

https://dspace.org/

Social movements and democracy in South Africa: questions about internal democracy and relations with popular constituencies with special reference to the Soweto Electricity Crisis Committee

Skuse, Jenali

2011-12-21
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/10898

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

Introduction

The issue of internal democracy is one which is rarely explicitly addressed in social movement theory. Often internal democracy is merely taken as a given or ignored all together. This is problematic when considering that much of the legitimacy of new social movements and the organisations which comprise them stems from their being a radical critique of liberal democracy. While it is widely accepted that social movements, and the organisations which comprise them should be non-hierarchical, representative, with decentralised decision-making structures and increased scope for participation (Della Porta & Diani, 2006: 240), there appears to be a gap in the research as to whether social movements do in fact operate in this way, and this especially applies to social movements in South Africa. Social movements are comprised of a variety of actors ranging from leaders, to members, to participants, to sympathisers, but the relationships between these various segments remains largely unexamined. While studies related to the wider political structures which affect social movements typically take the form of describing opportunity structures, the internal dynamics of social movements largely take the form of describing leadership styles, framing processes, repertoires, the politics of collective identity and mobilisation techniques while largely ignoring the internal structures and functioning of movements. It is suggested here, that internal democracy is a vitally important aspect of the study of new social movements especially in light of claims suggesting or accepting that social movement organisations are internally democratic. This study will attempt to answer the questions: are social movement organisations internally democratic? How do the various levels of social movement organisations relate to and interact with each other? What kind of claims about internal democracy do social movement organisations make and how do they live up to these claims?

In many studies of social movement organisations in South Africa and internationally, particular aspects of internal democracy are dealt with but not as the central point of the study. With the recent publication of *Democracy in Movements* (Della Porta, 2009), one of the first works which actually deals explicitly with internal democracy has finally been realised. However, as with all other social movement theory which emanates from the Global North, the findings of the studies included in the book cannot be uncritically applied

to South Africa, or other Southern cases. Where the book has been particularly useful is in providing much of the methodology for measuring internal democracy.

This study uses the Soweto Electricity Crisis Committee (SECC) as its case study but will draw on various studies of other social movement organisations to make certain points and highlight certain arguments. It also examines the Anti Privatisation Forum (APF) as the APF is one of the levels on which the SECC operates, and affiliation to the APF has certain effects on the internal organisation of the SECC.

Social movement organisations in South Africa do share many similarities. However their differences should not be overlooked, and the label social movement risks homogenising a wide variety of organisations.. However, for lack of a better term it shall nevertheless be used in this study. I will adopt Snow *et al's* definition of *social movements* as:

> ...collectivities acting with some degree of organisation and continuity outside of institutional or organisational channels for the purposes of challenging or defending extant authority, whether it is institutionally or culturally based, in the group, organisation, society, culture, or world order of which they are a part (Snow *et al*, 2004: 11).

However to this definition I shall add the elements of a clearly identified opponent, and a sense of collective identity, as adopted from Della Porta and Diani's definition of a social movement as:

> ...distinct social process, consisting of the mechanisms through which actors engaged in collective action are involved in conflictual relations with clearly identified opponents; are linked by dense informal networks; share a collective identity (Della Porta & Diani, 2006: 20-21).

Social Movement shall therefore refer to *a collectivity acting with some degree of organisation, continuity and shared identity for the purpose of challenging clearly identified opponents, whether they are culturally or institutionally based, in the group, organisation, society, culture, or world order of which they are a part*. The term 'new social movements' is often used in South Africa to describe the plethora of organisations which have emerged in response to the neo-liberal policies adopted by the ANC. Often the new social movements are grievance based, and while they may surface in response to a single issue, such as electricity, or water, or housing, there is often a process of goal transformation, in which goals are transformed or reframed, which results in an ideological stance, such as socialism, being adopted. These movements are also referred to as "poor movements" and some of them as "shackdwellers movements". The term New Social Movement may however also

refer to new social movements, in the traditional sense, that is, social movements concerned with 'post materialist' concerns, such as the environmental or LBGTI movements, for example. Where the term is used to describe such movements, it shall be noted. Social movement organisations refer to the organisations whose goals are broadly aligned with those of the social movement to which they are a part but they are also "sources of identity for the movements' constituencies as well as their opponents and the public" (Della Porta, 2009: 3). Social movement organisations shall be the unit of study for the purposes of this research.

