arab peoples' transition to democracy through their own social agency, participation and accountability; and this creates a platform for the rise of radical democracy where ordinary people are involved in determining their own form of governance and are responsible for changing it if they are dissatisfied.

There are more sceptical views of the Arab Spring; firstly, there is no united "Arab world" that we could describe as an entity; although there are some important characteristic of Arab societies. Many believe that the Arab Springs were a series of interconnected events that led to the ousting of dictators but only the partial ousting of authoritarianism. How far democratization will go is uncertain if it is successful at all; despite reforms implemented that are more democratic. However, there is more optimism for Egypt and Tunisia in terms of gaining a more democratic society as there has been evidence of inclusive political participation and active citizens involved in creating their new governments (Dalacoura 2012).

The Arab Spring uprisings can be compared to the South African uprisings against the apartheid regime. In the case of the Arab Spring however, the uprisings served as a turning point in the Middle East's history but has a lot more to overcome in order to reach the successes of the South African struggle for democracy. He cautions that when faced with conflict during the transitions of power in North Africa and the Middle East, the nations could revert back to using violence and oppression to quell different voices in the transition. Charles Villa-Vicencio (2012) suggests that the Arab Spring countries could follow in the footsteps of the South African transition to democracy by implementing a national peace accord, inclusive participation, a robust commitment to political reconciliation, ensuring local ownership of the settlement, an integration of armies and security reform, institutional reform and transitional justice.

Finally, Siba Grovogui (2011) makes a theoretical assessment of the Arab Spring from an African perspective and discusses how African countries reacted to the uprisings. He established that African countries (in cooperation within the African Union (AU)) made a decision not to support military intervention in Libya; unlike Western and European countries like the US, France, the United Kingdom (UK) and a few other Arab countries. He believes that this act of "non-cooperation" reveals the core of the future of global governance and international morality in the contemporary age. Grovogui (2011) points to the fact that in most of the anti-colonial struggles from the 1950s, to the late 1980s and 1990s, African people held a suspicion against the intervention by Western and

European countries as well as international law. The struggle against apartheid for example, showed the suspicion held for the instrumentation of international law as for a long time, Western countries like the UK supported an apartheid regime on the basis that it the anti-apartheid struggle was fuelled by Communism (a vilified ideology by the West). Grovogui (2011) therefore deduces that Western intervention may be seen as undermining the principles of the Atlantic Charter, the UN Charter, and other conventions such as the Non-Aligned Movement about conflict resolution and peacekeeping. There is a widely held sentiment that Western intervention in the Arab Spring uprisings (and he uses Libya as a case study) would "undermine the spirit and practice of global governance" (Grovogui 2011, 568). As a result, a "global democratic deficit" (Ibid) has developed. Grovogui (2011) suggests that a domestic democratic deficit has promoted the uprisings of the Arab Spring as self-interested elites were determined to maintain power. However, an international democratic deficit is evident when outside states have reacted in a way that may seem undemocratic. He explains that the US cold be perceived to be behaving undemocratically (despite encouraging institutional support for democracy) because the US has supported the opposition group, the Transitional National Council (TNC), in Libya while ignoring the TNC's growing intolerance for democracy and those supporters of the former Gaddafi regime. During the transition from apartheid in South Africa, Africans became accustomed to the kind of mediation that was encouraged by the international system at the time; to incorporate all the parties concerned (even he apartheid government) in the process of mediation. Marxist regimes in Angola, Mozambique and the Communist-influenced party of the ANC were also encouraged to be accommodated with the Western-friendly entities like corporations, states and political organisations in order to attain lasting peace.

The Arab Spring mediation therefore, has taken an alternative path, which Grovogui (2011) believes has unsettled many African countries in supporting the Western interventions. He speculates that perhaps the political tension against Gaddafi and his prominent anti-West stance has caused this type of non-democratic mediation from the US. However, none of the Africa countries (even those that support the US anti-terrorism programs and those that are dependent on aid from the US) have supported military intervention in Libya. Grovogui (2011) sees it as encouraging that the African continent has perhaps developed their own sense of morality and democracy separate from the Western models and norms.

Therefore, the Arab Spring has challenged the authoritarian regimes that have worked under the capitalist form of democracy that the Western world has supported after the Cold War. The Arab Spring emerges amongst many recent movements for governmental change and activism around the

world; however it directly challenges conceptions of democracy. Outside powers have reacted differently to the Arab Spring and a complex discourse around the prospects for democracy has emerged. As evident from the Arab Spring and its contribution to new forms of democracy is the impact that the ordinary people have in changing the status quo and demanding change. This reflects to the attributes of radical democracy; as the citizens of the countries of the Arab Spring are demanding fairer representation and equality in the political and economic spheres of governance.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY:

Discourse analysis provides an appropriate methodology for exploring the complex issues and discourse around democracy, South African foreign policy and the Arab Spring. The research report aims to engage in a discourse around democracy in South Africa and its international relevance. Discourse analysis is different from a positivist approach to social science which focuses on causal analysis. In discourse analysis, more attention is given to epistemology; therefore how the social world is constructed and consolidated through various different ideas and factors.

Discourse involves interrelated texts, conversation and practices which is centred on a particular object – and in this case it is centred on democracy. There are many forms of discourse analysis; this research will involve a critical discourse analysis rather than the linguistic or structuralism aspects of discourse. Discourse analysis is not limited by the traditional scientific approach to research alone, but still carries out an in-depth and considered qualitative research; it encourages research that identifies, describes and analyses important phenomena when they occur (Burnham et al. 2008). This is useful for assessing South Africa's response to the Arab Spring, as the academic discourse emerging from the Arab Spring is still evolving as events change and new information is brought to light. Discourse analysis allows for the broad discussion and research of a compound issue that is still being developed since 2011. It also lends itself to analysing the discourse around democracy and South African foreign policy by showing the many influencing factors and perceptions that give a comprehensive and holistic assessment of the subject.

Iver B. Neumann (2008, 61) explains that perceptions can be mediated through many aspects; discourse analysts refer to these as representations. Certain representations can become institutionalised or 'normalised' over time depending on how influential they are. Neumann (2008) asserts that discourse analysis explains the preconditions for action. It helps to understand why a state behaves the way it does and why it makes the decisions and actions it does. Part of this research report will use this methodology to understand the context of the development of South African democracy and foreign policy, in order to understand the country's response to the uprisings in Egypt and Tunisia. Discourse analysis also aims at providing a broad spectrum of possible outcomes rather than one outcome that can simplify or tend toward an essentialist strategy. Therefore discourse analysis provides me with the autonomy of answering the research report

question by referring to a broad array of influential factors and inspiring further questions and new discourses. It also allows for a sense of objectivity, by incorporating several factors, perceptions and ideas into my analysis. Discourse analysis also cannot detach itself from different discourses; therefore studying South African foreign policy and the discourse surrounding this topic would require research around different discourses such as the historical context of South African foreign policy and to a certain extent, the discourse around South African domestic policies.

Teun A. van Djik (2008) describes Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as a type of discourse analytical research method that lends itself to researching the way social power is abused, and how dominance and inequality is enacted. Critical discourse analysis aims to understand, expose and ultimately resist these social inequalities through a discourse that is broad and multi-faceted. van Djik (2008) mentions that discourse analysis comes in many forms with a fundamental awareness of its role in society; therefore, does not ignore the relation between scholarship and society. CDA focuses on social problems and political issues rather than current paradigms and fashions. This does not suggest that discourse analysis lacks empirical evidence; its multidisciplinary nature allows for empirical data and research to be incorporated into analyses. Rather than simply describing discourse structure, discourse analysis attempts to understand social interaction and structures of society.

Therefore, this research report will focus on the struggles for democracy in the Arab Spring countries, and it will attempt to analyse and understand South Africa's response to these conflicts. Discourse analysis allows me to engage in current discourses and also help find new meanings and understandings. In this way, I hope to gain a nuanced understanding about the meaning of democracy in South African foreign policy and its responses to phenomena like the Arab Spring. This research report will engage in the various issues surrounding South Africa's history and it uses empirical evidence of recent developments in the Arab Spring to unpack and expose the various aspects of South Africa's foreign policy and democracy (in theory and practice).

The research report uses primary and secondary sources. Foreign policy documents and official reports from the South African government and parliamentarians are used to assess South Africa's response to the Arab Spring. Secondary sources will use current literature surrounding democratic theory (and especially radical democracy) to form an analysis of South African foreign policy and its application to the Arab Spring uprisings. Current newspaper articles, academic journals and news reports will be used to assess the events of the Arab Spring.

The case studies of Egypt and Tunisia were chosen because that they constitute as countries that have been part of the recent Arab Spring uprisings and have shown aspirations for a more democratic society through civic activism. Both cases provoked a response from the South African government; however each elicited a slightly different response. Egypt and Tunisia are geographically situated in the continent of Africa; therefore South Africa's response to their uprisings could be mediated by its established Africa agenda. However, this research report is focused on South Africa's response in relation to its commitments and principles of democracy – not its Africa agenda. The two issues may be interrelated and the report will also explore this relationship between South Africa's foreign policy agenda in Africa and the influence of democracy. Both cases have prompted different interventions from the international community. However, Egypt and Tunisia experienced a large number of civilian protesters that have either toppled or severely weakened the legitimacy of the authoritarian governments and they have challenged the conception of democracy in their country (Morton and Shortt 2012).

Limitations:

The research largely uses a desktop research methodology in gathering information; therefore the research is limited to a certain extent in gaining 'on the ground' sources and information. Field research could have improved my analysis of South Africa's conception of democracy in its foreign policy and the workings of the Arab Spring in Egypt and Tunisia. However, the limitations in funding prevented me from conducting field research in Egypt and Tunisia, and the extent of my research in South Africa is limited to empirical research that documented South Africa's foreign policy principles and historicised its struggle for democracy. I have used certain processes of gathering information and informed opinions such as conducting an interview with political analyst, Steven Friedman, to gain insight into South Africa's conception of democracy and perceptions of democracy in South Africa's response to the Arab Spring. However, the lack of field research does not limit the value of my research as I have drawn on primary documents such as policy documents, speeches by politicians and resolutions. This has been particularly useful in understanding the discourse surrounding South Africa's struggle for democracy.

CHAPTER 4

Radical Democracy to Neoliberal Market Democracy in South African Foreign Policy

In order to engage in a discourse around South Africa's conception of democracy in foreign policy, it is necessary to historicize South Africa's rise to democracy and look at how it has evolved in the post-apartheid era. The role of the people and organisations (both political and social) were important in the anti-apartheid liberation struggle, which looked to set in motion the implementation of a radical form of democracy in the country. However, the 'new democratic' ANC-led government that came into power after apartheid, did not necessarily reflect this form of radical democracy. This is significant in assessing South Africa's navigation in the international system through their foreign policy today and it provides an understanding of South Africa's response to the Arab Spring.

(a.) South Africa's Transition: The Making of Radical Democracy

During the struggle for democracy, mass resistance and defiance was widespread and contributed greatly to the demise of apartheid. Women became actively engaged in protest in 1956 against the anti-pass march and in 1976, the Soweto Uprising showed mass resistance from black students in Soweto that protested on the streets and were met brutally with police force. These incidents brought international attention to the plight of the oppressed people in the apartheid government, and facilitated mass support for the anti-apartheid struggle. After apartheid, the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) was initiated, which created a blueprint for development that focused on the people. The Local Government Transition Act in 1993 helped undo the racial division, but it was the 1996 Constitution that enabled the decentralization of government and highlighted the importance of autonomy of local governments. Within South Africa's nine provinces, there are 284 local authorities in the form of district councils and municipalities. By the year 2000, local councils were being elected through popular elections; they had independent constitutional authority and protection against arbitrary dismissal by higher level of government. Popular participation in these local elections has also been high. However, centrality is maintained through various devices of government as well (Baiocchi and Checa 2009). These important plans and

engagements of the people with government were built in the anti-apartheid struggle and in the transition to democracy. It showed that a people-centred form of democracy was trying to be established for the post-apartheid era. The following documents and political and economic initiatives played a huge role in the formation of this radical version of democracy:

(i.) The Freedom Charter 1955

The Freedom Charter was adopted at the Congress of the People in Kliptown on 26th June 1955. This serves as a fundamental document underpinning the all the principles and values that the new democratic South Africa was created on. The Freedom Charter is a written document that reflected the values, principles, demands and ideas that the people of South Africa wanted the government of South Africa to adopt after apartheid. The document was developed at the grassroots level and consulted a wide group of ordinary South African citizens during the apartheid era; it symbolised the free and democratic society that South Africans wanted for their future. The fact that it consulted ordinary people shows it reflected the radical aspect of democracy that emerged from South Africa's society. The Freedom Charter pledged that the people shall govern; all national groups should have equal rights; all people should share in the country's wealth; the land should be shared by those who work it; all should be equal before the law; all should enjoy equal human rights; there should be work and security; learning and culture should be opened and encouraged; there should be houses, security and good standards of living; and that there should be peace and friendship promoted among South Africa and all nations (African National Congress 2013). The South African Constitution, adopted in 1996, drew heavily form the ideals of the Freedom Charter. Besides the freedoms that the Constitution brought for all South Africans; it also emphasized the importance of democracy and promoting that democracy to the international system as well (South Africa Government Online 2013). South Africa's Constitution is one of the most liberal and democratic Constitution in the world and many revere and respect its principles and values that it contains.

(ii.) Street Committees

Another important part of the struggle against apartheid was the street committees that emerged in many parts of South Africa. Street committees are a grass-roots level of a loosely constituted three-tiered system of informal local rule in the townships. They were also known as section committees or headman's committees that developed in established townships and squatter camps in Cape Town (Burman and Scharf 1990). These community formations were formed to counter crime in the areas. They were designed to consolidate support against apartheid for the ANC among poor black townships. They encouraged people to actively fight the system of white privilege. Provinces like

Limpopo and Kwazulu-Natal saw an effective implementation of this form of popular participation, and although legally, the ordinary citizens had limited powers to make arrests, citizens could inform higher authorities about criminal activities. People involved in these committees would question strangers entering their own small communities, and could intimidate suspected criminals. They would only be allowed to make citizens' arrest if they witnessed a criminal committing a serious crime like murder or rape. They did not consider themselves as vigilantes, but as responsible citizens of their communities. They became an important part of how the people governed themselves and took initiative for fighting against crime during the apartheid years. However, the Inkatha Freedom Party (IFP) argues that the street committees were used as political tools for the ANC as the committees may have been used as instruments of civil war of the ANC against IFP members. Street committee members however, reject this notion that they were used as a political tool. In 2008, President Zuma eluded to re-establishing these street committees in order to combat crime in the country (IrinNews 2014). This initiative shows the character of the anti-apartheid struggle's associated with the ANC; in that the emphasis on a people-centred form of governance and democracy was strong and existed even before the formal foundations of the Freedom Charter and the post-apartheid Constitution was established. Street committees focused on ordinary people taking responsibility for their immediate surroundings and contributing to the overall well-being and safety of disenfranchised and impoverished black communities. This shows the nature of the anti-apartheid struggle; having ordinary people at the centre of governance and focusing on the protection of these peoples' rights and conditions of living. This 'culture' of radical democracy in the struggle was not just directed at fighting against the apartheid regime, but it was also directed at uplifting ordinary citizens and letting their voices dictate how their communities were run.

(iii.) The United Democratic Front

The United Democratic Front (UDF) was an anti-apartheid organisation formed in 1983, which incorporated many different affiliated groups; from student movements, youth, churches and civic organisations. In the three years after it formed, South Africa experienced an unprecedented period of protest and confrontation to the apartheid government and its laws. This protest emerged from the townships and rural areas across South Africa. The UDF contributed to many aspects of the struggle for democracy and equality among South African citizens. Its main involvement in the townships was to help citizens mobilise and provide for their immediate priorities. However, from 1983-1984, the UDF focus more on the state's Constitutional reforms. Many point to the organisational limitations experienced within the UDF; yet its influence in facilitating a democratic society that provided equality and incorporated pluralism that was voluntary, was significant (Seekings 1992). Although the UDF may not have directly affected the everyday local political

organisation in townships, its existence was a statement of national defiance. This implies that the UDF played more of an indirect role in representing the people, although it did facilitate many successful campaigns and actions against the apartheid regime. Seekings (1992) believes that the UDF would steer local developments but opposition politics still remained fragmented. The UDF did however, play a significant role in preventing the apartheid government's 'reformist' policies in the 1980s that threatened a representative and democratic state (South African History Online: Towards a People's History 2014). Despite some of the organisational setbacks that the UDF experienced, I think that Jeremy Seekings (1992) overlooks the significance of the UDF's capacity to mobilise and inspire grassroot initiatives. The fact that the UDF attempted to unite such a diverse and fragmented opposition to apartheid, shows the broadening conception of democracy that started to grow in the struggle against apartheid. The fact that many opposition groups with different backgrounds and ideologies could rally behind an organisation for support, shows that an aspect of radical democracy was evident at this organisational level. The UDF also focused the struggle on democratic reform; emphasizing that it was not just their ambition to overthrow the apartheid government but to create a democratic government that was representative of the people.

(iv.) Reconstruction and Development Programme

Another important document formulated in the transition from apartheid to democracy, was the RDP. The RDP was a socio-economic policy framework that sought to mobilise all the citizens of the country and the country's resources toward eradicating apartheid and building democratic future. The document was drawn up after much consultation with the ANC, its Alliance partners, mass organisations and civil society. It drew inspiration from the Freedom Charter, intending to express and articulate the interests and aspirations of the people. In the preface of the RDP document, Nelson Mandela mentions that the people were consulted broadly and that the RDP planned on practically implementing a legislative economic programme reflecting the aspirations set out in the Freedom Charter (Polity 2013). Therefore, the RDP can also be considered as a reflection of the peoples' agenda and interests; their opinions and voices were attempted to be expressed in a formalised document/framework. The success of the implementation of the RDP however, has been debated by many scholars and activists. The subsequent Growth, Employment and Redistribution (GEAR) policy that was implemented after the ANC was elected, reiterated the link made in the RDP document, that economic growth and the redistribution of incomes were connected; however GEAR stressed the need for higher economic growth rates in order to achieve social objectives. GEAR was a macro-economic framework adopted in 1996 and focused less on the social objectives that the RDP asserted and more on accumulating capital; which seemed to conform to neoliberal economic polices (Peet 2002). The RDP therefore, showed the attempts by the people to establish an

economic framework that facilitated their participation and the people's social rights into governance. However, perhaps the subsequent GEAR programme that was adopted showed the first step to a form of democracy that moved away from radical democracy.

(v.) Unionism in the Struggle against Apartheid

African unionism dates back to the 1920s in South Africa and it grew significantly in the 1950s when the unions became supported the national liberation struggle with the ANC-aligned, South African Congress of Trade Unions (SACTU). The mass strikes in the 1950s associated with the liberation struggle was an effective tool for recruiting people until the ANC was banned by the apartheid government and SACTU became obsolete. New unions emerged in the 1970s in the aftermath of even more strikes and they became a more inclusive, non-racial union membership. These unions initially avoided political alliances to evade state repression and therefore focused on "shop-floor organisation" (Emery 2006, 13). They advocated democratic worker participation and this grassroot style of organisation to build their union strength. Workers formed unions based on these principles in industries of chemical, metal, automobile, textile, paper and wood, and food by 1975. Union growth experienced another setback because of the economic crisis and layoff in the mid-1970s, but by the end of the 1970s, unions managed to resume their functioning again; by 1979 unions won five recognition agreements. In 1979, the Federation of South African Trade Unions (FOSATU) was also been founded, consolidating a united labour movement that fought for democratic grassroot "factory floor" (Emery 2006, 8) organisation, a movement independent of race, creed or sex, national industrial unions, an ongoing worker education program and social justice, decent standards of living and fair conditions for the working class. These workers unions were important agents for the shift from apartheid to political inclusion and formal racial equality. FOSATU used the organising space (provided by the state for independent unions) to compel the apartheid state to legalize non-racial unionism. This can even be seen as a factor leading to the later de-racialization of the workplace (Emery 2006).

In 1984, the apartheid government attempted to co-opt the coloured and Indian communities into the Tricameral Parliament; however it excluded the black community. The protests that emerged from this decision provoked greater resistance and called for the formation of a new union federation called the Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU) in 1985. COSATU, drew form the principles of the Freedom Charter and declared its allegiance to non-racial politics of the ANC. Increasing state repression, led to more cooperation between COSATU and mass mobilisations of civil society that also emerged under the UDF. COSATU led several general strikes against the apartheid government; including the protests against the repressive 1987 Labour Relations Act

which put severe limitations on strike activity and allowed employers to claim damages from unions. However, COSATU's support did not waver, when it called for a general strike, an estimated 2.5 million workers supported it – which made it the country's largest strike in its history at the time. COSATU was also engaged in organising two worker summits to strategize anti-apartheid activity. COSATU, the UDF and the ANC unified and mobilised civil society against the repressive apartheid regime. Mass mobilisations led to regime factionalization and even white anti-apartheid organisations. These unions also helped to establish an inclusive political citizenship in the country (Ibid). As a result, the 1996 South African Constitution was founded on the principles of human dignity, the achievement of equality, the advancement of human rights and freedoms, non-racialism, non-sexism, the supremacy of the constitution, and the rule of law, universal adult suffrage, regular elections and a multi-party system of democratic governance (South African Government Online 2013). These were the attributes of South African democracy; which the workers' unions in South African had a role in influencing.

In the 1980s, COSATU ranked as one of the most innovative and powerful union movements in the world. As the country's largest labour federation, it had the capacity to build layers of organisation and leverage their industrial and political influence against apartheid. COSATU also provided an inspirational model for other unions in the country (Adler and Webster 1999). The ANC, the SACP and COSATU were not the only actors that were important in the liberation struggle against the apartheid government. These powers have held state power since 1994, however the Pan-Africanist Congress (PAC) of Azania, the Azanian People's Organisation (AZAPO) and the New Unity Movement (NUMO) along with several other organisations played an important role in the struggle as well (Ejiogu 2012).

The unions' movement made a great contribution to the idea of civic engagement and did contribute to the idea of radical democracy that is people-centred in South Africa. However, the country's Constitution is also known as one of the world's most democratic; advocating for rights to water, food, education, security and healthcare. Despite this, Raenette Taljaard (2009) proclaims that South Africa's current conception of democracy has since not been clear. She believes that South Africa has become governed by an elitist system that does not show a commitment to the provision of these services.

The trade unions' movement was an important part of the struggle against apartheid; however the youth movement in South Africa also contributed greatly to the struggle against the authoritarian regime. This youth struggle was epitomised by the Soweto uprising on June 16th 1976, which showed

the youth of South Africa mobilise themselves in the struggle against the authoritarian government's education system. Students from various schools in Soweto and the greater Johannesburg region took to the streets and marched from Orlando East in Johannesburg and took several routes where they were met with violent policemen from the government. The Soweto uprising is commemorated annually as Youth Day, as it is thought to have played a defining role in the struggle for freedom and democracy. The ANC has incorporated the Soweto uprising into the narrative of the liberations struggle and has noted its significance for the construction of post-apartheid South Africa (Baines 2007). There is much debate around whether the uprising was a spontaneous event; however some recognise that it was a planned uprising which collaborated with many student activists and associations.

In the preliminary negotiations to South Africa's transition to democracy, nothing particularly significant came of the discussions around issues of foreign policy. The all-party Convention for a Democratic South Africa (CODESA) negotiation held from 1991 to 1993 did bring to light many foreign policy issues, however a broad participatory institution for foreign policy was not created in CODESA and the Transitional Executive Council. After the election of 1994, the Government of National Unity (GNU) took a number of steps to democratize South African foreign policy; one of which was to make the Portfolio Committee in Parliament responsible for Foreign Affairs. There was the hope that this institution of government would allow representatives of the people to interact with the Department of Foreign Affairs (DFA). In 1996, the DFA also launched the 'South African Foreign Policy Discussion Document' which attempted to consult many academics, unions and NGOs. Workshops were set up to discuss stakeholders in civil society (Ibid).

(vi.) The International Anti-apartheid Movement

Håkan Thörn (2006) presents an interesting argument in his article, "Solidarity across Borders: The Transnational Anti-Apartheid Movement". He describes the effect that the international anti-apartheid movement had not only on the politics and dynamics of South Africa's struggles, but the impact it had for transnational movements around the world. Thörn believes that the anti-apartheid movement was part of a collective movement toward the conception of a "global civil society" (Thörn 2006, 285) and global political culture after the Cold War. He mentions that many of the movement organisations, action forms an networks that were developed in the anti-apartheid struggle, are still present in the current global context, fighting against issues like neoliberal globalization and supra-national political organisations like the WTO, IMF and World Bank.

There were many thousands of groups that were involved in the transnational anti-apartheid network; groups and organisations, solidarity organisations, unions, churches, women, youth and student organisations in more than 100 countries. In Britain, there were 184 local groups that were affiliated to the British Anti-Apartheid Movement (AAM) in 1990. Prominent Anti-Apartheid Movements also emerged in Australia and America. The anti-apartheid movement was very media-oriented; therefore one of the key objectives of the movement was to disseminate information and create awareness of the plight of the non-white people under apartheid rule. Its actions also put pressure on governments and political parties and it engaged people in political action outside of parliament (with actions such as boycotts and civil disobedience). At first, older, more established social movements such as labour movements and church networks gained more internationalization, and then other smaller groups started gaining international recognition as well. Activists mention that the international community also welcomed visits and people that were exiled from South Africa into their own countries; for example, in the 1980s the UDF spent time raising awareness of apartheid in countries like the UK and other parts of the world. This directly links the anti-apartheid movement to solidarity movements and activists all over the world.

This shows that the present-day mobilisation of global civil society (reacting to economic globalization and institutions like the IMF and WTO) has historical links to the post-Cold War transnational political culture – of which the anti-apartheid struggle was a huge component. For example, in 1999, Thörn (2006) mentions that he encountered two anti-apartheid veteran activists that were involved in the preparations of the protests against the WTO meeting in Seattle in November-December 2000. This protest is marked as one of the largest form of civic activism protests.

(vii.) Analysis of Radical Democracy in South Africa's Transition to Democracy

The anti-apartheid struggle mobilised the people and it was the people that created the documents and organisations that were fundamental to bringing down the apartheid government. The grassroot initiatives like the street committees managed to not only govern their own communities and townships but it also created a form of radical democracy; which relied on the participation of the people and made the people feel that they as ordinary citizens could have an impact on the governance and functioning of their community. These initiatives also created the "public space" or "the political" environment for ordinary citizens to engage in, as mentioned by theorists Robert Dahl and Hannah Arendt. These ordinary people were the people in apartheid were the non-white people

who were disenfranchised and disempowered by the apartheid government; therefore these organisations provided them with the power and rights that the government denied them. Initiatives like this grew into more formal organisations and documentation.

The Freedom Charter remains an exceptional example of how the aspirations of the ordinary citizens of the country are represented in a document that they expected to be implemented in the country. The UDF brought together a wide variety of civil society organisations, including political groups. The UDF promoted democracy, but the very structure and development of its organisation showed a radical form of democracy being established in the country. The UDF seemed to function through a horizontal form of leadership, where each of its members could voice its interests and concerns equally, and the UDF also provided a unified stand of all the civil society groups against a the common cause of defeating apartheid and instituting democracy. However, it should be recognised that the influence of the ANC was very strong in the UDF and divisions among its different members and organisations existed. The trade union movement mobilised the working class and would offer a more 'leftist' economic dynamic to the struggle against apartheid; this is reflective of some of the theoretical underpinnings of radical democracy that Rosa Luxemburg and Chantal Mouffe and Ernesto Laclau (1985) mention.

Unions like COSATU played a fundamental role in not only mobilising people against apartheid, but also voicing the peoples' concerns about the economic development of the country and the welfare of the people. The RDP similarly, expressed the peoples' aspirations and plans for the economic future of the country. The international anti-apartheid campaigns also played an important role in putting pressure on the apartheid government, but they also created a culture of people's street protests and the organisation of people into organisations. Analysts such as Conway and Singh (2011) highlight this form of engagement with citizens in countries like Mexico and India that have developed into practical forms of radical democracy. Kurt Anderson (2011) also reflects on the "culture" of street protests and citizen activism that has emerged in the world. The organisations and initiatives that emerged in the anti-apartheid struggle resisted not only apartheid, but many neoliberal institutions that affected the livelihood countries and communities in the international system. These forms of radical democracy are a few examples that show the prominence of a people-centred democracy that characterised the struggle against apartheid.

(b.) The Discourse around the Role of Civic Movements and Civil Society in South Africa

The important role that citizens played in the struggle against apartheid and in the building of democracy in South Africa has been reflected in defining policy documents and organisations. However, there is a vigorous debate around the impact of civic movement and civil society in not only toppling the apartheid regime, but in consolidating and reflecting South Africa's vibrant democracy. The literature on civic movement and civil society is broad; however there are a few authors that have highlighted important arguments to be considered.

In 1986, Jeremy Cronin wrote an article about the national democratic struggle and mentions that mass mobilisation and participation are a fundamental part of South Africa's history and culture. He argues that the basic structures of the democratic struggle have contributed greatly to the understanding of the transformational possibilities for South Africa. He believed that in order to gain the necessary conditions for democracy, strengthening the working class mobilisation was an important aspect. Also, the inclusion of trade unions, shop steward locals, street committees, parent/teacher and student associations also forms an important part of this transformation. Therefore, he encourages a transformation with people at the centre of its development. He believes that this was the only way to develop the democratic aspect of the struggle against apartheid. This document, along with others, emerged at the time of the creation of organisations such the UDF.

Cronin and many others believed that the struggle against apartheid should build upon the civic involvement and participation in society that already existed and functioned in the rural and urban areas of South Africa. He believed that this would inculcate the sense of national self-determination, national independence and eliminate the oppression that apartheid enforced. He mentions that although there is a call from many in South Africa to engage in militant intervention against apartheid forces, the only way to consolidate democracy is to fight it with the influence of civil society and civic organisation (Cronin 1986). Many would argue that this provides quite an idealistic view of civil society in its many different organisational forms and the potential impact it could have on transforming the dynamics of governance for South Africa. Cronin (1986) does not assess some of the impediments that civil society could have faced from political parties and the dominance of government forces in South Africa's transition to democracy. That being said, I think he highlights some important principles that an active civil society promotes; the principles of national self-

determination and independence are important because when these values do not exist among citizens, there is always an uncertainty to the legitimacy of those in power. Also, this document serves as a testament to the feeling of optimism and certainty that many shared about civil society being able to build the 'new' democratic South Africa. The document was written in 1986, a time when civil society was active and thriving. I think it therefore has value in reflecting the nature of civil society how people in that time perceived civil society to be such an important part of the struggle against apartheid. Cronin (1986) also touches on how South Africa has a history of activism in civil society – which shows the established place it had in the country.

The UDF played an important role in uniting the local struggles and organisations throughout the country, it helped create common national demands in the struggle against apartheid. However, the UDF also drew on the perception that political power would be transferred to the representatives of the majority in order to realise their broader socio-economic demands; which in some aspects limits civil society. Swilling (1992) encourages a civil society that musters creativity and energy that challenges government; not just another populist authoritarian government. He recognises one of the pitfalls of popular participation and an active civil society – it can be easily dominated by a political force or organisation that advances the interests of the majority rather than seeking a pluralistic and heterogeneous society. Despite this, Swilling (1992) still recognises the value that civil society organisations and movements have contributed to the struggle against apartheid. He does not question whether the role of civil society and civic movements in creating democracy in South Africa, but rather advances a democratic socialist dynamic to its existence.

Civil society movements developed into a diverse culmination of organisations and campaign that were not always formal and planned. Spontaneous protests and revolts were initiated and constituted a significant part of the anti-apartheid struggle. During the 1980s, the ANC represented an organisation in favour of a revolt; not just for a reform of the government. The ANC was committed to a revolutionary transition; they developed a "people's war" tactic to seize power. However, this tactic also competed with their traditions of negotiated settlement and constitutional reconstruction. Although South Africa opted for a 'leadership pact' or a peaceful transition to democracy, the ANC was at one stage prepared to stage a more violent revolutionary overthrow of the apartheid government (van Nieuwkerk 1992). This shows another dynamic of civil society that was willing to engage in the struggle against apartheid not just through organisations and institutions that represented their interests, but it was also prepared to employ a more drastic and revolutionary stance against the regime.

Patrick Bond (2006) has contributed significantly to the discourse around civil society and its contribution to democracy in South Africa. He writes that the movement of community-based democracy in South Africa in the 1970s was an important part of destabilising the apartheid government. Community-based democracy had gone through waves of prominence but it peaked in the 1990s and was considered to be the foundations of many of Mandela's policies and visions for South Africa. He recognises the fact that although new social movements did emerge after Mandela's term as President (such as the Treatment Action Campaign), many popular movements and organisations faded as well. The movements that allied with the powerful trade union, COSATU did well; however the political influence that the ANC held limited the influence of COSATU and other movements. The dominance of the ANC affected the progress made on social and economic change; Bond (2006) believes that the ANC has promulgated neoliberal public policy domination. There were many important anti-apartheid protests in townships, for example, the 1955 Bus Boycott, that were directed at improving living conditions. Community activists used protests to raise the demand on tax bases and many other socio-economic issues that affected the disadvantaged communities in apartheid. Many of the anti-apartheid movements that emerged from popular resistance, protest, and organisations were anti-capitalist in nature because of the socio-economic inequalities that were forced on them in the apartheid system. Bond (2006) therefore shows that although the effectiveness and impact of civil society organisations may not have been consistent; they still played a major role in developing the anti-apartheid movement. He speaks to some of the problems of the dominance of the ANC and the poor decisions that it made in the 1990s transition to democracy; however organisations like the trade union, COSATU are seen to still have potential in mobilising and representing communities.

Daryl Glaser (1997) reflects on the role of civil society and civic movements in South Africa in the early 1990's. He believes that many invested in the idea of a civil society in South Africa in the hopes that it would provide a more democratic, participatory country that also created a spirit of solidarity. He asserts that although civil society is valuable to liberals (as it stabilizes democratic state power) and valuable to radicals (as it incorporates a non-statist and participatory dimension of socialism in governance); civil society cannot substitute state power as an alternative to effective state democracy and it cannot serve as a new form of direct democracy. He believes that civil society can only be used an instrument of deliberation and association. He argues that civil society cannot act as an alternative mechanism of government; civil society is very diverse is not suited as a decisive form of governance. However, he states that we should not underestimate the value to democracy that civil society provide, in its collective action and direct accountability that it offers to citizens. Glaser (1997) critiques' the idea of Mark Swilling (1992)to have an associational socialistic society that

includes having strong voluntary associations in civil society that would be capable of self-government, and negotiation with the state, business and other power-holders. He also critiques the work of Mzwanele Mayekiso, who asserts that civil society is characterised by class and would prefer to see a civil society that benefits the working class. Glaser (1997) claims that both authors have given too much credit toward civil society in South Africa being an autonomous body that could govern a state, even after the active role of civil society movements in the anti-apartheid struggle. Glaser's (1997) analysis perhaps shows the limitations of civil society in governance. Of course, civil society cannot replace the institutions of government; however it is still an important part of growing a form of democracy that is people-centred. In this sense, South Africa's civil society definitely contributed to the consolidation of democracy. The civil society created within the anti-apartheid struggle incorporated the voice of the working class (through agents like COSATU) and showed its pluralist nature (in organisations such as the UDF). This civil society created the conditions for action to be made in bringing down the apartheid government. The political and economic pressure that the civil society organisations and movements created an environment that was difficult for the apartheid government (and international system) to ignore. Civil society also helped create the documents and plans for the post-apartheid era.

Alexander Johnston (2000) reviews the book by Adler and Steinberg; "*From Comrades to Citizens: The South African Civic Movement and the Transition to Democracy"* and also suggests that perhaps there is a tendency to romanticize the significance of the role of the civics in the struggle against apartheid. Certainly, they did show courage and sacrifice, especially for young people and residents' organisations; however he suggests that the civics represent 'era-bound' assumptions, interests and forms of organisation. He believes that civic organisations today have not found a way to organize themselves in a way that is appropriate for representative democracy, yet they might have the potential to do so. However, in the struggle against apartheid, the civics did provide "the fear of the crowd" to the apartheid government; the protests that they lead inspired ideas of a popular democracy and manifestations of direct democracy.

In an interview on the 28 August 2013 with political analyst, Steven Friedman (2013), he mentions that civil society movements in the anti-apartheid struggle was perhaps given too much accreditation and the idea that these civil society movements could create a more democratic post-apartheid society is a flawed notion. Friedman (2013) believes that organisations such as the UDF were not a spontaneous group of protestors, but were a political organisation that sympathised with the ANC. Organisations such as the UDF were organised to defeat the nationalist apartheid government and they were based on a specific political agenda. He believes that the correct

characterization of 'civil society' did not exist before 1994, as civil society means that people are a part of an already democratic society (which South Africa was not under apartheid). He asserts that a functional and effective civil society exists in a place where people all have basic rights – which the apartheid government limited to non-white citizens. Therefore, this implies that it was only a popular protest movement that South African people engaged in before 1994, and that this movement would be difficult to draw into a form of governance in the post-apartheid era.

Glaser (1997), Johnston (2000) and Freidman (2013) present some valid criticisms of the importance of civil society movements and civic organisations during the struggle against apartheid. However, I think that there is overwhelming evidence to show that a form of civil society existed and played a key role in the opposition against apartheid. Documents like the Freedom Charter, the Constitution and the RDP were all clearly influenced by grass-root movements and an active participation from civil society. The debate around the definition of 'civil society' draws attention away from the fact that citizens actively participated and mobilised themselves into organisations that intended to consolidate democracy – not just develop a popular movement to topple the apartheid government. Informal organisations like the street committees and township protests also reflected a radical form of civil society engagement because of the limitations against creating official organisations that the apartheid government imposed. Perhaps it is fair to suggest that political organisations like the UDF and trade unions like COSATU were politically motivated in some ways, as they aimed to overthrow the apartheid government. However, the people that the UDF and COSATU represented were diverse groups of people that wanted more than just a new government, but wanted democratic reforms that would serve their social and economic interests. Civil Society is a diverse and fluid concept that manifested itself in many different ways; which were indeed politically-motivated, but also motivated by the socio-economic problems that non-white people faced in their communities and wanted to change.

In more recent literature on civil society in South Africa (in the post-apartheid era) Patrick Heller (2012) makes an assessment of democracy and participatory politics in Brazil, India and South Africa. He firmly believes that in order for there to be inclusive democratic development, attention needs to be given to "effective citizenship" (Heller 2012, 645) and for ordinary citizens to be able to use the formal political and civic rights. Although representative democracy has been adopted in many forms, inequalities between citizens exist along the lines of class etc. This limits the show the deficits in representative democracy, which would make it difficult to build welfare states – particularly in countries of the Global South. Heller (2012) considers "effective citizenship" to exist when all citizens share basic rights, the capacity to exercise their free will and have the freedom to associate

and vote for whomever they choose. Therefore, citizens bearing these rights have the ability to associate, deliberate and express their preferences which could undermine the legitimacy of the democratic political authority. Heller (2012) asserts that the term 'civil society' would be able to provide a space that allows citizens his kind of participation, association and deliberation. The Communist Party (Marxist) in India and the Workers' Party in Brazil have implemented participatory reforms to strengthen the associational capacities of groups in rural areas. Although this has not solved the tension between institutional and participatory logics, it has allowed for the co-production between the state and civil society. In South Africa, the ANC has had little incentive to work in cooperation with the civil society and instead, it only emphasized a political objective of consolidating its control over public institutions. Having the institutional capacities for citizen participation does not guarantee the substantive outcomes of citizens being able to use and engage with decision-makers in government. Yet, the indomitable force of civil society continues to show that it can be implemented into governance. The idea of 'effective citizenship' seems to place importance on the rights of individuals and citizens – which would be the foundation of a strong civil society (Heller 2012). These views are shared by some of the aforementioned authors; expressing the decline of the prominence of civil society in the years after the ANC came into power. Effective citizenship is perhaps something that South Africa has not been able to maintain as yet in the post-apartheid era, despite the fact there is so much evidence to show that in the struggle for apartheid, an active civil society exited in many forms. Therefore, it is perhaps necessary to attempt to understand some of the changes in the post-apartheid era that seemed to have affected its civil society activism and its aspirations of a democracy that seemed to reflect tenets of radical democracy.

(c.) The Shift from Radical Democracy to Neoliberalism in South Africa: The Influence on Foreign Policy

(i.) Radical democracy Lost in Constitutionalism

Philip Nel, Jo-Ansie van Wyk and Kristen Johnsen (2004) mention that the type of democracy that was established was done through multiparty negotiations that brought about the official regime change. They show that the final Constitution of 1996 showed a mixture of a competitive elitist form of democracy and clientelistic corporatism. The ANC regime used these features to gain political stability and create the administrative means to deal with many developmental problems. The authors do argue that the South African Constitution, the Bill of Rights and the oversight of the Constitutional Court are perhaps not typical of a competitive clientelistic democracy model.

However, aspects such as the proportional representation electoral system show the lack of citizen participation. The closed party-list electoral process limits the citizens' voice in electing leaders for the country. The gap between voters and members of Parliament may be one of the reasons that South Africa has not been able to maintain its promises to its people. The authors mention that perhaps there are different interpretations of "putting the people first"; it could be perceived that putting the people first means that the government is gearing its policies to addressing the needs of the people. However, these needs of the people are those determined by the government, not the people. Perhaps this could be considered as "government *for* the people" rather than "government *by* the people".

There is evidence of democratic participatory elements in post-apartheid South Africa such as the development of ward committees, which were formally implemented into local government in 2000. Ward Committees were implemented in local government and municipalities; they are a representative structure that incorporates the opinions and participation of the community and citizens. The citizens inform the municipality about their aspirations, potentials and challenges of the people. The ward committees form a communication line between the councils and the people and the results of this interaction is incorporated into local government legislation. The ward committees form an important part of the Integrated Development Planning, municipal budgeting and municipal performance management processes. The Ward committees function at varying strengths, and it is intended to be implemented to more communities and municipalities in the country (Department of Provincial and Local Government, Republic of South Africa 2005).

However, the threat of 'new constitutionalism' in South Africa threatens to significantly reduce the influence of 'the people' in the development of policies in government. Louise Vincent (2011) discusses the interaction of populism and constitutionalism in South Africa. This suggests that the authority and functioning of the government derive from fundamental laws – and not necessarily the people. The author shows that there are many aspects of South African civil society that have given in to a 'majoritarian' form of democracy, despite the aspects of civil society such as independent media and NGOs that contribute to a more vibrant and varied democracy. The dominance of the ANC in election is an example of this. However, there is also the threat of new constitutionalism that has permeated into South Africa's governance; instituting top-down managerialism. In many instances, technocratic solutions are favoured instead of popular participation, local creativity and people-centred policy-making. Marketization is considered more important than mobilisation in South Africa's policy-making. Development has become bureaucratised and decision-making is developed through a top-down process. Vincent (2011)

believes that because of this, populism is appealing to the voters of South Africa; there is a lack of responsiveness from the state. Vincent's ideas reflect on the challenges of implementing the ideological conceptions of democracy that the South African government has used in rhetoric and the practical functioning of democracy.

After the vibrancy of a people-centred democracy experienced in the struggle against apartheid, it was encouraging to see the documents like the Freedom Charter, the consequent 1996 Constitution and the RDP being implemented into the new democratic government. However, it is also clear that after the apartheid government, civil society and the voice of the people in the country's democracy become limited. The civil society organisations that were engaged in the struggle of bringing down apartheid did not necessarily translate into a struggle for maintaining a people-centred democracy. Despite the implementation of initiatives such as the ward committees, the dominance of bureaucracy and the ANC government in developing policies has become a feature of the 'new' democracy. I think that although mechanisms of popular engagement and participatory democracy exist, many times these mechanisms are overruled by more technocratic and government-influenced decisions. Louise Vincent (2011) makes an interesting observation that the idea of 'populism' has emerged when describing democracy in South Africa; as it is a backlash from the lack of the new constitutionalism.