Part One of the dissertation begins with a discussion of the various methodologies used during the research. Part Two of the dissertation will be a literature review which will first deal with the issue of internal democracy and how this has been addressed in literature on new social movements. Secondly in the literature review, a discussion of the discourse surrounding new social movements in South Africa will be undertaken and it shall be suggested that new social movements are often valorised and celebrated in discourse without uncritically examining many of the failings of the new social movements. A particular focus will fall on the manner in which new social movements organisations are often uncritically accepted to be internally democratic, when the concepts of internal democracy are never interrogated and explained. Third, the issue of social movements in the Global North and the Global South is examined and it is suggested that certain fundamental differences exist between the contexts which has an impact on their organisational structure and the operation of democracy within the movements. It shall also be shown that the uncritical application of new social movement theory from the North to the South fails to acknowledge a number of differences. Finally traditional new social movement theory shall be discussed as it is often used to discuss new social movements in the South. Certain aspects of traditional new social movement theory can be incorporated into studies of South African cases. However, there are fundamental differences which cannot be ignored. Both political opportunity structure and resource mobilisation theory shall be addressed, but for the purposes of the study of internal democracy, resource mobilisation theory is more relevant. A brief note on the various levels of participants in new social movements will conclude the literature review section.

The third part of the paper will contextualise the emergence of new social movements and the various contributions of the four main factors which have been identified as having given rise to the emergence of these movements. Firstly, the geographic legacy of apartheid which has resulted in the spatial separation of racial groups, while apartheid trajectories of privilege still inform access to resources. Secondly, the rise of anti-neoliberalism and how the shift from the redistributive program of the RDP to the neo-liberal program of GEAR has resulted in opposition from the poor population all over South Africa. Third, the issue of continuity with the civics associations which emerged during apartheid and repeated repertoires of protest in contemporary South Africa shall be discussed. Finally, a discussion of the failure of local democracy, and the largely inefficient ward system shall be provided.

The fourth part of the paper will include the case studies of the SECC and the APF. Internal democracy will be evaluated in terms of participation, inclusion, decision-making and the production of and access to knowledge.

I. Methodology

Case Study

A case study of the SECC was undertaken in order to gain some insight into whether the academic theory surrounding internal democracy can be applied to social movement organisations in South Africa and whether social movements themselves practice the democratic values which many commit to in their constitutions. Social movement organisations in South Africa often make a commitment to internal democracy in their constitutions and are often accepted as being internally democratic in both new social movement theory and studies of South African new social movements. The validity of these claims of internal democracy, both by social movement organisations and the academics who study them go largely unexamined. It is acknowledged that the data gathered from a single case study cannot be used "to generalise about the population as a whole, as the case study is unique and not a representative sample" (Burnham *et al*: 2008: 64). However the merits of a case study are also acknowledged in that:

> ...data on a wide range of variables can be collected on a single group, institution or policy area. A relatively complete account of the phenomenon can thus be achieved. This enables the researcher to argue convincingly about the relationships between the variables and present causal explanations for events and processes. These explanations and generalisations are limited to the particular case study at the actual time of the investigation so a wealth of detailed information is collected which is specific to the particular case study (Burnham *et al*: 2008: 66).

In this particular case study, it was examined whether the social movement organisations do in fact operate democratically within their internal functioning. The specific variables under observation were how decision-making and agenda setting are undertaken, how leadership is elected, and whether the constituent members of the organisation felt represented by the organisation. Furthermore, the various levels within the organisations and the relationships between them were examined. A particular area of focus in the study was the role of Left intellectual activists in the organisations and movements. Other factors which were studied were issues of inclusivity and accountability, the construction and production of knowledge, and whether deliberative democracy is practised in the organisations.

Semi-Structured Interviews with Social Movement Participants

Interviews were conducted with members of the Executive Committee of the organisations, with Branch leaders and with constituent members. Where necessary an independent translator was used and at all times interviewees were given the option of responding in a language of their choice. The interviewees were asked a series of questions relating to the movement and their understandings of its organisation and operation, as well as of concepts such as democracy and socialism. The interviews were recorded (with the consent of the interviewees) and notes were taken. Later the findings of the interviews were interpreted and the results incorporated into the final part of the study.

Documentary Analysis

With regards to the analysis of documentation, as many documents on each organisation as possible were collected and considered. Such documentation included key documents from each organisation, such as constitutions, mission statements, minutes from meetings and careful examination of the websites of the movements (not applicable to the Soweto Electricity Crisis Committee).