(ii.) The Shift to Neoliberalism

In an article entitled, '*South African People Power Since the Mid-1980s: Two Steps Forward, One Back*', Patrick Bond (2012) mentions that civil society organisations and the community-based democracy that emerged in the transition from apartheid to democracy in South Africa has continued in some ways, but has also declined. After 1994, campaigns emerged under Nelson Mandela's presidency, such as the Treatment Action Campaign and urban community movements that attempted to improve water, sanitation, electricity and housing in their communities. However, by 2004, these movements began to recede and "people power" has emerged in a more disruptive way – in township insurgencies and the like. Even the successful trade union, COSATU has been limited by its political alliance with the ANC, and therefore, Bond (2012) believes society has maintained a neoliberal public policy agenda. The first decade of the 2000s seems to have given in to neoliberal patterns after the decades of struggle for social justice that was started in townships and grassroot initiatives. Although racial discrimination was eliminated in South African law, there is has been an increase in class power. The neoliberal threats such as the commercialised municipal services and corporate power over healthcare that were implemented inspired some social revolts.

However, these revolts were ignored and the neoliberal polices were set in motion and would endure throughout the post-apartheid period.

There was a watchdog that emerged from civil society after democratization in 1994; the Mass Democratic Movement (which the UDF was a strong supporter of). However, their functioning was demobilised. There was some public policy reform advocacy that was successful; however it did not progress many social policies. There was also a brief rise in protests against privatization in the early 2000s; some activists resorted to Constitutional strategies, referring to the Bill of Rights and its socioeconomic clauses for water, healthcare and housing. However, these campaigns were not as successful enough to radically change the policies that the ANC already implemented. Bond (2012) sees similarities in the protests that emerged in Egypt and Tunisia, against their neoliberal-nationalist regimes. Bond sees that the urban social protests in Senegal, Uganda, Kenya and Malawi, Swaziland and Botswana are also indicative of the frustrations shared by the people who are subjected to neoliberal-nationalist regimes.

In the early 1990s, the transition to democracy had begun; financial sanctions and other economic restraints were imposed on white businesses and the apartheid government in South Africa, which forced white businesses to negotiate with the ANC in exile. The transition however, was conducted between the apartheid government in Pretoria and the 'elite' -those within the political leadership of the ANC; which shows a neoliberal democratic character. With the development of the RDP in 1994, there seemed to be resurgence in active civil society as social movements and community-based organisations were deemed a vital part to democratize and develop our society. Although elements of the RDP encouraged enhancing civil society movements and community-based organisations, these organisations did not receive the funding they were promised. By the late 1990s, there were regular community protests against the ruling party in Johannesburg, starting with the Soweto Residents' Association in 1996 that led demonstrations against water price increases, and similar protests erupted in Durban and Cape Town. The escalade of service delivery protests that followed in the 1990s showed the citizens' discontent with the macroeconomic policies adopted by the ANC. The urban uprisings demonstrated against the commercialization of municipal services, rising poverty and equality. However, these protests were not progressive and effective enough to change the status quo or change the ANC's polices that were implemented. Some of the arguments made by the ANC for their decisions to go against expansive national and municipal policies included the fact that it needed to maintain its international competitiveness and job creation relied on South Africa's integration into the world economy (Ibid).

Richard Peet (2002) makes a similar argument, showing that although the ANC initially adopted a "leftist basic-need-oriented" (Peet 2002, 2) RDP initiative, it switched to a "rightist, neoliberal policy" called the Growth, Employment and Redistribution (GEAR) policy. The GEAR policy emphasized privatization, deregulation, and trade liberalization. Trade and tariff liberalization shows that the South African government has become more focused on accumulating capital and foreign investment; however local industries have suffered in return and the voice of the working class and ordinary citizens have clearly been stunted in the process. Peet (2002) believes that the leftist influence in South Africa's governance declined despite the influence of Marxist influencers such as the South African Communist Party and COSATU that pushed leftist development documents to guide the economic policy of the country. Peet (2002) believes that the leftist influencer was factionalised. In addition to this, the SACP became disillusioned because of the fall of the Soviet Union in 1989. Capitalist power eventually overruled the plans for government to have a limited role in business (as was previously expected in the transition out of apartheid). Furthermore, South Africa gave in to the stabilization and conditionalities that was offered by the World Bank and IMF. The IMF and World Bank offered loans and conditionalities that were to have secured anti-poverty and job creation programs in South Africa. This also meant of course, that South Africa conceded more neoliberal economic policies; polices which were seen to have been the answer for gaining progress on stock exchanges and currency markets (locally and around the word). Deviation from these policies seemed to present rejection from the world's economy.

The neoliberal policies implemented were taken on to integrate into the neoliberal global environment. They have widened inequality and increased unemployment in South Africa, just as it has done in many other parts of the world. Civil society's reaction to these neoliberal policies has been similar to the 'third sectors' emerging in other parts of the world. Civil society has become active in NGOS, informal agencies and social movements. In many ways, this has changed the relationship that civil society has with the state; some having a more critical influence over the state than others (Habib 2005).

In 2001 COSATU launched a general strike which was aimed at stopping the government's privatization program. Both COSATU and the SACP spoke out against the government's neoliberal macroeconomic policies; therefore they attempted add an aspect of accountability to the ANC government. Despite this, Thabo Mbeki's term in office continued to support the GEAR Program. COSATU stated that the ANC leadership had in part, "sold out" the country in their economic policies as most of the country's capital stayed in the hands of the emergent black bourgeoisie and white populations and it is these populations in the country that benefit and support the GEAR program.

This tension between the tripartite alliance show the serious problem of taking democratic practices of the government at face value. Political analyst Ian Taylor (2004) believes that in South Africa, the term 'democracy' is and has been used for the struggle for power and legitimization. However, precise and clear definition of South Africa's conception of democracy cannot be found. Taylor (2004) believes that tension arises within South Africa's foreign policy principles and actions because of the lack of input from the citizens of the country; only a few so-called 'experts' have significant influence over the country's foreign relations. The post-apartheid form of governance in the country is still driven by the elite groups in society who monopolizes the social and economic policies. South Africa has employed an elitist-driven system of governance and economic distribution and which can be reflected in its foreign policy. Taylor (2004) does not necessarily support a direct form of democracy, but in the foreign policy context, he believes that greater political openness, debate and discussion is needed for a more people-driven democracy to be implemented. This people-driven democracy has been promised by many leaders and encouraged through institutions and organisations such as NEPAD and the AU.

In analysing the literature on the increase of neoliberalism, it is evident that the decline in civil society participation and community-based organisation seems to be linked to the advancement of neoliberalism in South Africa's post-apartheid policy formation. Furthermore, neoliberal policies are enabled by the lack of civil society engagement in the governance of the country. Neoliberalism is known to have withering effects on the democracy and human rights as neoliberalism and market democracy has its focus on the profitability of the states' actions and it opens up the country's economy and development to free trade policy and privatization. This inherently excludes the influence of the people in the country's economy and development. Bond (2012) Peet (2002) Habib (2005) and Taylor (2004) reflect upon the different aspects of civil society that are affected by the institutionalization of neoliberal policies in South Africa. There are more concrete examples of the clash of neoliberalism and democracy (especially aspects of radical democracy) in South Africa. For example, Patrick Bond (2012) showed how neoliberalism negated the consideration for human rights in the incident of the Marikana protests in 2012.

On the 16th August 2012, wildcat striking miners form the Marikana mine were confronted by the police, resulting in 16 fatalities and 78 wounded miners. On the 12th October 2012, 12 000 striking mine workers were fired on with live ammunition by the South African police. Their protests were based on the miners' low wages which they sought to increase. Bond (2012) asserts that the ANC, SACP and COSATU were altogether unable to contain the labour movement, and even they couldn't have predicted the Marikana protests and outcome. Many would compare the Marikana massacre

to the Sharpeville Massacre in 1960 where 69 people were shot dead for burning passbooks or the massacre on June 1976 in Soweto where 100s of school children were shot by the police for protesting against the apartheid regime's policy of teaching in Afrikaans in all South African schools. The Marikana massacre shows the same resistance against the government and also shows the neoliberal nature of South Africa's conception of democracy. The South African government was perceived to have side-lined the rights and concerns of the workers, in the quest for economic benefit and capital. Political commentator, Moeletsi Mbeki (2012) even suggested that South Africa's own form of an Arab Spring could unfold in the near future if the South African government did not address the concerns of the people and workers. Bond (2012) believes that the ANC alliance has transitioned from revolutionaries to partners of "some of the world's most wicked corporations" (2012, 1).

(iii.) Neoliberalism in Foreign Policy

Globalization and competitiveness have become an integral in many countries' foreign policy as well as South Africa's. However, the principle of putting the people first is extended to South Africa's government and foreign policy in theory. Many have asserted that the Mandela era in South Africa defined the country's foreign policy that was committed to multilateralism and the role of a bridge-builder in South Africa. However, noticeable changes in foreign policy were recognised when Mbeki became the president in 1999. Mbeki's term brought on a reformist profile in foreign policy. Globalization and the agreements made around trade and economic policies can be conducive to domestic democratization in South Africa as many of the agreements with institutions like the European Union (EU) encourage democracy in foreign policy. However, the eventual economic and trade decisions made in foreign policy cannot escape the asymmetrical global power relationships - which in many cases compromise a people-centred form of democracy (Nel and van der Westhuizen 2004).

Member of Parliament and Chairperson of the Portfolio Committee on International Relations and Cooperation, Tiesetso Magama (2013) delivered a speech at the South African Institute of International Affairs (SAIIA) and spoke to the development of South Africa's foreign policy and the direction it has taken in recent years. He recalls that the post-apartheid foreign policy was indeed based on high moral principles as well as national interest paradigm. Magama (2013) quoted from Mandela's foreign policy mandate developed in 1993, and stresses again the fact that the elements of both human rights and democracy were an essential part of the post-apartheid foreign policy framework. It reflected a moralistic approach that also brought to the fore, elements of social and environmental justice. However, he also mentioned that South Africa also employed a realist

approach with regard to national interests - something which he considered to be pervasive in the international arena at the time. He brought to light the centrality of South Africa's domestic policy in its foreign policy; this he believes, placed South Africa's needs first above the needs of its partners and allies in the South African Development Community (SADC) and its engagement with peace, security and stability in Africa. Perhaps this shows a deviation from South Africa's direct commitment to the moral principles it advocated in its foreign policy, to its primary commitment to its domestic policy (which involved the advancement of neoliberalism). He mentions that South Africa's moral, ideological, political and strategic stances that it promoted in theory, helped to grow South Africa's stature and moral authority among the nations of the world. However, he addressed the criticism that South Africa received in its two tenures in the UN Security Council as a non-permanent member. He mentioned that many felt South Africa abandoned its commitment to human rights with the decision it made concerning the conflicts in Myanmar and Libya. Many criticised South Africa for engaging in 'realpolitik', while others also mentioned that South Africa should act with its national interests as its first priority. Magama (2013) mentions that a "purist moralistic foreign policy" (Magama 2013, 4) based on promoting democracy and human rights as a primary objective is not predictable or desirable. He suggests that the condition for promoting democracy and human rights in a situation is not always present and that there is not always a clear black or white decision that can be made. This suggests that South Africa's decision-making in foreign policy are not necessarily a simple choice between human rights, social and economic justice and other more realist domestic interests, but its decisions include a broad conception of all of these interests. Magama (2013) goes on to cite how even Mandela's decision to question the human rights of the previous Nigerian military junta in the execution of Ken Sarowiwa was questioned and criticised for not showing an allegiance with African governments.

Magama (2013) also cites a recent survey released in October 2012 by Karen Smith that shows how South African citizens view foreign policy and how they believe foreign policy should be conducted. In this survey, he mentions that South Africans want the country to play a major role in the world, as long as it does not undermine their domestic priorities like unemployment, poverty, shelter, education and access to health facilities etc. Additionally, when dealing with a situation that would put trade against promoting human rights, this survey shows that some South African citizens would prefer the concerns of trade to be put first. Similarly, they believe that even that even though countries like China do not have a good human rights record, South Africa could learn a lot from China in terms of economic growth, poverty-alleviation and trade relations. This shows the perception that South African citizens have a more pragmatic view of what South African foreign should be, and that foreign policy ultimately should consider domestic interests first. Magama

(2013) encourages civil society to claim its stake in the public discourse around foreign policy. He feels that academics, scholars and analysts have insulated themselves and are presented as the opposition to foreign policy decision made by the government. He also points out that the country's foreign policy is still evolving and that all sectors of society need to participate in its development. He mentions that DIRCO's senior management staff has attended engagements with civil society holding imbizos and community gatherings; and therefore public diplomacy is considered as an important instrument of public participation.

Patrick Bond (2006) also highlights South Africa's conflicted economic agenda after apartheid, and specifically during Thabo Mbeki's term as president. In Bond's book entitled '*Talk Left Walk Right: South Africa's Frustrated Global Reforms',* Bond shows that despite the rhetoric of radical reforms that former President Thabo Mbeki used, the policies that he adopted for South Africa reflected the principles of neoliberalism and provided the country with a capitalist economy. Bond asserts that a bottom-up approach to development and democracy needs to be implemented; focusing on people rather than capital. He believes that by abandoning the RDP plan and instead adopting the GEAR plan, South Africa's decision-making in governance and foreign policy shifted to a neoliberal agenda. He shows that Thabo Mbeki has not only adopted a neoliberal agenda, but also promoted it throughout the continent using NEPAD. SADC member states have also been inspired to adopt neoliberal policies due to Mbeki's decisions about governance and economics in South Africa. Bond believes that a new form of colonialism has developed in the post-Cold War era – especially for Africa - as the international system is being dominated by a capitalism system of trade and investment which dispossess the indigenous people of the land. The fact that South Africa moved toward more moderate and neoliberal policies, which comply with the West's standards of governance and economics, a certain amount of tension has also arisen between South Africa and other African countries.

Nel and van der Westhuizen (2004) make a fair argument, suggesting that the domestic neoliberal policies in the economy and trade could affect the people-centred form of democracy in foreign policy. Magama (2013) presents an interesting argument, emphasizing the complexity of South African foreign policy. It is encouraging to see that there have been some initiatives to involve civil society in the processes of foreign policy. However, Magama (2013) does not fully address the impacts that South Africa's foreign policy decisions have on its identity as an advocate for democracy. Although he encourages civil society to participate in the theoretical and practical development of foreign policy, the decisions that have neglected human rights abuses and democratic consolidation in external conflict situations do not reflect this people-centred approach

to governance that Magama insists South Africa still engages in. The survey that shows South African citizens wanting foreign policy to put its domestic interests first above other interests shows the shift to neoliberal policies. However, I think that this survey also shows the desperation and concern that South African citizens have for their domestic socio-economic well-being. People want the immediate economic security and benefits that come with its engagement with the rest of the world. However, this may blind some citizens to the long-term consequences of neglecting the defence of human rights and democracy in the international system. It is reflective of the market democracy that South Africa has subjected to, and deviated from the radical form of democracy that was evident in the struggle against apartheid. I agree with Magama (2013) in saying that foreign policy situations and decisions are not "black or white"; therefore they are complex. However, foreign policy incoherence and inconsistency can also be considered as a negative identity in the international system and it jeopardizes South Africa's moral standing in the international system as well.

(iv.) South Africa's Foreign Policy in Africa

South Africa's engagement in Africa has been primarily influences by Thabo Mbeki's notion of the 'African Renaissance', but has also been emphasized as important in Mandela's 'Future Foreign Policy' document. It seems therefore, that South Africa has a unique commitment to the African continent, and as aforementioned, mediating conflict, and promoting peace and stability has been long been advocated as the essence of South Africa's foreign policy in Africa. South Africa has also been viewed as a model for democracy and therefore, many analysts and politicians have supported promoting democracy as well in Africa. There has been much literature and discourse around South Africa's position among other African countries and the dynamics between South Africa and Africa when engaging in mediation and economic relations. However, evidence shows that although South Africa has not always promoted democracy and human rights even in its engagement with other African countries. Of course, each African conflicts and situation is different and has many different variables that affect South Africa's response. However, many analysts have noticed trends in South Africa's engagement with Africa, which points to the reflection of South Africa's domestic policy and conception of democracy in the post-apartheid era.

For example, South Africa's foreign policy response to the conflict in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) show that far from promoting democracy and the principle of the 'African Renaissance', South Africa's response was based on political economy. Ian Taylor and Paul Williams (2001) show that South Africa's response revealed the neoliberal nature of Thabo Mbeki's principles. The ongoing civil war in the DRC that surfaced again in 1998 threatened to derail and submerge the region in

violence. Ian Taylor and Paul Williams (2001) write that at the time, South African politicians engaged in helping to resolve the conflict believes that the war could be resolved through conventional political channels and dialogue with the state elites. However, the elites in the Great Lakes and southern African regions used their new-found independence and sovereignty to help bolster their own patronage networks and weaken their opponents. South Africa was criticised for not providing a coherent response to the conflict; in fact, many suggested that it adopted a non-leadership role, despite its promotion of the principle of the 'African Renaissance'. In Thabo Mbeki's address to the United Nations about the African Renaissance at the time, it was clear that many of its policies acceded to neoliberalism; he believed that countries needed to become competition states that attracted foreign investment. Mbeki's definition of African Renaissance promoted the liberalization of markets, trade and polyarchic institutions across the continent. The DRC conflict showed evidence of bad governance and a lack of democratic principles, yet South Africa did little to tackle these issues head on and instead, resorted to an incoherent and withdrawn response from the conflict. Taylor and Williams (2001) suggest that in conflicts such as these, there were many business rewards that could have been gained by supporting the powerful governments (that also happened to practice bad governance and undemocratic policies). Especially in the great lakes region there are rich deposits of mineral wealth, and conflict-ridden places offer a form of competitiveness for both the patron and client. South Africa could have used this circumstance in the DRC to secure access to resource-rich areas and establishing privatised accumulation networks.

Many have made criticisms against Mbeki's deployment of 'quiet diplomacy' in Zimbabwe as well. Zimbabwe has become synonymous with bad governance and a brutal dictatorship that emerged after gaining independence from colonial powers. Economically, the country is on the brink of starvation and politically, many believe Mugabe has lost legitimacy and popular support. The Opposition party in Zimbabwe: the Movement for Democratic Change is led by trade unionist, Morgan Tsvangirai. Although the opposition party has gained much support, Mugabe's brutal regime has suppressed the MDC from gaining power and influence in the country. Mugabe resorted to undemocratic, illegal and violent means of preserving power. Furthermore, many Western countries and other international organisations recognise that many of the electoral processes in Zimbabwe have been undemocratic (Adelman 2004).

The Western countries have increasingly turned to South Africa in the processes of mediation with Zimbabwe, as South Africa is a direct neighbour and trading partner, but also because South Africa has gained a reputation in the international system as a country that stands for democracy and human rights after its overthrow of apartheid. Many Western countries and financial institutions

have applied sanctions to Zimbabwe, but South Africa has refrained from taking such measures; instead opting for the broad terms of 'quiet diplomacy' and 'constructive engagement'. Some leaders (such as George W Bush and Gerhard Schroeder) appreciated Mbeki's 'quiet diplomacy' as it left the channel of communication open between Mbeki and Mugabe (Nathan 2005). However, others remarked about the precedent that Mbeki was setting for other undemocratic leaders and dictatorships on the continent. By supporting Mugabe, it seemed that South Africa was accepting the deteriorating situation; which contradicts the principles of peace, democracy that focused on the people's upliftment and human rights that South African foreign policy proclaimed to be committed to (Adelman 2004).

Nathan (2005) argues that South Africa's policy toward Zimbabwe has not been 'quiet', but rather it was a clumsy effort of mediation that showed support for Robert Mugabe's dictatorship and his ruling party, Zanu-PF. Mbeki focused on tackling the issues of inequitable distribution of wealth and land in Zimbabwe, however he did so without questioning or condemning the illegal and violent manner in which this redistribution was done in Zimbabwe. Many argue that Mbeki's support for Mugabe's regime is based on maintaining relations with Zimbabwe. However, important domestic, continental and international constituencies disagreed with Mbeki. The SACP and COSATU have been some of Mbeki's biggest critics in South Africa. His stance on Zimbabwe has also ruined his own credibility in South Africa and within the NEPAD organisation. Mbeki's stance also may reflect the constraints of regional politics as the SADC has not been able to provide a comment or effective diplomatic engagement that addressed the situation in Zimbabwe either. In fact, SADC has also shown solidarity with Harare and has neglected human rights concerns.

Mbeki has showed mild criticisms of Zimbabwe's presidential elections in 2002; however his engagement with Zimbabwe lacked emphasis on democracy that goes beyond procedural democracy. Mbeki emphasized the need for African countries to engage in a process of 'decolonization' and liberation form former colonial countries; however the he did not promote good governance and democracy within the new governments after colonialism.

In an article in 2011, Laurie Nathan wrote an article reflecting on South Africa's engagement with the conflict in Darfur, Sudan. This article shows the criticism South Africa received in blocking the UN censure of Burma (Myanmar), Sudan and Zimbabwe for gross human rights abuses. Many criticised South African foreign policy for turning a blind eye to the excessive violence and human rights abuses that were carried out by the Sudanese government in Darfur – a position which seemed to show South Africa betraying its own struggle for democracy that protected the rights and

participation of the people. As an elected non-permanent member of the UN Security Council at the time in 2007, South Africa supported the Sudanese government in rejecting the UN Resolution that would have implemented sanctions against combatants that attacked civilians, obstructed peace initiatives and refused to cooperate with the UN-AU peacekeeping force in Darfur. Nathan (2011) argues that South Africa's conception of human rights and democracy has been influenced by the anti-imperialist paradigm it committed to in foreign and domestic policy. This shows that the actual foreign policy principles that were supposed to focus on promoting human rights and democracy are flawed in themselves and reflect an incoherent and ineffective foreign policy to the rest of the world.

(v.) South Africa in the United Nations Security Council

There is a wide variety of literature on the subject of South African foreign policy, and many have assessed South Africa's voting behaviour in the UN Security Council. Many have shown contradictions and incoherence between South Africa's foreign policy principles and its actions in the UNSC. Considering South Africa's role in the UNSC during the period of 2007-2008, many assumed that South Africa's role in the UNSC would be to pursue an Africanist progressive policy, critics such as the former Archbishop Desmond Tutu, the COSATU trade union, the Communist Party and many other human rights activists criticised South Africa's lack of commitment to human rights and the UN Resolutions that were put forth to condemn the abuse of human rights. In the case of human rights abuses in Burma (Myanmar), South Africa voted against the draft Resolution(S/2007/14) that condemned the human rights abuses by the government of Burma (Myanmar). This decision could be indicative of South Africa's vested interest to become a leader or supporter of the Global South, and therefore show solidarity with countries like China (who is considered to be part of the Global South) and Russia who took similar positions in the UNSC (van Nieuwkerk 2007).

It would seem that South Africa was more concerned about their identity as a supporter of the Global South that is resisting the intentions and dominance of the Global North, rather than fighting for the cause of human rights and democracy. Furthermore, South Africa's commitment to the Global South was deepened by its economic relationship with countries constituted within the Global South. Therefore, South Africa's decision on Burma (Myanmar) in the UNSC leaves a lot of questions around its commitment to democracy and human rights and it shows that perhaps South Africa has adopted a neo-realist paradigm to its foreign policy, letting the dynamics between the Global North and Global South dictate its decision-making in situations of conflict. Part of South Africa's resistance to the Global North is its protest against the structure of the UNSC which has

been unfairly dominated by Western and European powers. Perhaps this stance from South Africa shows its foreign policy as supporting developing countries of the Global South, because of South Africa's history of being exploited by imperialist governments. However, this comes at the price of sacrificing its commitment to democracy and human rights (Jordaan 2010).

(vi.) Analysis of South Africa's Post-apartheid Foreign Policy

Therefore, one can question what model of democracy South Africa has been exporting to conflict in Africa and indeed, the rest of the world. What is evident from the examples of South Africa's engagement in Sudan and Zimbabwe is the fact that South Africa is willing to put aside its commitments to human rights and democracy in order to gain other national interests. South Africa also seems to be concerned about maintaining its relations with African governments by not condemning some of these African governments' human rights abuses and undemocratic actions. This may seem consistent with the principle of the 'African Renaissance'; however, as Laurie Nathan (2005) points out, this principle is inherently neoliberal as well. It portrays South Africa as promoting a democracy and mediation that is not substantive and that does not have the ordinary African citizens' concerns at heart. It shows South Africa promoting a form of democracy that only negotiates with elite governments and ignores the well-being of ordinary citizens that are affected by the conflict situation.

South Africa is concerned about its future investments in resources, its commitment to the Global South and its trading partners from the Global South. In order to secure investment and trade good relations with emerging economies like China, South Africa has forfeited its own foreign policy principles of promoting and supporting human rights and a form of democracy that benefits the state's citizens – not just its government. South Africa's anti-imperialist resistance to the policies and decisions of the Global North perhaps also come across strongly in its foreign policy decisions. However, it again shows South Africa to be concerned about the power-relations of the international system and its economic viability and stature among important trading and economic partners. It deviates from the promotion of democracy that is concerned about the people that are affected by neoliberal policies that deepen inequality and benefit the elite groups in society.

(vii.) South Africa's Post-apartheid Response to the Middle East and Arab Countries

In terms of South Africa's engagement with the Middle East in the country's general foreign policy, it is also viewed as a mediator; a Middle Power that supports multilateralism and negotiation in the

conflicts within the Middle East. However, South Africa's 'anti-imperialist' character in its foreign policy, may limit the country's impartiality in mediation in the Middle East. Eduard Jordaan (2008) refers to anti-imperialism as a commitment against the dominant forces of Western and European countries like the US and Britain. As aforementioned, South Africa has promoted a foreign policy that supports the Global South, and shows a resistance to the decision-making of the Global North – even if those decisions promote human rights and democracy. It's 'anti-imperialist' tendencies are evident in the decisions made around Iran's nuclear ambitions, the 2003 invasion of Iraq, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and Hamas' 2006 electoral victory. South Africa's anti-imperialist character may not always be unreasonable or unjustified, but it has put South Africa in close proximity to countries like Syria and Iran, as well as organisations like Hezbollah, and Hamas (Jordaan 2008). South Africa's associations and to some extent support for these countries and organisations that have violated many human rights, is damaging for South Africa's identification as a moral leader, and it limits their role as an impartial mediator in conflict.

South Africa's engagement with the Middle East seems to be based on its own historical liberations struggle against imperialism and the dominance of Western and European countries. The emphasis seems to be placed in the struggle against imperialism and not the struggle for democracy. This again, limits its identity as a country that promotes human rights and democracy. It is unclear as to the type of democracy that South Arica promotes in the Middle East. The perception that South Africa cannot be considered as an impartial mediator perhaps shows that South Africa's commitment to a people-driven democracy in Middle Eastern countries is also limited. South Africa's engagement with the North-African region also has a significant history. In the eight years before 2011, the region has established autocratic regimes that were stable but generally it was also alienated from the AU. The Egyptian regime led by Hosni Mubarak was the only country in the region to commit itself to the AU and Africa. South Africa's closest relation in the North African – Arab region was with Algeria. Algeria experienced a similar colonial-settler experience and also had a liberation struggle which also supported the anti-apartheid struggle. Most of the Middle East and North African countries had a common ruling tendency since they all shared an Arab and Muslim affinity, which also shared an autocratic nature of government. The events of the Arab Spring in 2011 dramatically changed the political landscape of the Middle East and North African region. However, previously, South Africa's foreign policy was focused on rebuilding relations with North African countries after its liberation. Since many countries in North Africa supported the struggle against apartheid both materially and ideologically, all the presidents in the post-apartheid era showed immense support for its old allies (Jhazbhay 2012).

In 2009, there was a tripartite initiative launched (including organisations such as the Common Market of Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA), SADC and the East African Community (EAC)) to create 'The Grand Free Trade Area' (GFTA) – hoping to fulfil Cecil John Rhode's dream of building an infrastructural network from 'Cape to Cairo'. Development finance institutions such as the African Development Bank (AfDB) and the Development Bank of South Africa (DBSA) have combined with emerging markets led by China to make these North-South communications in Africa possible (Ibid).

South Africa also had close relations with Libya, previously led by autocrat, Muammar Gaddafi, and has on several occasions mediated conflicts and diplomatic situations between Western countries and Libya. However, South Africa's stance on the 'No-Fly Zone' that was to be imposed on Libya in the wake of the revolution in 2011, showed that South Africa was left in a difficult position of supporting its Libyan ally and condemning the human rights abuse and violence that the Libyan government participated in (Ibid).

(viii.) Analysis: Domestic and International Meanings of South African Democracy

South Africa's conception of democracy is evolving and although key elements of radical democracy are still evident in civil society participation in South Africa's domestic context, it is fading. The advancement of neoliberal polices that support a form of market democracy are beginning to dominate the decision-making processes in South Africa's domestic environment. This is evident in the limited role that ordinary citizens have and the limited spaces for civil society to engage in a struggle for a more people-centred democracy and more leverage in the economic policies in the country. The dominance of South African government decisions is apparent in the post-apartheid era; however efforts have been made to include popular participation and engagement in policy-making, such as the establishment of ward committees and the initiative made to incorporate communities in foreign policy. I think that within South Africa, there is a battle between the remnants of radical democracy (that existed in the struggle against apartheid) and the new institutionalization of democracy that centralizes more decision-making in government and advances neoliberal policies.

The conception of democracy that South African foreign policy promotes however; shows a tendency toward neoliberal economic policies and strategic power relations. There is a lack of commitment to a people-focused democracy that is concerned about the wellbeing of ordinary citizens and the consolidation of substantive democracy that encourages popular participation and a

space for civil society to make decisions. South African foreign policy has been characterised by negotiation with elite governments and trading partners, its anti-imperialist stance against the dominance of the Global North and its national interest for economic investment. Market democracy therefore, seems to be the form of democracy that it promotes. Although South Africa has promoted negotiation and non-violent means of conflict resolution, it has not promoted a radical form of democracy where all parties concerned are incorporated into the transition to peace and democracy.

CHAPTER 5

CASE STUDIES: TUNISIA and EGYPT:

(a.)Tunisia:

The Tunisian Arab Spring started in December 2010, and many credit it as the beginning of the domino effect of uprisings across the Middle East in the next few years. A tradesman, Muhammed Buazizi set himself alight in protest against the humiliation he faced from the oppressive police force, but he also served as a symbol of the Tunisian people's plight. Buazizi feared the loss of his livelihood if he protested against the government forces. Many protests around the country followed this protest and initially, there was quite a slow response from the government regime headed by Zine el-Abidine Ben Ali. Tunisia's main trade union, the Union Générale des Travailleurs Tunisiens (UGTT) and other professional associations were major contributors in mobilising and gathering support against the regime. By the 14th January 2011, a general strike unfolded and Ben Ali was forced to flee the country for Saudi Arabia. A temporary president replaced Ben Ali in the following few weeks of his departure; signalling that Ben Ali had abdicated from his position in government and the people were now in power and a national unity government was created. The incumbent prime minister, Muhammad Ghannouchi was later considered to be too close to Ben Ali's regime; he was removed by the political and popular opposition and was replaced by Beij Caid Essebsi. On the 4th July 2011, Ben Ali was tried and convicted for a number of criminal offences. By October, elections were held to rewrite the Constitution. The previously banned opposition group, Hizb al-Nahda is an Islamist political party that formed a coalition government led by Hamadi Jebali, a former political prisoner (Dalacoura 2012). Therefore, the uprising was initiated by trade unions, the professional working class people and to some extent, the youth in the country. Although opposition groups may have been divided along certain ideological, religious and ethnic lines; they were all united in their desire to topple the authoritarian government. The uprisings on the street, started by Muhammed Buazizi's protest against Ben Ali's regime developed into a revolt that managed to topple the regime and successfully establish a new one.

(i.)Ben Ali's Regime

Historically, Tunisia had a liberal tradition dating back to the nineteenth century; they were the first African country to adopt a written Constitution in 1864. Its liberalism however, existed alongside a stronger state police tradition. Tunisia gained its independence from France in 1956; and its citizens

endured two reformist dictatorships thereafter; Habib Bourguiba and Zine el-Abidine Ben Ali. Although Tunisia experienced steady economic growth, the tyranny of the dictatorships continued (Bix 2011).

In 2010, still under Ben Ali's regime, the IMF gave a glowing report of Tunisia's economic growth. According to the IMF, Tunisia weathered the financial crisis of 2008 well. Tunisia's growth saw an improvement since the crisis and the IMF report mentioned that although Tunisia' debt-to Gross Domestic Product (GDP) ratio was half that of France, it did need to address the issue of unemployment. Tunisia attracted foreign direct investment from Europe and the World Economic Forum judged Tunisia to be the 32nd most competitive country in the world between 2010 and 2011. International organisations labelled Tunisia as an 'economic miracle'. However, Tunisian citizens did not share these sentiments; although the per capita GDP was growing; only 14 percent of Tunisians classified themselves as 'thriving' in 2010. Tunisians were increasingly dissatisfied with the state of housing, healthcare, roads and the corruption and inefficiency of bureaucracy. One of the main issues that fuelled their dissatisfaction too, was the increasing unemployment especially among the youth. According to Tunisians, corruption, inequalities and the lack of opportunities dramatically worsened. In addition to this, political repression compounded their frustrations. Islamist groups in particular, faced sever repression under Ben Ali's regime. The Islamist group called 'Enhada' or 'Resistance' had hundreds of their members surveyed and harassed by the police and many of them were also jailed. Corruption in employment also permeated into the Tunisian society; if one wanted to get a job, you were forces to go through security checks on your political views to assure the government that you were not a 'leftist', 'Islamist', or 'nationalist (Noueihed and Warren 2012).

Furthermore, Ben Ali allowed his family to take control of the ruling party; former ministers would complain about their lack of access to major government functions and decision-making. Major privatizations or sales of state assets such as mobile phone licenses were extended to Ben Ali and his wife's clan – this caused much anger among ministers and the citizens. Businessmen in large and small companies would complain that members of the elite clan would seek to take a cut from any company that did well and made a profit. If they refused, they would find themselves being investigated for tax or other irregularities (Ibid). The Ben Ali-Trabelsi clan in Tunisia was incorporated into a patronage system in the country. This elite group and Ben Ali's ruling party were involved in all parts of gaining employment, acquiring a bank loan, buying a car with credit facilities, importing machinery or raw materials, exporting or gaining access to basic facilities and services. The unequal competition between the investors and local populations (including peasant farmers) and the

decreasing access to employment caused much of the suffering within the poorer parts of the country (Ayeb 2011).

The IMF staff mission released a report in 2010 referring to Article IV of the IMF Articles of Agreement, which includes an annual review of the economic policies of all the IMF member countries. This report on Tunisia reflected the IMF's optimism about the country's economy and commended the fact that the country had weathered the global financial crisis relatively well. The Directors of the report stressed the importance of expanding the tax base and reforming the social security system. They also emphasized the need for Tunisia to improve its infrastructure and policies in order for it to be more open and accessible to foreign investment and trade; the report identified Tunisia's main trade partners as the countries within the EU (IMF Press Release No. 10/249, 2010) Tunisia was lauded as a success story for the IMF and Ben Ali was embraced by former IMF leader Dominique Strauss-Kahn. Tunisian was seen as a 'model' for emerging countries in the international system. The IMF praised Ben Ali's commitment to reduce taxes on businesses and to increase the standard Value Added Tax rate – which actually affected the poor people in the country the most. The IMF had also advised Ben Ali to contain the subsidies of food and fuel products which also had its greatest negative impact on the poor. The IMF ignored the corruptive way that Ben Ali ruled the country's politics and economic exchanges and they also ignored the brute force that was used by Ben Ali to rule the country and ensure that the leader's family and elite network benefitted the most. The advice of subsidy cuts and privatisation strategies propped up the corruptive government of Ben Ali and severely affected the livelihoods of the poor and informal sector. The informal sector of Tunisia before the revolution was vibrant (and contributed to about half the size of the formal gross domestic product in the country) but they did not benefit from the reduction of tax rates on formal businesses (Bond and Sharife 2012).

Tunisia has a history of an active civil society; however it was limited in many ways. Islamists could not meet or organize. However, their presence was felt in unions, professional syndicates and human rights and advocacy groups. Ben Ali was wary of the civil society groups but did not ban them outrights for fear of severe condemnation from the international society. Instead, Ben Ali undermined these groups in subtle ways; all NGOS had to be approved by the interior ministry who could deny or delay their license to operate. External funding for NGOS had to pass through the state and could sometime be deliberately held or delayed. Ben Ali did not license any human rights groups in the last decade of his rule and activists were sometimes intimidated, dismissed from work or monitored - especially if they were travelling. Despite this, civil society survived and created a base for participatory politics. The labour union, UGTT for example, represented almost 500, 000

workers in various different sectors and it was Tunisia's second-largest organisational force. Presidential elections were held every five years; however Ben Ali did not allow rival candidates to stand in elections until 1999. Legal opposition parties were sometime disqualified because they did not have enough seats in parliament or because the party did have an approved leader. Parties also found it difficult to become licensed. Ahmed Ibrahim was the only credible rival to Ben Ali, but stated that he could not develop an effective campaign. Voter turnout in Tunisia was very high; however Ben Ali would almost always win the Presidential elections with 89 percent of the vote (Noueihed and Warren 2012).

In recent years, Tunisian became frustrated with the repression of free speech in broader communication avenues among the urban, educated, youth and middle-class. Tunisian newspapers were repressed, and limitations were put on what was broadcast on television. Many considered Ben Ali's most draconian policies came from the online censorship. Despite these restrictions however, there were vocal Tunisian bloggers that expressed their freedom of speech in what they reported, what questions they asked and what footage and pictures that they documented. There were some sites that began to collate blogs, news and interviews – which gave the people of Tunisia an opportunity to find out what was really going on in the country – first hand. In December 2010, a website called 'Nawat' published WikiLeaks documents that related to Tunisia and the Tunisian government. This enraged the government and it started to block sites carrying US cables. Media coverage of the Gafsa mining strike was banned; however bloggers found a way to visit the area and report on the violent police crackdown on innocent civilians. Tunisian bloggers and the online community therefore managed to circumvent the state controls and even shared advice with other Arab countries. This experience would hold the Tunisian people in good stead once the uprising started in December 2010 (Ibid).

It is apparent that Ben Ali's repressive regime formed a system of authoritarianism in Tunisia. The elitist dynamic to the system of governance and society shows that perhaps in some ways, there was a class struggle between the affluent groups in the country that were close to the President, and the rest of the population that held no power or representation in business and government. What is interesting to note, is the fact that Tunisia has a history of civil society that guided their politics in the past; however Ben Ali repressed and restricted this 'public space' that the people themselves created in unions, social media, human rights and social advocacy groups. It was the repression and limitations of these organisations that reinforced the authoritarian rule. Also, the economic inequality is mentioned as a large component of Ben Ali's authoritarianism. The political and social repression and limitations that Tunisian citizens experienced were supported by the economic

policies that allowed for cronyism and a patronage system of business. The vast gap between the rich and poor motivated the development of protestors and civil society groups that tried to combat this system. This system reflects many of the characteristics of a neoliberal government functioning in society; where the elitist groups gain the most wealth, which also allows for political rights and democratic representation to be compromised. Robert Dahl (1994) and Patrick Bond (2012) reflect on this contradiction between neoliberal policies that institutions like the IMF promote, and the consolidation of democracy and the development of civil society engagement.

(ii.) The Revolution's Radical Democracy

Lin Noueihed and Alex Warren (2012) argue that of all the countries on the Middle East and North African area, Tunisia possessed the ingredients for a successful revolution. Tunisia has a long history of political activism which Ben Ali was able to curb but not completely control, it has a resilient civil society, it has a large population of educated people, a relatively neutral military and a relative religious homogeneous society. Despite this, many did not expect the revolution to rise and topple the authoritarian regime. Many anticipated social rebellion and outbursts of unrest, but no-one expected a revolution. Both the middle classes and popular classes were united in their rebellion against the regime; both groups calling for freedom and dignity. Without this alliance, the authoritarian government would not have been removed. Many changes have been made since Tunisia's transformation from an authoritarian government; new political actors, discourses, spaces and topics of debate and action have surfaced. Ayeb (2011) shows that even some of Tunisia's earlier violent revolts in 1978 and 1984, did not allow such progress expected from the 2011 uprising.

There was an absence of a strong leader in the uprising of 2011, and therefore, Muhammed Bouazizi became a symbol of the hopelessness and frustration of the generation of Arab people. It was Bouazizi's friends and family, along with union leaders and political activists in his home town that first mobilised his anger into a national revolution. Protestors demanded payback for the blood of Bouazizi and this developed into economic, social and political demands, asking for the end to corruption. The 'Bar' Association has a history of activism behind them against extrajudicial detentions and the mistreatment of prisoners. They were among the first of the unions to engage in the local protests and brought these small protests into a larger revolution. Other unions became involved from other sectors such as teachers, lawyers, doctors and sections of civil society. They set up a Popular Resistance Committee to support the people of Sidi Bouzid and ultimately support the national uprising. The protests continued for ten days with little support, but then the protests spread and captured headlines in newspapers (Noueihed and Warren 2012).

Demonstrations spread across the province of Sidi Bouzid and many youth clashed with the police, turning the protests into riots. Cyber-activists began to emerge; a Facebook group called 'The Tunisian People Are Burning Themselves, Mr President' published pictures and footage of the protests which raised awareness of the events. Within a matter of days, online activists also began to tweet news on the Tunisian protests under the hashtag #sidibouzid. On Facebook, activists and people sympathising with the campaign replaced their profile pictures with the red and white Tunisian flag. The protests grew from town to town, and by the end of December 2010, they reached the capital. Trade unionists held small protests. Journalist, Sofiane Choubari used Facebook and his blog to call for the first independent, citizen-led political protest in Tunis on 28 December. It was on this day that Ben Ali also delivered a speech, condemning the protests. However, more activists began to independently organize protests online, using mobile phones and fliers. The demonstrations evolved from a protest for jobs and freedom, to a protest about ousting Ben Ali as president; slogans like "Dégage!" or "Get Out!" were used in the revolution. Tunisian protestors also coined the chant: "The people want the fall of the regime" which would later also be heard on the streets of Cairo and Sana'a. On the 13 January 2011, a general strike and mass protest was launched across the country. By the 14 January, Ben Ali fled to Saudi Arabia (Ibid).

Lisa Anderson (2011) emphasizes the fact that the uprisings in Tunisia and Egypt in 2011 were not the result of social media and the internet alone; despite the fact that it played a major role in mobilising people in the uprising. She believes that the Arab Spring uprisings are similar to those seen in 1919, where there was a calculated spread of popular movements that resulted in the toppling of many governments in Europe after World War I. Anderson (2011) concludes that the patterns and demographics varied in each country involved in the Arab Spring; Tunisia's revolution emerged from the neglected rural areas and their oppressed labour movement. Egypt in contrast, had a revolution emerging from the urban and cosmopolitan population. However, what they both have in common was that both revolutions called for personal dignity and a responsive government. Lisa Anderson (2011) claims that the Tunisian people need to work on addressing their class divisions in order to claim a successful revolution.