Focus Group

A focus group was held at a forum meeting of the SECC in which groups were tasked with filling in a worksheet on internal democracy within the organisation. The questions were focused on democracy, internal democracy and ideology. Focus groups are useful in two ways. Firstly, they allow participants to interact with each other and share ideas generating very interesting outcomes and secondly they allowed for the group to divide into smaller groups showing factions and loyalties and disclosing a lot of tacit information about the group.

Elite Interview

Interviews with a number of political specialists in the field of civil society and social movements were interviewed. Elite interviewing serves the purpose of obtaining first hand information from an expert in a field. Experts included both academics who had studied movements as well as academic-intellectuals who had been involved in movements

themselves as well as studying them, and also many seasoned activists who had been involved in social movements. While the balance of knowledge is usually on the part of the interviewer, this relationship is reversed with elite interviewing as:

> Elite interviewing is characterised by a situation in which the balance is usually in favour of the respondents. This is because of their high levels of knowledge of the subject matter under discussion and their general intellectual and expressive abilities" (Burnham *et al*: 2008: 231).

While interviewing intellectuals who had some connection to the movements constituted a key part of the research, a broad representation of participants in the movements was interviewed to get as objective and representative view as possible of the movements, with the limited resources available.

Critical Reflexivity

The debate on the role of the activists and intellectuals in social movements and social movement organisations has been the subject of debates recently, with many scholars reflecting on their individual experiences in movements, as well as the contradictory experience of being an activist and an academic. Some South African academics have tried to untangle the problems of being both an activist and a researcher (such as Dawson, 2010, Walsh, 2008), and there is a growing body of literature on critically reflexive research internationally. I have decided to incorporate critical reflexivity into the paper as a way of dealing with my own role of a researcher, as well as because I believe the presence of an 'outsider' has implications on internal democracy in social movements. Fuller (1999: 222) proposes that by constantly repositioning ones identity and reassessing the motives of ones role as a researcher, a "further layer of professional accountability is added to the research project, as the researcher interacts with his/her positioning and role" (Fuller, 1999: 222).

I entered the organisations studied here as a researcher, and clearly stated that research was my primary aim. Although I sympathise avidly with the cause and plight of the people who were under study, in order to maintain objectivity and to not fall into the trap of 'speaking for others', I believe it was of great importance to maintain my distance from the movement and to not get involved in the movement personally. This was to avoid my own personal opinions 'contaminating' those of the subjects under study. It was of central

importance that I did not project my own political agenda on the organisation, and at times when I wished to make my point known, often rather chose to hold back in order to maintain neutrality. Absolute neutrality is impossible, but I made the utmost effort to ensure the highest degree possible.

With regards to trajectories of power "the extent to which similarities and differences between the researcher and researched in characteristics such as gender, race class and sexuality influence the nature and structure of research relationships" (Mautner & Doucet, 2003: 417) has been the focus of much debate, particularly in feminist research. It was very clear that as an educated individual I was considered to be someone knowledgeable and respectable, and was referred to as 'mam' repeatedly, although this probably also corresponds with apartheid entrenched racial trajectories of power. My presence at meetings was often met with applause despite my not having done anything at all, and while this is also a gesture of welcoming, it occurred after public announcements or introductions. It was also often iterated that participants in interviews, focus groups et cetera should make use of the opportunities for their own education too in their interaction with me. Considering that my presence was perceived in such a way, it was of utmost importance for me not to project my own political and ideological opinions and viewpoints on the respondents. I tried to stay as close as possible to the questionnaires which had been carefully structured so as not to project any values onto respondents.

As this was the first research I had undertaken in an underprivileged area and with subaltern populations, it was extremely difficult for me to reconcile the reality of the privileged life I live with people living in such dire conditions. There were times when I was very tempted to involve myself in the organisation, or contribute material resources to the organisation, however as I felt this would compromise my objectivity and the ethics of the research, I held back.

Language was another area that warrants reflection. All the constituent members of the organisations who were interviewed were not first language English speakers. Many also had a very limited formal education and did not possess the conceptual tools to express the intricacies of ideological concepts. At all times, it was made clear to interviewees that they could answer questions and fill our questionnaires in whatever language they pleased, they

more often than not chose English as their medium. This was obviously as a result of them identifying me as an English speaker and trying to accommodate that in their responses. During the focus group, one group responded in isiZulu, but the rest responded in English. This often lead to me having to probe for more details in their answers without leading them in their responses. I do believe however that the responses generated did reflect the opinions and beliefs of the respondents, despite being circumscribed by language.