Ben Ali restricted freedom of expression, oppressed political parties and supported a corrupted economic and social system in the country. Tunisia's labour movements, political and civil society groups were strong enough to mobilise people against the government with little military assistance for the Tunisian army. This is significant, as Egypt's military did play a major role in ousting Mubarak. In Tunisia, however, the military play a less significant role in Tunisia's economy and therefore gave

support to the revolution, but they are unlikely to shape the country's future politics. Anderson (2011) believes that it was primarily the labour movement protests, strikes, union activists and political parties that led the Tunisian revolution (often referred to as the "Jasmine Revolution") (Ibid).

Many had concerns about the Ennahda Islamist political party in power, and whether they would advance greater democracy, the promotion and protection of human rights, economic development and the other demands that the uprising brought to light (Nanda, 2012). However, the fact that the people themselves are becoming involved in the development of the 'new' Tunisia shows progress toward a democratic society and shows elements of radical democracy being practiced. Borna Zguric (2012) shows that in the 2012 Tunisian elections, the Islamist party, Ennahda won thirty-seven percent of the seats in the Constitutional Assembly (89 out of 217); therefore the influence of the Islamists have become a major factor in the future of the governance of the country, and many have questioned the influence that Islamic law could have on the new Tunisian Constitution. However, on the 24 January 2014, it was announced that Tunisia's parliament agreed on a new Constitution after a political deadlock. The governing Ennahda agreed to a number of concessions, which included dropping references to Islamic law. The members of the Tunisian constituent assembly announced that the Constitution is a consensus document that reflects the unity and diversity of the country. The final Constitution text states that Islam is the religion of the Tunisian state, but it also guarantees religious freedom. Article 45 of the Constitution also emphasizes the need to protect the rights of women and ensure equal representation of men and women in elected institutions – which is considered as a milestone in the Arab world. However, the success of the new Constitution for democracy and elements of radical democracy in participation and a people-centred form of governance depends on whether the principles enshrined in the Constitution will be respected by Tunisian politicians (Kottoor, 2014).

Tunisia's Constitution seems to reflect a compromise made between the ruling Islamist party during their transition, Ennhda and secular leaders. This compromise contrasts with the upheaval seen in Libya and Egypt. The new Prime Minister, Mehdi Jomaa is to appoint a non-political cabinet one the Constitution is approved. However, the new government must still decide on the economic reforms and ways of appeasing radical Islamist armed groups. The appointed election committee is yet to decide on the date for the presidential vote. The fact that the new Constitution caused a political deadlock also signalled to many people, that democratic norms are being set and compromises between groups that want to be represented would need to be made. Amira Yahyaoui, the president of the watchdog organisation monitoring the National Constituent Assembly (NCA), mentions that

human rights activists still have a role to play to ensure that the new Constitution does not adopt articles that do not comply with human rights. These activists and civil society will have to engage with the government to fight for the principles they want to see enshrined in the Constitution and in the governance of the country (Aljazeera 2014).

Since the fall of Ben Ali's government, press freedom has flourished and for 2012, Tunisia was ranked 184th out of 196 countries in Freedom House's annual *Freedom of Press* report (Puddington, 2011). Tunisia is now an example of how mass protests, through elections, have represented the semi/quasi-democratic governments.

(iii.) Analysis of Tunisia's Revolution

There is a clear link between the Tunisian revolution and the economic and class dynamics in the country. The situation in South Africa during apartheid was similar, in which a particular group in society were socially and economically disadvantaged. Although the divisions in apartheid South Africa were based along lines of race, South African society still experienced a disenfranchised society that was ruled by an authoritarian government that was not accountable to the people; neither was it representative of the concerns of the majority of the country (Baiocchi and Checa 2009). The authoritarian government in Tunisia showed a link between Ben Ali's authoritarian government and neoliberalism. It is evident that neoliberal policies – despite being beneficial for the country's GDP, overall growth and investment opportunities – can also be manipulated by a powerful and elitist governing system. This manipulation prevented the working class and majority of the country's population from gaining social and economic rights and benefits. The neoliberal policies and the authoritarian rule disallowed the participation and involvement of the citizens in the governance of the country; which eliminated accountability and democratic elements in governance. Having silenced the voice of the people through authoritarianism and the country's economic policies, democracy was stunted. The link between neoliberalism and how it undermines forms of radical democracy is evident in the works of many authors such as William Connolly (1999), Rita Abrahamsen (1997), Chantal Mouffe and Ernesto Laclau (1985). They show that neoliberal policies also eliminate the role of civil society or a space for the concerns of the poorer, working class to be considered. Yet, it is this disadvantaged group in society that outnumbered the elites of Ben Ali's regime and managed to assert their dominance and interests into government through the 2011 revolution.

There are some similarities between the Tunisia's revolution and South Africa's struggle to end apartheid. Firstly, the central role of trade unions in the protests against the authoritarian regime in

Tunisia and South Africa is evident. The so-called working class people and professionals that drove the country's economy mobilised the people and forced the government to take notice of their demands. Ben Ali fled to Saudi Arabia after the general strike put Tunisia's main cities at a standstill. In South Africa, the role of the trade unions was particularly important in auctioning strikes and protests against the apartheid government. COSATU led the trade union movement against the government; which proved to be a very effective form of not only expressing the concerns of the working class, but also representing the people that did not have a stake in the governance of the country (Emery 2006).

Secondly, the Tunisian revolution also comprised of a large youth population that participated in the protests on the street and that mobilised many people to participate by using social media. Although the South African struggle against apartheid did not have the technological benefits of social media; incidents such the Soweto uprising show the important role that the youth in the country played. In both struggles against authoritarianism, the youth were determined to have their voices be heard among the protests. The youth demographic is an important factor to consider when assessing the revolution in Tunisia. I think that without the mobilisation by and of the youth, the revolution may not have been as successful. The campaign developed online using social networks like Facebook and Twitter engaged the whole world in a discourse around the authoritarian regime in Tunisia and the plight of the people. This also perhaps put political and economic pressure on Ben Ali's regime as many other Arab countries and the Western world would have acted to support some of the rebels. In the same way, the anti-apartheid campaigns all over the world helped highlight the issues happening in South Africa and draw in support and radical mobilisation. The online campaigns led to the eventual mass demonstrations in Tunis and other major cities.

These demonstrations on the streets and online, with their chants and slogans that demanded regime change showed a form of radical democracy in its physical and symbolic form. Physically, the people's decision to take to the streets in protest to voice their concerns shows a form of radical democracy in that people gathered and actively participated in a movement to stand up to the government and challenge its policies of authoritarianism and neoliberalism. Symbolically, it showed the development of a space in society where people can voice their concerns and ideas about the government and the future of the country. It may seem that this form of protest and activism is only about the idea of a revolution and rebellion against the established regime, however the Tunisian revolution shows that through the use of social media and mass demonstrations, these symbols and ideas could be executed to topple the government and create a new form of democracy that they

are a part of. Authors like Kurt Anderson (2011) show the rise of this form of activism that has actually produced change in governments around the world- -not just in Tunisia. For Tunisia, these demonstrations and protests show the rise of direct and representative forms of democracy that almost all of its citizens actively participated in; reflecting some of the principles of radical democracy.

The opposition in Tunisia was involved in creating a new Constitution and holding elections after Ben Ali's regime was toppled. The process of transition happened over a few years in South Africa as many parties were involved in creating the new Constitution. In Tunisia however, it is unclear as to whether there are specific articles in the new Constitution that would guarantee the people's involvements and the protection of democratic values. This could be seen as a challenge for democracy in Tunisia in the years ahead, and it certainly serves as a challenge to conceptions of radical democracy being implemented in the country. However, the elements of radical democracy are evident in the fact that the people that participated in the protests on the streets were able to have an impact on the governance of the Tunisian state and the elections are a step the direction of a more democratic government. The fact that compromises could be made as well between the secular leaders and communities and the Islamist Ennahda party, shows potential for a competitive and representative democracy. Also, it is encouraging to note that civil society organisations, particularly dealing in issues of human rights, are encouraged to monitor and fight for these rights and ensure that the Constitution protects the people. However, the country's economic policies for the future have not been secured.

(iv.) South Africa's Response to the Tunisian Revolution

Analyst, Kenneth Roth (2011) thinks that there has been a disappointing response to the Arab Spring uprisings – and especially Tunisia – from democratic countries of the Global South such as Brazil, India and South Africa. He claims that these countries (including South Africa) are more concerned about "outmoded" issues of national sovereignty even when it is actually shielding the repressive regimes. Despite the fact that countries like South Africa managed to create accountable governments and the rule of law from former authoritarian governments, they have shown erratic efforts in helping the people in the Arab Spring countries who are struggling to do the same for their own countries. In fact some of the countries of the Global South have suggested that there could be a misuse of human rights pressure which would allow countries of the Global North to dominate the situations in the Arab Spring. This premise also justifies their failure to intervene because of the authoritarian regimes' abuse of human rights. By standing in solidarity with the people demanding their legitimate rights, it would exert pressure on their oppressors to stop the bloodshed.

The African Union has been quite complacent as well. The AU was created to promote democracy, but their inaction proves that it just supports the dictators on the continent, supporting whichever government happens to be in power. South Africa is known as one the key Southern democracies that has held non-permanent positions on the UN Security Council, and yet it tolerated it has shown uncertainty in both cases of the intervention in Libya and Syria. There has been suspicion around whether the protestors and revolutionary movements in Tunisia and Egypt would produce democratic governments, and many are sceptical about the Islamist opposition parties that could be more repressive toward other communities. However, countries like South Africa siding with the authoritarian governments would not only be counter-productive, but it does not show solidarity with democratic principles. Brazil, India and South Africa with the backing from the Arab League managed to refer Libya to the International Criminal Court (ICC)– with support from the Western countries as well. This sent a message to former president Gaddafi, which he ignored to his peril (Ibid).

In South Africa, the DIRCO released some statements relating to the events in Tunisia in 2011. In 2013, in a DIRCO Budget vote speech, Deputy Minister of DIRCO, Ebrahim Ebrahim (2013) mentioned that South African foreign policy embraces the idea of 'Ubuntu' which expresses the desire for others to have what you want for you as well. He stated that it is in South Africa's national interest to promote human rights in Africa and the world, and that it is not surprising that South Africa is increasingly being called upon to share its experiences and to play an active mediating role in conflict. He asserts that South Africa demonstrated its commitment to conflict mediation, reconciliation and nation-building by monitoring the ongoing political transitional processes in Egypt, Libya and Tunisia. He claimed that South Africa offered its assistance and experiences to the transitional governments. However he also mentions the importance of coordinating South Africa's foreign policy action with its economic interests and benefits (Ebrahim 2013).

South Africa has also held workshops that have highlighted the plight of the Tunisian people such as the South African Women in Dialogue (SAWID), supported by DIRCO, which highlighted the impact for women in Tunisia since the revolution and the future prospects for women (Department of International Relations and Cooperation, Republic of South Africa 2013, "Media Advisory: The Department of International Relations and Cooperation to host South African Women in Dialogue (SAWID) one day workshop on the events in Tunisia").

DIRCO would admit that its policies on humanitarian assistance and political solidarity have been patchy; as the South African government has been hindered by unwieldy laws and red tape. The speed at which the South African government can react to a humanitarian crisis or emergency situation is limited, especially since the Public Finances Management Act regulates how money is spent. The regulations are there to prevent corruption and to keep official accountable; however the tight regulations are also counter-productive in reacting to emergency situations (Allison 2012).

(v.) Analysis of South Africa's Response

Foreign policy analysts, Chris Landsberg and Jo-Ansie Van Wyk (2012) assess South Africa's response to Tunisia's revolution; they determine that the Tunisian revolution has affected the bilateral relations between South Africa and Tunisia. South Africa's post-apartheid foreign relations between Tshwane and Tunis began with a low-key yet good relationship. Ben Ali ordered Tunisian businesses to establish ties with their South African counterparts, however there was a less enthusiastic response form South African businesses. At some point, South Africa even showed admiration for Ben Ali's poverty alleviation programmes and societal building projects. These issues seemed to dominate the relations between Tunisia and South Africa; which overlooked Tunisia's human rights situation. However, the 2011 uprising changes these relations. Landsberg and Van Wyk (2012) predicted that the ousting of autocrat Ben Ali should strengthen the ties between the two countries as South Africa maintained good relations with the Tunisian Islamist reform leader, Rachid Ghannouchi, from the An-Nahda party. Ghannouchi was said to have been inspired by South Africa's transition to democracy and the important role of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC).

South Africa's struggle for democracy was people-orientated, like the Tunisians' struggle against Ben Ali's regime and Tunisia is an African country that shared good relations with South Africa after apartheid. However, South Africa's response- as analysed through its statements and action within the AU- can be seen as quite temperate. The fact that for many years, South Africa focused on the bi-lateral trade relations with Tunisia instead of the human rights issues that Ben Ali's regime ignored; perhaps shows that South African foreign policy was directed more by a neoliberal ideology. Landsberg and Van Wyk (2012) certainly suggest that South Africa's foreign policy had side-lined human rights – a principle emphasized in its official foreign policy. I think that South Africa faced a good opportunity to support the people protesting against Ben Ali's regime; however the South African government has done little by itself for the Tunisian state. Deputy Minister of DIRCO, Ebrahim Ebrahim (2013) mentioned that South Africa showed its commitment to conflict mediation, reconciliation and nation-building while monitoring the political processes in Egypt. However, little

of this rhetoric has been evidenced in peacekeeping missions etc. The deputy minister also did not mention how this mediation and reconciliation will be achieved by the South African government.

As a member of the AU, South Africa has initiated little propositions or solutions for intervention in Tunisia, or for helping the people of the country be represented in the country. Part of South Africa's foreign policy commitments is to promote the concerns of the African continent and take initiative to address African conflicts and problems. However, there has been no decisive action or a Resolution adopted by the organisation. South Africa is a major stakeholder in the AU and many of its peacekeeping and peace-building activities emanate from the AU's initiatives. However, South Africa and the AU seem to be hindered by other interests to fully support the protests in Tunisia. It is understandable that in any revolution, many are uneasy about siding with a particular group especially when the situation seems volatile. Some analysts such as Nanda (2012) have raised the concern that the opposition forces in Tunisia may not engender democratic principles. However, I think that South Africa could be more involved in Tunisia's democratic process by supporting groups that do show initiatives for creating democratic principles in government.

Considering South Africa's proclaimed commitment to human rights and the promotion of democracy, as evidenced by the principles outlined in the Freedom Charter, the South African post-apartheid Constitution and Mandela's foreign policy outlines, it could be expected that South Africa would show support for the people of Tunisia and support establishing a democracy that the people want. However, before the Tunisian revolution emerged, South Africa adopted a neoliberal foreign policy toward Tunisia and turned a blind eye to some of the human rights issues in the country. Based on the South African government's statements and lack of action (as a country on its own and as a member of the AU), South Africa has done little to move away from such neoliberal tendencies. South Africa has not yet shown a firm commitment to democracy in Tunisia nor has it shown support to the ideals of radical democracy; promoting people-based organisations and government.

South Africa's response to the Tunisian uprising does not reflect the conception of radical democracy (a form of democracy that characterised its transition to democracy in many ways). South Africa's response seems to be unclear in its intentions; showing that is it willing to aid in the promotion of democracy, but not promoting democracy that encourages participation and consolidating democracy beyond free and fair elections. It is evident that democracy in South African foreign policy is not consistently reflected in conflict and decision-making in the international system. Simon Allison (2012) mentions that South African foreign policy may be limited in its response to circumstances such as uprising in Tunisia because of the failing of bureaucracy. However, South

Africa has not shown a consistent and sure stance on supporting the citizens of Tunisia rather than the government of Tunisia.

(b.) Egypt

The overthrow of Ben Ali in Tunisia inspired political action in Egypt. The opposition against Hosni Mubarak's regime was motivated by people on the street searching for political freedom and economic opportunities. Mubarak was seen as many authoritarian leaders in the Middle East, as a leader that created a closed political world which prevented any opposition or challenges to his leadership and governance. Like many countries involved in the Arab Spring, Egypt faced high unemployment, negative effects of inflation and corruption in most sectors of their society. In an attempt to extend his reign in Egypt, Mubarak even altered the Egyptian Constitution to remove the term limits of the Presidency. Mubarak also limited opposition parties' participation in elections on the basis that they were motivated by certain religious ideologies that would threaten a "secular" Egyptian government. The 2010 Egyptian parliamentary elections incited more frustration against Mubarak's regime as the voting yielded a very low turnout – which also showed people's loss of faith in the electoral process and it proved how opposition parties were stifled in parliament (Ajami 2012).

On the 10th February 2011, Mubarak attempted to quell the progressive protests against his regime that developed significantly since the 25 January 2011 in Tahrir Square. Mubarak amended the Constitution, expanding the eligibility of more candidates for the Presidency, and he also altered the Constitution to include judicial monitoring of elections. However, this did not appease he protestors who vowed to increase their remonstrations until Mubarak was removed from office. Protestors marched to the state TV building and the military did not stop them. Many military men defected to the protestors and eventually, it was the military gave Mubarak an ultimatum to leave voluntarily or by force. On the 11 February 2011, Mubarak stepped down from power and transferred power to the Supreme Council of Armed Forces which was headed by the Defence minister, Mohammed Hussein (El-Kawas 2012). Tunisia and Egypt's radical demonstrations that ousted its authoritarian Presidents sent a wave of optimism that these regimes could be defeated and it also contributed to a domino effect of protests against established regimes in the Middle East and North African region. Egypt's mass demonstrations in Tahrir Square have become an iconic and symbolic representation of ordinary citizens actively taking their fate into their own hands – simply by mobilising together and developing an environment for a lively civil society.

(i.) Mubarak's regime

Mubarak assumed power after the assassination of Anwar al-Sadat in 1981 by a Muslim extremist group. At the time, Mubarak started out his rule with the application of a state of emergency under

Law No. 162 which extended the powers of the police, legitimised censorship and suspended some Constitutional rights. Although Mubarak promised a more moderate and temperate government after Sadat, he strengthened the authoritarian system of a party-bureaucratic-security governance. His rulership resulted in a socio-economic stagnation and foreign policy debacles. He ruled with violent oppression; in 2010, the number of political prisoners in Egypt ranged between 15, 000 to 30,000 people. He also found it threatening to appoint a vice-president (Saikal 2011).

Imad Salamey and Frederic S Pearson (2012) make observations about the authoritarian governments in the Middle East and deduce that because of the conditions of social inequality, sectarian and ethnic disparities, authoritarian regimes like Mubarak's were able to be maintained and a united opposition force could be suppressed. Political limitations were most evident in the steps taken to ban the opposition groups in the country and limit the freedom of the press and assembly. However, the Western world promoted the belief that neoliberalism would advance global economic integration and that political liberalization could be attained through investment, privatization, free market capital, interdependence, multilateral institutionalism and the free flow of information and labour. Western governments like the USA previously supported the authoritarian regimes like Mubarak's in order to maintain liberal economic relations and to maintain stability and security in the regions. The US and Europe chose these prioritizations rather than promoting democracy and citizen participation. These neoliberal policies suited the authoritarian government in Egypt as Mubarak was able to monopolise the economic and political spheres of the country without consulting the broader citizenship. Despite the economic development and global integration that countries like Egypt experienced, democratic liberalization eluded the citizens, and the manipulation of the ruling elites flourished under the policies of neoliberalism.

The Egyptian revolution also needs to be understood in the context of a neoliberal economic shift. The two decades of economic liberalization polices supported the authoritarian governments and supported crony capitalism. The wealthy and cosmopolitan elite became distanced from the ordinary people and businesses on the street. As a result, social tensions rose as did the inequality gap in the country; this was even displayed in the living spaces in the country where the wealthy lived in gated communities among poor that lived in dilapidated buildings. The IMF did give a warning signal to the increasing levels of unemployment in 2011 and suggested that perhaps increasing social subsidies and social welfare could maintain social stability. The neoliberal policies in Egypt were implemented after the economic crisis in the 1980s which saw their oil revenues decline and reduced earnings from the Suez Canal. These factors among many caused Egypt to experience foreign and public debt which also caused fiscal strain on the state. In 1990, Egypt received debt

relief from Western powers and in return, Egypt aided them in the Iraq war. Part of this relief was supplied by the IMF and the conditionalities of repaying this relief included a restructuring of Egypt's economy according to free market principles. In 1991 Egypt implemented an Economic Restructuring and Adjustment Program (ERSAP) which privatised state-owned enterprises liberalised trade and prices, introduced more flexible labour legislation and removed certain social policies. The new economic elite directly benefitted from the privatization of state enterprises; most of whom were friends or affiliated of Mubarak's National Democratic Party. Economic liberalization also suited foreign and domestic investors as it employed investor-friendly policies (Joya 2011).

The economic situation that Mubarak's regime (which contributed to the 2011 revolution) was similar to that of Tunisia's. Egypt's economy was "booming" (Sultan 2011, 27) in the sense that it had an annual growth of 5 to 8 percent. However, this growth did not trickle down to benefit the working classes and ordinary citizens that were not participants of Mubarak's elite cronyism. The concentration of wealth was highest in only a small percent of the population – within the small circle of friends of Mubarak. This included people such as Mubarak's close family, friends, senior army officers and senior members of the National Democratic Party. Egypt's populations however, has been growing significantly – with an increasing birth-rate of almost a million and a half each year – which had a negative impact on the economic growth of the whole country. About half of the Egyptian population lived under conditions of poverty, and thousands of educated youth could not find jobs or a viable career that would allow them to progress and provide for their families. Many believe that Egyptian government could not have even met the popular demands and economic requirements due to its insufficient resources to cater to the needs of a population of approximately 84 million people (Sultan 2011).

The revolutions in Egypt and Tunisia have posed a challenge to the way scholars have explained the dynamics of change and transition in these countries. The social polarization created by Mubarak's regime with neoliberal economic polices resulted in the breakdown of his regime. Since 2004, social protest groups have emerged in Egypt, including: Students for Change, Youth for Change, University Professors for Change, Workers for Change, Artists for Change and the People's Campaign for Change. The "Campaign for Change" was started by Tariq Al-Bishri who was later appointed as the head of the Constitutional Reform Committee on 15 February 2011. Protests continued against Mubarak from 2004; the Kifaya group staged an anti-Mubarak protest at Tahrir Square on the 21st February 2011, demanding political reforms. Kifaya was soon joined by the Muslim Brotherhood and as a result, both groups were excluded from political processes in the country. Constitutional reforms were put forth by an Egyptian intellectual in September 2005; they formed the National

Assembly for Democratic Transition. There were even protests after the Presidential elections in September 2005 (Joya 2011).

The political and economic are inextricably linked, and in the case of the Egyptian revolution, it is particularly evident. Academic scholars such as Abdelrahman (2012) draws links to the works of Rosa Luxemburg in assessing how mass strikes, political and economic strikes and other forms of demonstrative strikes are part of the same struggle and function alongside each other.

(ii.) The Revolution's Radical Democracy

The protests of 2011 were largely organised by the 6th April Youth Group (named after the Mahalla labour strikes of 6th April 2008) and the "We Are All Khaled Said" Facebook groups, along with groups like the Wafd political group, the Nasserist Party, the Tagammu Party, the Al-Ghad Party (Kifaya) and a broad association called the National Association for Change (NAC) which was led by Mohamed El Baradei. Initially, the Muslim Brotherhood kept its distance from the protestors, although it members participated in the protestors as civilians. Other groups involved included the Justice and Freedom Youth Movement, the Popular Democratic Movement for Change and the Revolutionary Socialists. The protests gained momentum and culminated into millions of protestors in Egypt's main urban centres in Cairo and Alexandria, which eventually spread throughout the country (Joya 2011).

The workers involved in the protests advocated for economic reform whereas political reforms were demanded from a variety of other civil society groups headed by the Muslim Brotherhood, leftists, nationalists, journalists, judges and youth groups. Political reforms that were asked for include opposition to Gamal Mubarak as successor to Hosni Mubarak, opposition to police repression, Constitutional changes and the end to arbitrary arrests. Workers have demanded economic and social rights since 1988, and have used methods of strikes, protests and factory occupations, demanding higher wages, lowering of food prices, affordable housing, healthcare and better education systems. These demands gained momentum after the neoliberal budget cuts in various aspects of social and economic sectors in Egypt. Joya (2011) sees that the Egyptian people showed their rejection of neoliberalism when they took to the streets in protest on 2011, and she believes that these protest mark the beginning of a new era in mass mobilisation and anti-government protest against an autocratic government (Ibid).

The mass protest that unfolded in Tahrir Square reflected the physical and symbolic nature of the revolution in Egypt. Egyptian student, Mohammed Abouelleil Rashed and photographer, Islam El

Azzazi (2011) present some of the insights of the events of Tahrir square as participants. The first mass demonstration on the 28 January in Tahrir square was labelled the "Friday of Rage" and in the following 15 days, tens of thousands of protestors joined the mass demonstration – all sharing a common sentiment of removing Mubarak from power. The speed at which people managed to mobilise and gather in Tahrir square was extraordinary. Rashed (2011) mentions that even as there were barricades being put out to separate Tahrir square from the rest of Cairo, there was a sense that there was a psychological barrier also being put up; uniting the protestors together as people of the revolution. The central physical space of Tahrir Square became a social hub of activities, while the outer areas of the mass movement near the barricades became a space of uncertainty and violence. The communication hub in the middle of the masses included people using Facebook and Twitter (referencing the protests with hashtags like #Friday of Rage) to spread the information and happenings of the demonstrations.

The protests started on the 25 January 2011, prompted by several social media groups (most prominently the April 6th Movement) and industrial workers' groups and unions. Thousands of protestors took to the streets all over Egypt, not just Tahrir Square, although Tahrir Square was the largest mass demonstration. Many of the protestors were met with police brutality – the police used tear gas, water cannons and even live ammunition to disperse crowds. Tahrir Square seemed a natural choice for the mass demonstrations because the name 'Tahrir' meant 'Liberation'; it was named after the 1919 uprising against British rule. Tahrir Square is a major transport route; it is surrounded by government institutions such as parliament, ministerial buildings and the Mogamma' El Tahrir administrative complex. The protestors' chants demanding the removal of the regime and by 5pm, the police lost control of the situation. A curfew was announced and the army was deployed top maintain stability. Rashed (2011) mentions however, that protestors respected each other in their solidarity against the government forces.

The mass demonstration in Tahrir Square continued during the next few days and on Friday the 4th February, Egyptian campaigners called their demonstration the "Friday of Resilience" which was to mobilise up to a million protestors. The variation of people that participated in the demonstration was wide and yet, the people felt unified in their common stance against Mubarak's regime (Ibid).

The rise of civil societies was a critical factor in defying the authoritarian regime, and had it not been for the access to information through the internet that emerged in the 1990s, the 2011 revolution would not have been so successful. The rise of civil society online and the demonstrations on the streets broke a crucial aspect of the authoritarian regime: its ability to control the information being

disseminated to the people and its control over political and economic mobilisation. In 2011, the Egyptian Google executive, Wael Ghonim ran an internet campaign against the Mubarak regime. Other private media also broadcast live images of unarmed protestors that battled with the government's security forces. Aljazeera and many other media outlets focused the world's attention on the revolution unfolding in Egypt and the people's concerns – rather than the Egyptian government's concerns. (Abdelrahman 2012)

The youth of Egypt were inspired by the Tunisian uprising, and found the internet as the necessary tool to organize the first day of mass protests against Mubarak on the 25 January 2011 in Tahrir square. According to the Arab Social Media Report by the Dubai Schools of Government, almost 9 in 10 Egyptians and Tunisians were said to have used Facebook to organize protests or spread the awareness about the anti-government movements. Most of the campaigns that started on Facebook ended up being mobilised on the streets. Facebook and Twitter allowed activists to organize and publicize the protests within countries involved in the "Arab Spring", but most of all it has played an important role in giving the ordinary citizens in these countries a sense of empowerment; social media has given a platform for shaping opinions and contributing to the discourse in civil society. Many debate just how essential social media was to these protests; some refer to social media as the main instigators influencing people; however others say it was only used as a tool for mobilising people to join the protests that were inevitable (El-Khawas 2012).

It is undeniable that Facebook and Twitter mobilised the Egyptian people; Facebook usage peaked in the Arab region between January and April in 2011; Egypt saw a 29% growth compared to the 12% in 2010. Most people surveyed said they received their information about the protests from social media. Many Egyptians even claimed that blocking Facebook disrupted their efforts to organize and communicate (Huang 2011). Besides its power to mobilise people, social media carried messages of freedom and democracy; people who shared interests in democracy built extensive networks and organised political action. Social media is easy to access; for example many people in Egypt may not have access to computers, but almost every person has a mobile phone which enables social media content. Especially for the demographic of young people that constitute a huge part of Egypt's population, social media was accessible and a convenient way of dispersing messages (O'Donnell 2011).

Lisa Goldman (2013) however, asserts that Egyptian activists rejected the notion that social media alone drove their revolution for more government accountability and freedom of expression; she argues that even when the Mubarak government shut off the internet and mobile phone networks,

mass protests continued. The fall of Hosni Mubarak ignited a flood of political activity, with many new political parties and civil society organisations emerging, as well as the revival of existing opposition groups in the country. Egypt actually has a long tradition of party politics. Left-wing liberal and Islamist groups have always challenged Egypt's establishment. One of Egypt's strongest opposition movement, the Muslim Brotherhood, gained the most number of votes in the 2011/12 legislative and presidential elections. However, the results were later invalidated. This does point to the fact though, that Egypt does have an active and competitive political arena. Currently, there are many secular and ultra-religious political parties that oppose the ascendency of the Muslim Brotherhood and there are various pro-democracy groups that advocate radical change that was promised in the anti-Mubarak uprising. The existing political parties that have a stake in influencing the government include:

- The Freedom and Justice Party (FJP)
- Al Nour Party (an arm of the Muslim Brotherhood)
- Al Wafd Party
- The Egyptian Block
- The April 6 Youth Movement
- The Labour Movement (Manfreda 2012).

Analysts such as Lisa Anderson (2011) argue that the Egyptian uprising was not the result of the efforts of social media or opposition groups; but rather the result of the strikes and civil disobedience that forced the Egyptian government to relinquish its control over the country. The April 6 Movement that started in 2008 (and were part of the 2011 protests), staged their protests with textile workers and the movement attracted 70 000 members on Facebook. Professionals, labour movements and workers began to organize strikes that continued the momentum of the protests. In the two weeks before Mubarak resigned, civil disobedience affected transport, communications, industrial sectors, professionals, journalists etc. The military also played an important role in ousting Mubarak, civil disobedience and political opposition alone could not have created the national discourse on more democratic freedoms and the demise of an authoritarian government.

Since the revolution in 2011, Egypt has continued to express their concerns on the streets of Egypt in the forms of street art and political campaigning and organisation. The impact of the mass demonstrations and the clash between the government police forces and the protestors has stayed with the Egyptian people long after Mubarak was removed from office, and its street art and political discourse reflects this (MSN News 2014).Oxfam made an assessment of civil society months after the

2011 revolution and determined that civil society still remains a key part of the development of the country, There are now up to 800 independent trade unions and political parties have increased. People are challenging those who were once affiliated with Mubarak regime and local popular committees have developed as well. However, Oxfam also notes that there has not been a uniting voice bringing together the variation of people within the 'reformist' movement. However, Maher Bushra, executive director of the 'Better Life' Association says that the association and civilians in Egypt will protest again if the newly elected government do not live up to their promises. International solidarity organisations have also been creating, recruiting institutions like Oxfam to help the transition to democracy (Oxfam 2014).

There have been positive developments such the increase in political parties, independent trade union activism, and the development of other civil society groups that contribute to building a democratic society. There was a high turnout for the vote for the Constitutional referendum held on the 19th March; around 18 million voters participated in support of the proposed changes. However, there are still challenges for the working class and those involved in the protestors. Although the military has openly refused to take radical reforms, workers have been asked to return to work and strikes and public protests have been made illegal. Despite this, protests and struggles by workers, the unemployed, student, and social groups continue across the country (Joya 2011). Other civil society associations and NGOs have also developed to promote public debates about human rights, democratization, women's rights, children's rights and labour rights (Bayat 2003).

The development of Egypt's new Constitution under the leadership of former President Morsi brought much criticism and has ignited a discourse on the future of Egypt's democracy. Despite the radical nature of the revolution and the protestors' demands for better rights and freedom, many have made the criticism that Egypt's new proposed Constitution only provides limited freedoms and does not provide enough for the rights of women. Hassiba Hadj Sahraoui, the deputy director for the Middle East and North Africa at Amnesty International finds that the drafted Constitution would be a disappointment to the protestors that fought to eliminate Mubarak's authoritarian regime. There was also evidence that the freedom of religion is limited and does not provide for or protect religious minorities and political religious groups. There are also concerns that the Constitution does not give supremacy of international law over national law; which raises question about Egypt's commitment and accountability to human rights treaties. Additionally, the Constitution did not fully guarantee the economic, social and cultural rights (Amnesty International 2012). Morsi's and his drafted Constitution only lasted a year; since the consequent fall of Morsi as President of Egypt, an amended proposal for the Constitution was put forward to be voted on by the people in January

2014. Recent events show that this Constitution has been successful in being voted in. This Constitution eliminates some of the Islamic tendencies in legislature; for example, eliminating the legislative role of the Al-Azhar (the Sunni theological institution) which required lawmakers to consult this institution and some of the principles alluding to the implementation of Shari 'a law. The 2014 Constitution also slightly limits the percentage of seats that "farmers and worker" have in the People's Assembly because of its vague characterization. One of the more controversial amendments however is the forbidding of religious parties or political parties formed on the basis of religion to be established. This limits many political parties in Egypt which have emerged from religious bases – such as the Muslim Brotherhood. Furthermore, the Muslim Brotherhood has been considered as a terrorist organisation within the state (Carlstrom 2014).

(iii.) Analysis of Egypt's Revolution

Like Tunisia, the Egyptian revolution also shows how radical democracy played a role in toppling Mubarak's regime and establishing a new Constitution. Radical democracy was expressed in the people's mobilisation and organisation to not only topple the regime, but re-establish the important role of civil society in the country. In Egypt, the role of social media was considered as a very important part of mobilising people against the regime, however, the role of trade unions, strikes, several political parties and the military also made it possible for people to oppose the regime. These forms of organisation and its contribution to governance and democracy, can be seen to reflect many of the theories and ideas proposed by William Connolly (1999), Hannah Arendt, Robert Dahl, Rosa Luxemburg, Chantal Mouffe and Ernest Laclau (1985). These authors contribute to the concept of radical democracy and they advocate forms of participatory and representative democracy – much of which is evident from the Egyptian revolution in 2011. Connolly (1999) shows the importance of recognising the economic and social limits of liberalization or neoliberal democracy.

The neoliberal principles that were adopted in Egypt empowered Mubarak's authoritarian government and it suppressed the voices of ordinary and working class people in establishing how the state functioned. Arendt and Dahl support forms of representative and direct democracy in a space where all citizens can interact and participate in governance. The revolution itself showed how this space in society was being created; the mass demonstrations in Tahrir Square showed the physical creation of this space where people of all classes and backgrounds came together to show that they wanted Mubarak to step down. The role of social media too, created this space for people to interact and share their ideas and organize a way of changing the status quo in government. The fact that trade unions and political parties emerged together and stood in solidarity in the mass demonstration, voicing their economic and social concerns (that were interlinked), also reflects Rosa

Luxemburg's theory of linking both the economic and political struggles. The works of Mouffe and Laclau (1985) reflect the conflicting relationship between neoliberalism and democracy. Egypt's new Constitution and the development of its civil society after the 2011 revolution show that Mouffe and Laclau's idea that democracy is something that should be an open-ended project that people actively engage in – whether it be through revolutions or an active street participation.

Like South Africa's struggle for democracy, Egypt's struggle too had a significant role of the youth. As aforementioned the Soweto uprising served as an example in South Africa's case, of showing the youth's involvement in the protests against the apartheid regime. Although the Soweto uprising on June 16, 1976 did not result in any immediate policy changes or fall of government, it brought world-wide attention to the plight of the non-white communities in South Africa, which also allowed international pressure to be advanced against the apartheid government. Social media mobilised many young people in Egypt, which to a large extent contributed to the mass uprising in 2011 – which was successful in toppling the Mubarak regime. However, it is also important to remember that the Egyptian military removed Mubarak from office and the role of trade unions and political parties also contributed greatly to the uprising. Besides providing a platform and space in Egyptian society to discuss ideas of governance and mobilisation, social media also would have highlighted the Egyptian people's cause to the rest of the international community; therefore it could also be considered as a mechanism that facilitated a radical form of democracy. Social media helped to unite the different groups in Egypt in one uprising against Mubarak and against authoritarianism; despite the fact that many of the groups involved have different interests. The Freedom Charter created by different groups and ordinary people on the streets served as a unifying document that expressed the common will for freedom and democracy in South Africa. Both social media in Egypt and the Freedom Charter in South Africa engaged with ordinary people on the streets (who would otherwise have no stake in government or political issues); which shows emergence of radical democracy in shaping the governance of both countries.

The effective role of the trade unions in the struggle in South Africa and Egypt show the interdependence of the economic and political struggles in the countries. The unions that initiated the strikes and civil disobedience in the revolution in both countries reflected the need for ordinary and working class people to be incorporated into political and economic governance. They reflect the clash of neoliberalism and radical forms of democracy; showing that neoliberal policies do not engender an equal form of governance in the state.

The role of the military was influential in Egypt, as they defected from the regime and removed Mubarak from office. The military have also facilitated the transition to a new Constitution and elections in Egypt; however their role was limited after the elections took place. South Africa's transition however, was a peaceful negotiation. It is yet to be seen as to the influence of the military in Egypt for its future democracy. Certainly, the threat of a military government makes many uneasy about its role in the future government; however the military did execute the demand of the people to remove Mubarak's regime and therefore it has played its role in developing a form of radical democracy in the 2011 revolution.

(iv.) South Africa's Response to the Egyptian Revolution

The South African government has made several statements about the situation in Egypt since the revolution in 2011. On the July 2013, DIRCO released statements about the protests that emerged in Egypt; it stated that South Africa recognises the ongoing protests in Egypt and encourages all parties to resolve their issues in a peaceful and democratic spirit. It stated that South Africa would monitor the situation and provide updates. The statement reasserted the fact that stability and peace was necessary for democracy and the ultimate well-being of Egyptians (Department of International Relations and Cooperation 2013, "SA statement on the situation in Egypt").

On August 2013, DIRCO also released a statement expressing concern when Mohammed Morsi (who replaced Mubarak) was removed from power. The South African government expressed concerns over the fact that there was an unconstitutional change of government; which also goes against the AU Constitutive Act. However, it did mention that the South African government encouraged the Egyptian people to resolve the crisis through inclusive dialogue and consolidate the achievements made by the people in the initial 2011 protests (Department of International Relations and Cooperation, Republic of South Africa. 2013. "Press Release: South Africa Condemns Acts of Violence in Egypt").

Similarly, the AU has made statements regarding the current situation in Egypt, encouraging a resolution to be made since the humanitarian crisis has escalated in the country. However, an AU Resolution has not been adopted as yet. The South African AU Chairperson, Nkosazana Dlamini-Zuma emphasized the need for all Egyptian stakeholders to work together, embracing tolerance and compromise in their transition to democracy. The AU has also encouraged there to be Constitutional order in the country. The AU Council underlined the need to respect human rights, the sanctity of human life and fundamental freedoms. It also mentioned that a stable and democratic Egypt would be an asset to the AU as Egypt hold a lot of influence on the continent. The AU has suggested it

would do anything within its capability to help the Egyptian state; however there has been no mention of intervention as yet (African Unions Peace and Security 2013).

On the 30th July 2013, The South African government showed more initiative in the politics of Egypt by joining the call from the international community to release former President Morsi as they viewed it as unconstitutional to remove a democratically elected President (South African Foreign Policy Initiative 2013).

In August 2013, the South African government released a statement saying that they condemned the violence in Egypt, but they also mentioned that they would welcome an initiative from the AU to send a mission to Egypt to aid their democratic transition (Department of International Relations and Cooperation, Republic of South Africa 2013, "Press Release: South Africa Condemns Acts of Violence in Egypt.").

(v.) Analysis of South Africa's Response

South Africa and Egypt are important stakeholders in the AU, yet South Africa has yet again shied away from directly intervening in the Egyptian revolution and its transition to democracy. South Africa has shown support for democracy in Egypt through its statements and in recent months, it has shown its support for a mission to be established in Egypt by the AU and it encouraged all parties to cooperate and compromise. These are encouraging steps for South Africa to promote democracy in Egypt and the broader African region. However, these statements have not firmly committed South Africa to becoming involved in Egyptian politics and it has also maintained a certain neutrality; by not siding with a particular leader or group in Egypt. This may be seen as a safe and impartial foreign policy initiative; however South Africa is also at risk of being seen as indifferent to the true concerns of the Egyptian people. It certainly does not portray South Africa as a supporter of radical democracy.

Given South Africa's struggle against apartheid and its proclaimed commitment to promoting democracy, many analysts like Landsberg and Van Wyk (2012) predicted that South Africa would play a more active role in supporting the processes of mediation and implementation of democracy. I would assert that given South Africa's history of radical democracy through similar means of trade unions and mobilising people on the streets, South Africa would have supported the people on the streets of Egypt calling for the demise of Mubarak's regime. However, South Africa did not overtly support the people on the streets. Even after former president, Mohammed Morsi was elected and then ousted by more protests in 2013; South Africa condemned the protests as they stood against

an elected president in Egypt. South Africa's conception of democracy therefore, appeared to be based on the procedural aspects of democracy such as the elected officials and it appeared to support those who managed to gain power. It is understandable that aspects such as the democratic electoral process of democracy should be supported and honoured; however, surely the will and voice of the ordinary people on the streets should be supported as well. In the case of South Africa, the 1996 Constitution was representative of many groups on the country (through negotiation) and was founded on many of the principles of the Freedom Charter. South Africa continues to encourage a similar dialogue between the parties on Egypt; however South Africa has shown little initiative beyond its statements of encouragement to facilitate this dialogue.

South Africa supports the principles of the AU, and perhaps it has adopted a principle of 'non-interference' (Kioko 2003) in the case of Egypt and Tunisia. It is understandable that South Africa (like many African countries) would not support a military intervention in Egypt as it would seem undemocratic. As Siba Grovogui (2011) mentioned, many African countries are uneasy about even supporting Western interventions in the Arab Spring. However, South Africa's decision to not intervene (whether militarily or through diplomacy)has also created the perception that South African foreign policy has chosen to be distanced from conflicts such as the Arab Spring uprisings and distanced from the people that started the uprisings. South Africa's struggle for democracy has therefore not been adequately reflected in its post-apartheid foreign policy. This shows a broader shift away from values and principles such as human rights and democracy; which is replaced by a neoliberal agenda focused on economic interests. The economic relationship between Egypt and South Africa would seem to be prioritised, as the South African government seems to be supporting those in power (with the most amount of economic and political monopoly) even if the people of Egypt are not satisfied with those in power governing over them. This could explain South Africa's support for former President Morsi and their lack of support for the concerns of the Egyptian people on the streets during the 2011 revolution and the revolution against Morsi in 2013. However, regardless of the potentials of pursuing economic interests in Egypt, the South African government has not asserted what kind of democracy it promotes in foreign policy. It has been established that South Africa's own democratic struggle is steeped in steps toward radical democracy; incorporating the voices of the ordinary citizens in the political and economic governance of the country. Egypt presented signs of this kind of democracy developing within its 2011 revolution as well. Yet, South Africa has not shown to support this form of democracy in Egypt. I think that it is unclear as to what kind of substantive forms of democracy that South Africa hopes to help achieve in Egypt. Many of its statements and rhetoric toward the Egyptian revolution allude to the consolidation of democracy - but it has not specified how it will help consolidate this democracy and it what kind of democracy

should be established. South Africa shows no evidence of helping to establish a form of democracy that ensures the ordinary people of Egypt have a voice and are incorporated into the functioning of governance. Instead of supporting and highlighting the importance of Egypt's people, the South African government has only shown support for whoever is the leader of the country (such as Morsi) and shown support for the procedural elements of democracy.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION:

South Africa's foreign policy gained its inspiration, core values and principles from South Africa's struggle for democracy before 1996. South Africa's struggle for democracy was characterised by a radical nature; trade unions and civil society organisations played a major role in the struggle for democracy. The struggle emphasized the participation of the people in the governance of the country and the ANC alliance with the SACP and COASTU aimed to implement the values outlined in the Freedom Charter, the 1996 Constitution and Nelson Mandela's foreign policy document. These documents along with actions such as the Sharpeville Massacre, the Soweto Uprising and the worker strikes and boycotts, showed radical street protests that challenged the apartheid government. There was also a development of organisations and civil society that not only helped in toppling the authoritarian apartheid government, but helped establish a form of democracy that incorporated the concerns and participation of all citizens in the country. These developments seemed to put South Africa on the path for implementing a form of radical democracy, or a democracy that provided a space for citizens to determine their governance – rather than allowing the economic policies of accumulating capital to dominate the functioning of government. One of the fundamental principles reflected in South Africa's struggle against apartheid, was the promotion of democracy and human rights. However, as many political analysts have reflected on, South Africa's foreign policy actions have not been consistent with the principles and nature of South Africa's struggle for democracy. In many cases since the post-apartheid era, South Africa's foreign policy has been criticised as neglecting human rights and the promotion of democracy for other national interests.

In exploring the concept of radical democracy, it is evident that traces of the theory of radical democracy was indeed significant in South Africa's struggle against apartheid as well as Egypt and Tunisia's struggle against authoritarianism. Radical democracy's critique of neoliberalism is seen in the works of William Connolly (1999), Rita Abrahamsen, Chantal Mouffe and Ernesto Laclau (1985). Connolly draws a link between the economic limitations of liberalism and the decline of a more pluralist form of democracy. This is evident in the case of South Africa, in that less participatory mechanisms of government (such as the GEAR programme) were implemented in the transition to democracy. As a result, South Africa's foreign policy and domestic policy decisions have been affected – as seen in its engagement with the conflict in Zimbabwe and the domestic conflict that happened with the Marikana mine workers. The idea of having a "public space" for all citizens to

engage is an important part of radical conceptions of democracy, as advocated by Hannah Arendt, Robert Dahl and Simon Springer. This public space was effective in the struggle for democracy in South Africa As Håkan Thörn (2006) shows, the internationalisation of the anti-apartheid movement inspired many other non-governmental movements and organisations that form the idea of a "global civil society".

Neoliberal policies that have permeated into South Africa's domestic and foreign policy may help to understand some of its decision-making in foreign policy that does not reflect the radical democracy that characterised its struggle for democracy. The nature of neoliberal policies focuses attention away from a people-centred democracy in order to advance a market-oriented form of governance. Neoliberal polices therefore help to understand why South Africa has moved away from a radial nature of democracy in its domestic and foreign policy. Transnational activism against neoliberalism shows that the clash of neoliberalism and a people-centred form of democracy is experienced all over the world. Furthermore, theorists and political analysts such as Patrick Bond (2012), Jeremy Cronin (1986) and Mark Swilling (1992) all show that as South Africa has adopted more neoliberal polices, its focus on civil society and participation has declined; active civil society organisation serves as an important challenge to neoliberal polices that exclude the rights of many.

The Arab Spring marks a historic era for Egypt and Tunisia; it showed their own struggle for democracy against dictators and authoritarian regimes. Their revolutions used aspects of radical democracy in mobilising people against their authoritarian regimes; also turning to trade unions, social media and civil society organisation. It is interesting to note from this research however, the link between authoritarianism and neoliberalism. Neoliberal policies were advocated even by Western countries that were the so-called torch-bearers of democracy in the post-Cold War era. Liberal economic policies were thought to create liberalised political societies of countries as well. However, many authors such as Amichai Magen (2102), Habib Ayeb(2011) and Alan Emery (2006) have suggested that neoliberal policies were present in the repressive authoritarian governments in the Middle East and North African region. By assessing the case studies of Tunisia and Egypt, I can conclude that neoliberalism helped to create the economic divide between the elite groups (that were close to the authoritarian governments and benefitted from this position) and the working class, ordinary people in the country who do not reap any benefits from these policies. This allowed the authoritarian government to repress the citizens' voice and input into the governance and future of the country. Packenham and Ratliff (2007) allude to the same conclusion in assessing the case of Chile. However the link between authoritarianism and neoliberalism – and the consequent mass revolution – is particularly distinct in Tunisia and Egypt's Arab Springs. The results of political

repression and the economic strain that the majority of the citizens experienced motivated them to take action and engage with forms of radical democracy to change the status quo and participate in shaping the future of their country.

Kurt Anderson (2011) reflects on the significance of this form of radical democracy or form of protest that has swept over the international system (not just in the Arab Spring) in recent years. It seems that the clash of neoliberalism and radical forms of democracy has emerged in many countries and mass protests seen on the streets of Egypt and Tunisia reflect the authority of and will of the people. This form of protest has contributes to the idea of a global civil society – an idea that the anti-apartheid movement contributed to significantly as well.

The Arab Spring more importantly, has ignited a discourse around democracy that has become an international discourse. The uprisings were similar in many ways to South Africa's struggle for democracy; showing aspects of radical democracy and a people-centred approach to creating a new democratic government and society. Despite this, South Africa's response to the uprisings for democracy in Tunisia and Egypt, has been inconsistent and restrained. South Arica has shown support for the consolidation of democracy in Egypt and Tunisia; however it has done little to support the people on the streets that are engaged in the protests against the authoritarian governments. It is perhaps understandable that South Africa has reacted with restraint and hesitancy as the situations in the Arab Spring countries are volatile and it is uncertain as to the consequences of fully supporting one side or one group in the new changes in government of these countries. However, South Africa's response and commitment to promoting democracy in the grassroots levels (not just at the procedural level in elections) has also been restrained. South Africa's statements and support for procedural democracy have been more prominent (especially in the case of Egypt, in supporting former President Morsi) rather than supporting mechanisms that support or bolster the ordinary citizens in Egypt and Tunisia.

The limits of radical democracy are brought to light by authors such as Darrel Enck-Wanzer (2008) and Clive Barnett (2004) theorize that radical democracy would be difficult to organize into a policy framework and that it can be perceived as an idealistic theory that cannot be applied to the functioning of the state. Their arguments highlight the fact that the term 'radical democracy' itself does not provide specific steps for the theory to be realised in practice. I would argue that the foundations of the theory of radical democracy emerge from practice and the participation and engagement of people in a country. However, it is apparent that Egypt and Tunisia face great challenges ahead in implementing and maintaining radical democracy (used in their revolutions to

topple the authoritarian governments) in the future institutions of government. The new Constitutions of Tunisia and Egypt have yet to show an emphatic policy or article that puts most of the governmental power in the hands of the people. The Egyptian Constitution in particular, shows signs that the role of civil society will have to actively ensure that the people's concerns for democracy and human rights are included; it does not guarantee the rights of civil society in governance. Although South Africa's Constitution firmly ensures the social and economic rights of the people, South Africa too, is an example of a country that needs to work on maintaining aspects of radical democracy in governance. In the transition to democracy, South Africa has defected from using radical democracy as a tool for governance to implementing more neoliberal policies that have distanced itself from the idea of promoting a people-centred democracy. The domestic and international reactions to this shift from radical democracy to neoliberalism include the Marikana mine protests and some inconsistent foreign policy decision in countries like Sudan, Zimbabwe and in institutions like the United Nations. There is a need therefore, for South Africa to reignite its support for elements of radical democracy; encouraging polices to be created that address the needs of all its citizens – not just the economic elites. Moeletsi Mbeki (2012,) reflects on some of these concerns for the South African government to address the social and economic needs of the South African citizens and warns that South Africa too could experience the equivalent of the Arab Spring uprisings in protests and mass demonstrations.

South Africa's foreign policy reaction to the uprisings in Egypt and Tunisia also show that South Africa is perhaps more committed to the AU's principles of non-intervention. This principle is maintained because of the obstacles of state sovereignty and mutual respect for elected governments in Africa. Siba Grovogui (2011) engages with some of these issues, showing Africa's responses to conflict situations. Grovogui (2011) highlights the tension between the intervention of Westerns powers in African countries in the Arab Spring, and suggests that many African countries see intervention in the affairs of another African state an undermining its legitimacy and solidarity to the continent. Grovogui (2011) sees this position of many African countries as encouraging in that the continent is developing its own sense of morality and democracy, separate from Western models. However, I think that in the case of South Africa's response to the uprisings in Egypt and Tunisia, it is in danger of losing its reputation of being a country that supports the consolidation of democracy among its citizens (not just the procedural aspects of democracy). Although South Africa may show solidarity to its fellow African states, there are broader implications for the type of democracy it promotes in foreign policy. South Africa's conception of democracy therefore; is left open-ended for many to decide what kind of democracy it engenders and promotes. In its response to the Arab Spring uprisings in Egypt and Tunisia, South Africa seems to reject the strong conviction

for a radical, people-centred form of democracy, and instead show a form of democracy that tolerates neoliberalism and reflects certain anti-imperialist tendencies.

Bibliography:

Abrahamsen, Rita. 1997. "The Victory of Popular Forces or Passive Revolution? A Neo-Gramscian Perspective on Democratisation." *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, 35(1): 129-152. doi: 10.1017/S0022278X9700236X.

Abdelrahman, M. 2012. "A Hierarchy of Struggles? The 'Economic' and the 'Political' in Egypt's Revolution." *Review of African Political Economy*, 39(134): 614-628. doi: 10.1080/03056244.2012.738419.

Adelmann, Martin. 2004. "Quiet Diplomacy: The Reasons behind Mbeki's Zimbabwe Policy." *Africa Spectrum*, 39(2):249-276. URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/40175024.

Adler, Glenn and Webster, Eddie. 1999. "Lessons from South Africa: Unions, Democracy, and Economic Liberalization: Labor Seeks to Counter Government's Neoliberalism." *WorkingUSA*, 3(3):9-22. doi: 10.1111/j.1743-4580.1999.tb00160.x.

African National Congress. 2013. "The Freedom Charter." Accessed October 15 2013. http://www.anc.org.za/show.php?id=72.

African Unions Peace and Security. 2013. "Press Statement of the Peace and Security Council of the African Union (AU), at its 387th Meeting on the Situation in Egypt and on Follow-Up to Communiqué PSC/PR/COMM.(CCCLXXXIV) Adopted at its 384th Meeting Held on 5 July 2013." Last modified July 30, 2013. http://www.peaceau.org/en/article/press-statement-of-the-peace-and-security-council-of-the-african-union-au-at-its-387th-meeting-on-the-situation-in-egypt-and-on-follow-up-to-communique-psc-pr-comm-ccclxxxiv-adopted-at-its-384th-meeting-held-on-5-july-2013#.

Ajami, Fouad. 2012. "The Arab Spring at One: A Year of Living Dangerously." *Foreign Affairs March/April 2012*, 91(2): 56-65.

Ajami, Fuad. 2011. "Demise of the Dictators: The Arab Revolutions of 2011." *Newsweek*, 14 February 2011.

Alden, Chris and Le Pere, Garth. 2010. "South Africa's Post-Apartheid Foreign Policy: From Reconciliation to Ambiguity?" *Review of African Political Economy*, 31 (100): 283-297. URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0305624042000262293.

Aljazeera. 2014. "Tunisia agrees content of new constitution." Last modified January 24, 2014. http://www.aljazeera.com/news/africa/2014/01/tunisia-agrees-content-new-constitution-201412444742412307.html.

Allison, Simon. 2012. "Charity Begins in Pretoria: Dirco's Plan to get Humanitarian Assistance Right." *Daily Maverick*, Last modified September 05, 2012. http://www.dailymaverick.co.za/article/2012-09-05-charity-begins-in-pretoria-dircos-plan-to-get-humanitarian-assistance-right#.UvAw8WKSxyQ.

Amnesty International. 2012. "Egypt's New Constitution Limits Fundamental Freedoms and Ignores the Rights of Women." Last Modified November 30, 2012. http://www.amnesty.org/en/news/egypt-s-new-constitution-limits-fundamental-freedoms-and-ignores-rights-women-2012-11-30.

Anderson, Lisa. 2011. "Demystifying the Arab Spring: Parsing the Differences between Tunisia, Egypt, and Libya". *Foreign Affairs*, 90(3):2-7.URL: http://www.ssrresourcecentre.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/06/Anderson-Demystifying-the-Arab-Spring.pdf.

Anderson, Kevin. 1988. "Raya Dunayevskaya, 1910 to 1987, Marxist Economist and Philosopher." *Review of Radical Political Economics,* 20(1): 62-74. doi: 10.1177/048661348802000104.

Anderson, Kurt. 2011. "The Protester" *Time Magazine*, December 14. Accessed September 21, 2013. http://content.time.com/time/specials/packages/article/0,28804,2101745_2102132,00.html.

Ayeb, Haib. 2011. "Social and Political Geography of the Tunisian Revolution: the Alfa Grass Revolution." *Review of African Political Economy*, 38(129):467-479. doi: 10.1080/03056244.2011.604250.

Ayers, Alison J. 2009. "Imperial Liberties: Democratisation and Governance in the 'New' Imperial Order." *Political Studies*, 57: 1-27. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9248.2008.00723.x.

Baines, Gary. 2007. "The Master Narrative of South Africa's Liberation Struggle: Remembering and Forgetting June 16, 1976". *The International Journal of African Historical Studies*, 40(2):283-302. URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/40033914.

Baiocchi, Gianpaolo, and Checa, Sofia. 2009. "Cities as New Spaces for Citizenship Claims: Globalization, Urban Politics, and Civil Society in Brazil, Mexico, and South Africa in the 1990s." In *Democracy, States, and the Struggle for Global Justice,* edited by Heather Gautney, Omar Dahbour, Ashley Dawson, and Neil Smith, 131-140. New York: Routledge.

Bar, Shmuel. 2011. "Revolution in the Middle East: The Arab Awakening." *Israel Journal of Foreign Affairs*, 5(2): 17-23. URL: http://israelcfr.com/documents/5-2/5-2-3-ShmuelBar.pdf.

Barnett, Clive. 2004. "Deconstructing Radical Democracy: Articulation, Representation, and Being-with-others." *Political Geography*, 23: 503-528. doi: 10.1016/j.polgeo.2004.01.004.

Bayat, Asef. 2003. "The "Street" and the Politics of Dissent in the Arab World." *Middle East Report*, 226: 10-17. URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/1559277.

Bix, Herbert P. 2011. "The North African – Middle East Uprisings from Tunisia to Libya." *Massachusetts Review*, 52(2):329-347. URL: http://0-web.a.ebscohost.com.innopac.wits.ac.za/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=311da152-8277-4aad-bab6-f577b170f982%40sessionmgr4003&vid=4&hid=4107.

Bond, Patrick. 2006. "Civil Society on Global Governance: Facing Up to Divergent Analysis, Strategy, and Tactics." *Volutas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 17(4):359-371. doi: 10.1007/s 11266-006-9024-2.

Bond, Patrick, 2012. "How the Marikana Movement Stunned Neoliberal South Africa". *Counterpunch*, Last modified October 19, 2012. http://www.counterpunch.org/2012/10/19/how-the-marikana-movement-stunned-neoliberal-south-africa/.

Bond, Patrick. 2012. "South African People Power Since the Mid-1980s: Two Steps Forward, One Back." *Third World Quarterly*, 33(2): 243-264. doi: 10.1080/01436597.2012.666011.

Bond, Patrick. 2006. "Talk Left Walk Right: South Africa's Frustrated Global Reforms". Pietermaritzburg: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press

Bond, Patrick and Sharife, Khadija. 2012. "Will IMF neoliberalism Make a Comeback in Africa via Tunisia?". *Links International Journal of Socialist Review*, Last Modified February 2, 2012. http://links.org.au/node/2720.

Braun, Daniel. 2004. "Democracy and the Prospects for Peaceful Relations in Eastern Europe." *East European Quarterly*, 37(4):497-510. URL: http://0-web.a.ebscohost.com.innopac.wits.ac.za/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=4&sid=d5817edf-c45e-4edc-8ab7-e672b8cb9af0%40sessionmgr4001&hid=4214.

Burman, Sandra and Schärf, Wilfried. 1990. "Creating People's Justice: Street Committees and People's Courts in a South African City". *Law & Society Review*, 24(3):693-744. URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/3053857.

Burnham, Peter, Gilland, Karin, Grant, Wyn and Layton- Henry, Zig. 2008. "Discourse Analysis and Other Methods." In *Research Methods in Politics*, by Peter Burnham, Karin Gilland, Wyn Grant and Zig Layton-Henry, 248-281. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Carlstrom, Gregg. 2014. "What's in Egypt's Proposed New Constitution?" *Aljazeera*, Last Modified January 14, 2014. http://www.aljazeera.com/news/middleeast/2014/01/what-egypt-proposed-new-constitution-201411312385987166.html.

Cho, Hee-Yeon. 2000. "Civic Action for Global Democracy: A Response to Neoliberal Globalization." *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies*, 1(1): 163-167. doi: 10.1080/146493700361060.

CNN. 2009. "Police Clash with Protesters Outside Finance Meeting in Turkey." Last modified October 7,2009.http://www.cnn.com/2009/WORLD/europe/10/07/turkey.imf.protests/index.html?eref=rss_topstories.

Connolly, William. 1999. "Assembling the Left". *Boundary 2*, 26(3): 47-54. URL: http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/boundary/v026/26.3connolly.html.

Conway, Janet and Singh, Jakeet. 2011. "Radical Democracy in Global Perspective: notes from the pluriverse." *Third World Quarterly*, 32(4): 689-706. doi: 10.1080/01436597.2011.570029.

Cronin, Jeremy. 1986. "National Democratic Struggle and the Question of Transformation." *Transformation*, 2 : 73-78. URL: http://www.transformation.ukzn.ac.za/index.php/transformation/article/view/398/217.

Custers, Peter. 2011. "Antonio Gramsci and Rosa Luxemburg: Leading Thinkers on Socialist Democracy." *Countercurrents,* Last modified December 21, 2011. http://www.countercurrents.org/custers211211.htm.

Dahl, Robert. 1994. "A Democratic Dilemma: System Effectiveness versus Citizen Participation." *Political Science Quarterly*, 109(1):23-34. URL: http://0www.jstor.org.innopac.wits.ac.za/stable/2151659.

Dalacoura, Katerina. 2012. "The 2011 Uprisings in the Arab Middle East: Political Change and Geopolitical Implications." *International Affairs*, 88(1):63-79. doi: 10.1111/j.14682346.2012.01057.x.

Dallmayr, Fred. 2011. "Radical Changes in the Muslim World: Turkey, Iran, Egypt." *Globalizations*, 8(5): 639-646. doi: 10.1080/14747731.2011.622872.

Del Felice, Celina. 2012. "Transnational Activism and Free Trade. Exploring the Emancipatory Potentials of Global Civil Society." *Voluntas,* 23: 302-327. doi: 10.1007/s11266-011-9198-0.

Department of International Relations and Cooperation, Republic of South Africa. 2013. "Media Advisory: The Department of International Relations and Cooperation to host South African Women in Dialogue (SAWID) one day workshop on the events in Tunisia". Accessed November 02, 2013. http://www.dfa.gov.za/docs/2011/sawid0308.html.

Department of International Relations and Cooperation, Republic of South Africa. 2013. "Press Release: South Africa Condemns Acts of Violence in Egypt." Last modified August 15, 2013. http://www.dfa.gov.za/docs/2013/egyp0815.html.

Department of International Relations and Cooperation, Republic of South Africa. 2013. "SA Statement on the Situation in Egypt." Last modified 03 July, 2013. http://www.dirco.gov.za/docs/2013/egyp0704.html

Department of International Relations and Cooperation, Republic of South Africa. 2010. *"*Strategic Plan 2010-2013*."* Accessed 20 September 2013. http://www.dfa.gov.za/department/strategic%20plan%202010-2013/index.htm.

Department of Provincial and Local Government, Republic of South Africa. 2005. "Ward Committee Resource Book: Best Practices & Lessons Learnt for Municipal Officials, Councillors & Local Governance Practitioners." Accessed October 27, 2013. http://www.westerncape.gov.za/text/2006/2/ward_committee_resource_book.pdf.

de Souza, Marcelo and Lipietz, Barbara. 2011."The 'Arab Spring' and the City, City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action." *City*, 15(6): 618-624. doi: 10.1080/13604813.2011.632900.

De Villiers, Susan and Simanowitz, Stefan. 2012 . "South Africa: The ANC at 100." *Contemporary Review*, 294(1704): 39-45. URL: http://0web.a.ebscohost.com.innopac.wits.ac.za/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=1e6be32d-695a-4314-86c3-0bafeaa64bca%40sessionmgr4002&vid=4&hid=4206.

Dixon, Marion. 2011. "An Arab spring." *Review of African Political Economy*, 38(128): 309-316. doi: 10.1080/03056244.2011.582766.

Donohue, Brian. 2000. "On Democracy by Robert Dahl." *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 33(2): 435-436. URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/3232996.

Dwyer, Mimi. 2013. "Where Did the Anti-Globalization Movement Go?" *New Republic*, Accessed December 22, 2013. http://www.newrepublic.com/article/115360/wto-protests-why-have-they-gotten-smaller.

Ebrahim, Ebrahim. 2013. "Celebrating 19 Years of South Africa's Foreign Policy: Milestones and Challenges." Public Lecture by Deputy Minister of International Relations and Cooperation, H.E. Mr Ebrahim Ebrahim, *South African Institute of International Affairs (SAIIA)*. Accessed July 4, 2013. http://www.saiia.org.za/events/celebrating-19-years-of-south-africas-foreign-policy-milestones-and-challenges.

Ejiogu, EC. 2012. "Post-Liberation South Africa: Sorting Out the Pieces." *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, 47(3):257-268. doi: 10.1177/0021909611428041.

El-Khawas, Mohamed. 2012. "Egypt's Unfinished Revolution". *Mediterranean Quarterly*, 23(1):52-66. doi: 10.1215/10474552-1540693.

Emery, Alan. 2006. "Privatization, Neoliberal Development, and the Struggle for Workers' Rights in Post-Apartheid South Africa." *Social Justice*, 33(3): 6-19. URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/29768382.

Enck-Wanzer, Darrel. 2008. "A Radical Democratic Style?: Tradition, Hybridity, and Intersectionality."*Rhetoric & Public Affairs*, 11(3): 459-465. doi: 10.1353/rap.0.0055.

Friends of the MST. 2014. "What is the MST?" Accessed January 04, 2014. http://www.mstbrazil.org/whatismst.

Friedman, Steven. Interview by author, Johannesburg, August 28, 2013.

Garcia-Rivero, Carlos. 2010. "Political Culture and Democracy: The South African Case." *Politikon: South African Journal of Political Studies*, 29(2): 163-181. URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0258934022000027781.

Gibson, Nigel. 2001. "The Pitfalls of South Africa's "Liberation"." *New Political Science*, 23(3): 371-387. doi: 10.1080/07393140120080994.

Gill, Stephen. 1998. "New Constitutionalism, Democratisation and Global Political Economy." *Pacifica Review: Peace, Security & Global Change*, 10(1): 23-38. doi: 10.1080/14781159808412845.

Glaser, Daryl. 1997. "South Africa and the Limits of Civil Society." *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 23(1):5-25. URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/2637135.

Goldman, Lisa. 2013. "Social Media Has Been a Mixed Blessing for the Arab Spring." *Techpresident,* Last modified February 15, 2013.http://techpresident.com/news/wegov/23510/social-media-harming-arab-uprising.

Greenpeace International. 2014 ."What we do: The issues we work on." Accessed January 04, 2014. http://www.greenpeace.org/international/en/campaigns/.

Grovogui, Siba. 2011. "Looking Beyond Spring for the Season: An African Perspective on the World Order after the Arab Revolt." *Globalizations*, 8(5): 567-572. doi: 10.1080/14747731.2011.622868.

Habib, Adam. 2005. "State-Civil Society Relations in Post-Apartheid South Africa." *Social Research: An International Quarterly*, 72(3): 671-692. doi: 10.1353/sor.2005.0025.

Hashemi, Nader. 2012. "The Arab Spring, US Foreign Policy and the Question of Democracy in the Middle East." *Denver Journal of International Law and Policy*, 41:31-46. URL: http://0-web.a.ebscohost.com.innopac.wits.ac.za/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=3b770e90-6f3b-420c-9384-df5298228179%40sessionmgr4003&vid=4&hid=4212.

Heller, Patrick. 2012. "Democracy, Participatory Politics and Development: Some Comparative Lessons from Brazil, India and South Africa." *Polity*, 44(4): 643-665.URL: http://www.palgrave-journals.com/polity/journal/v44/n4/pdf/pol201219a.pdf.

Henderson, Phil. 2013. "Radical Discourse in Democracy: An Evaluation of Wolin's Critique of Modern Power." *Academia*, Accessed December 29, 2013. http://www.academia.edu/1834197/Radical_Discourses_in_Democracy_An_Evaluation_of_Wolins_Critique_of_Modern_Power.

Huang, Carol. 2011. "Facebook and Twitter key to Arab Spring Uprisings: Report." *The National*, Last modified June 06, 2011. http://openlab.citytech.cuny.edu/designprocess/files/2012/08/TheNational_FacebookandTwitterKeytoArabSpringUprising.pdf.

IMF Press Release No. 10/249. 2010. "Statement by the IMF Mission on the Article IV Consultation with Tunisia" Accessed 29 May 2014. http://www.imf.org/external/np/sec/pr/2010/pr10249.htm

Inbar, Efraim. 2012. "The 2011 Arab Uprisings and Israel's National Security." *Mideast Security and Policy Studies,* 95: 1-29. URL: http://www.biu.ac.il/SOC/besa/MSPS95.pdf.

IrinNews. 2014. "South Africa: Government Resurrecting Street Committees." Accessed January 07, 2014. http://www.irinnews.org/report/80565/south-africa-government-resurrecting-street-committees.

Jhazbhay, Iqbal. 2012. "South Africa-North African relations: Revisiting the Bridging of a Continent." In: *South African Foreign Policy Review: Volume 1,* edited by Chris Landsberg and Jo-Ansie van Wyk. Pretoria: Africa Institute of South Africa and the Institute for Global Dialogue.

Johnston, Alexander. 2000. "Review of From Comrades to Citizens: The South African Civic Movement and the Transition to Democracy edited by Glenn Adler and J. Steinberg." *Labour, Capital & Society*, 33(2): 304-306. URL: http://0-web.a.ebscohost.com.innopac.wits.ac.za/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=3d35db8c-5a78-4a54-a114-555a3ca44c87%40sessionmgr4003&vid=4&hid=4207.

Jordaan, Eduard. 2008. "Barking at the Big Dogs: South Africa's Foreign Policy Towards the Middle East." *The Round Table*, 97(397):547-559. doi: 10.1080/00358530802207344.

Jordaan, Eduard. 2010. "Fall from Grace: South Africa and the Changing International Order." *Politics*, 30(1):82-90. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9256.2010.01395.x.

Joya, Angela. 2011. "The Egyptian Revolution: Crisis of Neoliberalism and the Potential for Democratic Politics." *Review of African Political Economy*, 38(129): 367-386. doi: 10.1080/03056244.2011.602544.

Jung, Dietrich. 2011. "Unrest in the Arab World: Four Questions." *Insight Turkey*, 13(3): 1-10.URL: http://file.insightturkey.com/Files/Pdf/insight-turkey_vol_13_no_3_-2011_jung.pdf.

Kateb, George. 1983. "Arendt and Representative Democracy." *Salmagundi*, 60: 20-59. URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/40547751.

Kioko, Ben. 2003. "The Right of Intervention under the African Union's Constitutive Act: From Non-Interference to Non-Intervention." *International Review of the Red Cross*, 85(852):807-825. URL: http://www.mkkk.org/eng/assets/files/other/irrc_852_kioko.pdf.

Koelble, Thomas A and Lipuma, Edward. 2008. "Democratizing Democracy: A Postcolonial Critique of Conventional Approaches to the Measurement of Democracy'." *Democratization*, 15(1): 1-28. doi: 10.1080/13510340701768075.

Kottoor, Naveena. 2014. "Tunisia's NCA agrees new constitution." *BBC News*, Last modified January 24, 2014. http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-africa-25878534.

Klotz, Audie. 2004. "International Causes and Consequences of South Africa's Democratization." In: *Democratizing Foreign Policy? : Lessons from South Africa*, edited by Philip Nel and Janis van der Westhuizen, 13-21. Maryland: Lexington Books.

Kurki, Milja. 2010. "Democracy and Conceptual Contestability: Reconsidering Conceptions of Democracy in Democracy Promotion." *International Studies Review,* 12: 362-386. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2486.2010.00943.x.

Laclau, Ernesto. 2005. *On Populist Reason*. London: Verso.

Leggett, Will. 2013. "Restoring Society to Post-structuralist Politics: Mouffe, Gramsci and Radical Democracy." *Philosophy and Social Criticism*, 39(3): 299-315. doi: 10.1177/0191453712473080.

Landsberg, Chris and van Wyk, Jo-Ansie (Eds). 2012. *South African Foreign Policy Review: Volume 1.* Pretoria: Africa Institute of South Africa and the Institute for Global Dialogue.

Landsberg, Chris. 2010. *The Diplomacy of Transformation: South African Foreign Policy and Statecraft*. Johannesburg: Pan Macmillan.

Landsberg, Chris. 2005. "Toward a Developmental Foreign Policy? Challenges for South Africa's Diplomacy in the Second Decade of Liberation." *Social Research*, 72(3): 723-756. doi: 10.1353/sor.2005.0041.

Little, Adrian. 2010. "Democratic Melancholy: On the Sacrosanct Place of Democracy in Radical Democratic Theory." *Political Studies*, 58: 971-987. doi: 10.1111/j.14679248.2009.00807.x.

Lummis, C. Douglas. 1996. *Radical Democracy*. New York: Cornell University Press.

Magama, Tisetso. 2013. "Speech by The Honourable Tisetso Magama, Member of Parliament and Chairperson of the Portfolio Committee on International Relations and Cooperation, at the South African Institute of International Affairs, 25 July 2013." *Parliament of the Republic of South Africa*. Accessed July 27,2013. http://www.saiia.org.za/events/the-honourable-tisetso-magama-speaks-at-saiia.

Magen, Amichai. 2012. "On Political Order and the "Arab Spring'." *Israel Journal of Foreign Affairs,* 6(1): 9-21. URL: http://israelcfr.com/documents/6-1/6-1-2-Magen.pdf.

Mandela, Nelson. 1993. "South Africa's Future Foreign Policy." *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 72(5): 86-97.

Manfreda, Primoz. 2012. "Guide to Egyptian Opposition: Political Parties, Activist Groups, Labor Unions." *About.com Middle East Issues.* Accessed July 13, 2013. http://middleeast.about.com/od/egypt/tp/Guide-To-Egyptian-Opposition.htm.

Martinez, Elizabeth and Garcia, Arnoldo. 2014. "What is Neoliberalism: A Brief Definition for Activists".*Corpwatch*. Accessed January 07, 2014. http://www.corpwatch.org/article.php?id=376.

Mbeki, Moeletsi. 2012."Moeletsi Mbeki: ANC Will Lose Power." *News24*, Last modified May 11, 2012. http://www.news24.com/SouthAfrica/Politics/Moeletsi-Mbeki-ANC-will-lose-power-20120511.

Meyer, David S. 2004. "Globalization from Below: Democracy after the Cold War; Review of 'Global Civil Society: An Answer to War' by Mary Kaldor." *International Studies Review*, 6:297-301. URL: http://0-www.jstor.org.innopac.wits.ac.za/stable/3699602.

Morton, Jeffrey S. and Shortt, Nicole. 2012. "The Arab Spring: Implications for Israeli Security." *Mediterranean Quarterly*, 23(3): 34-51.

Mouffe, Chantal and Laclau, Ernesto. 1985. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. Michigan: Verso.

Mouffe, Chantal and Paul Holdengräber. 1989. "Radical Democracy: Modern or Postmodern?" *Social Text*, 1(21): 31-45. URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/827807.

MSN News. 2014. "Egyptians Speak Out Through Street Art". Accessed 12 January 2014. http://news.msn.com/world/egyptians-speak-out-through-street-art.

Mueller, John. 2010. "Capitalism, Peace and the Historical Movement of Ideas." *International Interactions*, 36: 169-184. doi: 10.1080/03050621003785066.

Nathan, Laurie. 2005. "Consistency and Inconsistencies in South African Foreign Policy." *International Affairs*, 81(2): 361-372. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2346.2005.00455.x.

Nathan, Laurie. 2011. "Interests, Ideas and Ideology: South Africa's Policy on Darfur." *African Affairs*, 110/438:55-74. doi: 10.1093/afraf/adq058.

Nanda, Ved P. 2012. "The Arab Spring, the Responsibility to Protect, and U.S. Foreign Policy – Some Preliminary Thoughts", *Denver Journal of International Law and Policy*, 41(1):7-30. http://0-web.a.ebscohost.com.innopac.wits.ac.za/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=f9c97461-6069-41c1-b037-777e3dd4155d%40sessionmgr4002&vid=4&hid=4106

Nel, Philip and van der Westhuizen, Janis (Eds). 2004. *Democratizing Foreign Policy?: Lessons from South Africa*. Maryland: Lexington Books.

Nel, Philip, van Wyk, Jo-Ansie and Johnsen, Kristen. 2004. "Democracy, Participation, and Foreign Policy Making in South Africa." In *Democratizing Foreign Policy? : Lessons from South Africa*, edited by Philip Nel and Janis van der Westhuizen, 13-21. Maryland: Lexington Books.

Neumann, Iver B. 2008. "Discourse Analysis" In: *Qualitative Methods in International Relations: A Pluralist Guide*, edited by Audie Klotz and Deepa Prakash, 61-77. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Noueihed, Lin and Warren, Alex. 2012. *The Battle for the Arab Spring: Revolution, Counter-Revolution and the Making of a New Era*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

O'Donnell, Catherine.2011. "New Study Quantifies Use of Social Media in Arab Spring". *University of Washington News Releases, Research*. Last modified September 12, 2011. http://www.washington.edu/news/2011/09/12/new-study-quantifies-use-of-social-media-in-arab-spring/.

Oxfam. 2014. "Egyptian Civil Society Organizations Keep the Faith in Democracy." Accessed January 12, 2014. http://www.oxfam.org/en/development/egypt/egyptian-civil-society-organizations-keep-faith-democracy.

Packenham, Robert A. and Ratliff, William. 2007. "What Pinochet Did for Chile" *Hoover Digest*, Last modified January 30, 2007. http://www.hoover.org/publications/hoover-digest/article/5882.

Panja, Tariq and Biller, David. 2013. "Brazil Riots Threaten World Cup as Nation Prepares for Games." *Bloomberg*, Last modified October 24, 2013. http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-10-23/brazil-world-cup-disruption-seen-outcome-of-rio-violent-protests.html.

Peet, Richard. 2002. "Ideology, Discourse, and the Geography of Hegemony: From Socialist to Neoliberal Development in Postapartheid South Africa." *Antipode*, 34(1):54-84. doi: 10.1111/1467-8330.00226.

Pillay, Anton.M. 2011. "Mbeki to Zuma: South Africa in the UNSC. Consultancy Africa Intelligence." Consultancy Africa, Last modified July 18, 2011. http://www.consultancyafrica.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=794:mbeki-to-zuma-south-africa-in-the-unsc&catid=57:africa-watch-discussion-papers&Itemid=263 .

Polity. 2013. "The Reconstruction and Development Programme: A Policy Framework." Accessed October 15, 2013. http://www.polity.org.za/polity/govdocs/rdp/rdpall.html.

Puddington, Arch. 2011. "Democracy's Stake in the Arab Spring." *Israel Journal of Foreign Affairs*, 5(3): 13-22. http://israelcfr.com/documents/5-3/5-3-3-ArchPuddington.pdf

Rashed, Mohammed Abouelleil and El Azzazi, Islam. 2011. "The Egyptian Revolution: A Participant's Account from Tahrir Square, January and February 2011." *Anthropology Today*, 27(2): 22-27. 10.1111/j.1467-8322.2011.00798.x.

Roth, Kenneth. 2011. "Time to Abandon the Autocrats and Embrace Rights: International Response to the Arab Spring". *Human Rights Watch, World Report 2011*, Accessed October 28, 2013. http://www.hrw.org/world-report-2012/time-abandon-autocrats-and-embrace-rights.

Saikal, Amin. 2011. "Authoritarianism, revolution and democracy: Egypt and beyond." *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, 65(5): 530-544. doi: 10.1080/10357718.2011.613903.

Saks, David. 2009. "Tough Choices for South Africa." *Israel Journal of Foreign Affairs*, 3(2): 45-50. URL: http://israelcfr.com/documents/issue8_DavidSaks.pdf.

Salamey, Imad and Pearson, Frederic S. 2012. "The Collapse of Middle Eastern Authoritarianism: breaking the barriers of fear and power." *Third World Quarterly*, 33(5):931-948. doi: 10.1080/01436597.2012.674702.

Seekings, Jeremy. 1992. "'Trailing behind the Masses': The United Democratic Front and Township Politics in the Pretoria-Witwatersrand-Vaal Region, 1983-84." *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 18(1):93-114. URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/2637183.

Serrão, Olivier and Bischoff, Paul-Henri. 2009. "Foreign Policy Ambiguity on the Part of an Emergent Middle Power: South African Foreign Policy through other Lenses." *Politikon*, 36(3):363-380. doi: 10.1080/02589341003600189.

Shah, Anup. 2011. "Public Protest around the World." *Global Issues,* Last modified November 07, 2011. http://www.globalissues.org/article/45/public-protests-around-the-world#ProtestsHaveOccurredAllOverTheWorld.

Shehata, Dina. 2011. "The Fall of the Pharaoh: How Hosni Mubarak's Reign came to an End." *Foreign Affairs*, 90(3): 26-32.

Shiva, Vandana. 2011. "The Lies of Free Market Democracy." *Aljazeera*, Last modified November 15, 2011. http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2011/11/20111112135744718390.html.

Smith, Helena. 2013. "Greek Protesters Rally against IMF and EU inspection." *The Guardian*, Last modified November 05, 2013. http://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/nov/05/greek-protesters-rally-against-imf-eu-inspection.

South Africa Government Online. 2013. "Constitution of the Republic of South Africa 1996." Accessed October 15. http://www.justice.gov.za/legislation/acts/1996-108.pdf

South African Foreign Policy Initiative. 2013. "Egypt: SA demands release of Morsi, other political prisoners." Last modified July 30, 2013. http://www.safpi.org/news/article/2013/egypt-sa-demands-release-morsi-other-political-prisoners.

South African History Online: Towards a People's History.2014. "Turning the Tide: A Chapter from The UDF. A history of the United Democratic Front in South Africa." Accessed January 13, 2014. http://www.sahistory.org.za/articles/turning-tide-chapter-udf-history-united-democratic-front-south-africa#content-top.

Springer, Simon. 2010. "Public Space as Emancipation: Meditations on Anarchism, Radical Democracy, Neoliberalism and Violence." *Antipode*, 43(2): 525-562. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8330.2010.00827.x.

Sultan, David. "Egypt the Morning After." *Israel Journal of Foreign Affairs*, 5(2): 25-29. URL: http://israelcfr.com/documents/5-2/5-2-4-DavidSultan.pdf.

Swanson, Jacinda. 2007. "The Economy and Its Relation to Politics: Robert Dahl, Neoclassical Economics, and Democracy." *Polity*, 39(2):208-233. URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/4500273.

Swilling, Mark. 1992. "Socialism, Democracy and Civil Society: The Case for Associational Socialism." *Theoria: A Journal of Social and Political Theory*, 79: 75-82. URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/41801955.

Taljaard, Raenette. 2009. "Think Again: South Africa". *Foreign Policy Magazine*, Last modified April 14, 2009. http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2009/04/13/think_again_south_africa.

Taylor, Ian. 2004. "The Democratization of South African Foreign Policy: Critical Reflections on an Untouchable Subject." In: *Democratizing Foreign Policy? : Lessons from South Africa*, edited by Philip Nel and Janis van der Westhuizen, 23-37. Maryland: Lexington Books.

Taylor, Ian and Williams, Paul. 2001. "South African Foreign Policy and the Great Lakes Crisis: African Renaissance Meets Vagabondage Politique?" *African Affairs*, 100(399):265-286. URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/3518768.

Thörn, Håkan. 2006. "Solidarity across Borders: The Transnational Anti-Apartheid Movement." *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 17(4):285-301. doi: 10.1007/s 11266-006-9023-3.

Toameh, Khaled Abu. 2011. "From an Arab Spring to Islamist Winter". *Gatestone Institute: International Policy Council*, Last modified October 28, 2011. http://www.gatestoneinstitute.org/2541/arab-spring-islamist-winter.

van Dijk, Teun A. 2008. "Critical Discourse Analysis" In *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis,* by Deborah Schiffrin, Deborah Tannen and Heidi Hamilton, 352-371.Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd. http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/9780470753460.fmatter/pdf.

van Nieuwkerk, Anthoni. 2007. "A Critique of South Africa's Role on the UN Security Council." *South African Journal of International Affairs*, 14(1), pp.61-77. doi:

10.1080/10220460709545483.

van Nieuwkerk, Anthoni. 1992. "Transitional Politics in South Africa: From Confrontation to Democracy." South African Institute of International Affairs. Accessed January 08, 2013. http://dspace.cigilibrary.org/jspui/bitstream/123456789/30794/1/Transitional%20Politics%20In%20Southern%20Africa-From%20Confrontation%20To%20Democray.pdf?1.

Vaughan, Josh. 2013. "Arbitration in the Aftermath of the Arab Spring: From Uprisings to Awards." *The Ohio State Journal on Dispute Resolution*, 28(2): 491-518. URL: http://0-web.a.ebscohost.com.innopac.wits.ac.za/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=2f723733-02b7-4daf-a7a5-8dfe10e65850%40sessionmgr4001&vid=4&hid=4114.

Villa-Vicencio, Charles. 2012. "Making Up is Hard to Do: As the Arab Spring Countries are about to Learn, Reconciliation is Hard, Grinding Work." *Foreign Policy*, Last modified January 17, 2012.http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/01/17/making_up_is_hard_to_do?page=0,0.

Vincent, Louise. 2011. "Seducing the People: Populism and the Challenge to Democracy in South Africa." *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, 29(1):1-14. doi: 10.1080/02589001.2011.533056.

Wolin, Sheldon. S. 1983. "Hannah Arendt: Democracy and the Political." *Salmagundi*, 60:3-19. URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/40547750.

Youla, Christian. 2009. "The Foreign Policies of Mandela and Mbeki: A Clear Case of Idealism vs. Realism?" MA Thesis, University of Stellenbosch. Accessed October 23, 2013. http://scholar.sun.ac.za/handle/10019.1/1592.

Zgurić, Borna. 2012. "Challenges for Democracy in Countries Affected by the 'Arab Spring'." *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations*, 23(4): 417-434. doi: 10.1080/09596410.2012.712455.

Žižek, Slavoj. 2008. *Violence*. London: Transaction.