Theoretical Framework

The researcher proceeds from the normative premise that democracy is an essentially valuable organising principle. By including all people in the decisions which affect them, more legitimate decisions can be made. Furthermore, it is underpinned by the idea that social movements constitute a valuable part of civil society.

While many accounts of what would constitute an internally democratic organisation exist, the case studies presented here shall be evaluated in terms of participation, inclusivity, decision-making structures, leadership, deliberation, access to and production of knowledge and information, and local and global relationships. These indicators of internal democracy have been drawn from a number of sources including, *inter alia*, Della Porta & Diani (eds) (2006), Della Porta (ed) (2009) and Freeman (2006).

II. Literature Review

Internal Democracy

Prior to the publication of *Democracy in Movements* (Della Porta (ed), 2009) no in-depth and focused look at democracy in social movements and social movement organisations had been undertaken. Internal democracy is occasionally mentioned or alluded to, taken for granted or uncritically accepted to be a feature of grassroots movements but it is rarely critically examined or analysed in any real detail. In many cases there are allusions to isolated elements of internal democracy such as participation or inclusivity and often leadership and representation, but never all the aspects of internal democracy as the focus of a study. Social movements, especially new social movements in South Africa are often unquestioningly accepted to be sites for participation on a basis of equality and horizontality, whereby people can articulate and pursue a particular interest or a set of interests. However, by unquestioningly accepting the 'democraticness' of social movement organisations a very large portion of what their legitimacy is based on, is never proven or scrutinised. While literature abounds studying trends in social movements, their issues, framing, repertoires of action, continuities with the past, manners in which they challenge the state, amongst others, the issue or internal democracy is often left as an assumed feature.

The 'new' social movements in Europe and the USA developed, as a direct response to the "traditional left's bureaucratic structures" (Della Porta & Diani, 2006: 137). An intrinsic part of their revolt against the traditional left was a new, radical democratic organisational structure. They experimented with non-hierarchical structures, decision-making in an open assembly, possibilities for substantive participation and a high degree of equality between members. While many new social movement leaders and activists may sincerely have believed in and explored such democratic innovations, it cannot be taken for granted that all new social movements are defined by these democratic practices. As has been shown (Della Porta and Diani, 2006; Giugni & Nai, 2009) many of those movements evolved into more centralised and institutionalised structural forms. There is still however a tendency to label all new social movements as embodying the principles of direct, grassroots or radical democracy without interrogating what these terms actually mean, and whether the

organisations are in fact as 'democratic' as they claim to be. Initially new social movement organisations "theorised direct democracy, self-organisation, grassroots participation and permanent control" (Della Porta & Diani, 2006: 137) emphasising inclusivity. However, in many cases, these principles were difficult to maintain in the long term as the organisations grew. Small and informal organisations also suffer from many maladies, such as the 'tyranny of structurelessness' (with its informal, unaccountable hierarchies) and decision-making through coerced consensus, amongst others. It could be argued that the principles of internal democracy are still valued in many new social movements, and still inform the rhetoric of new social movements although the organisational structures in movements follow more practical lines for mobilisation and general organisation. The following literature review will show how much of the contemporary literature on new social movements, and new social movements in South Africa in particular, has failed to deal with internal democracy in a critical manner.

Democracy in Movements (2009) is the first study that attempts to address the question of internal democracy in social movement organisations in qualitative and quantitative terms. The study focuses broadly on the Global Justice Movement and examines a wide variety of organisations from six European countries. Addressing a number of issues surrounding internal democracy within organisations that are aligned with the Global Justice Movement, an in-depth and critical appraisal of a movement defined by a collection of highly diverse organisations is provided. While one cannot ignore the vast differences between the context in which these movements operate and the South African context, some of the theory and much of the methodology can be borrowed for a similar study in South Africa which could certainly yield interesting and most probably very different results. One of the fundamental differences between the organisations under study in *Democracy in Movements* and the organisations that comprise the social movement in South Africa is that of age. In *Democracy in Movements*, organisations whose foundations go as far back as 1968 are considered, while in South Africa, many of the organisations are still very 'young', having only been formed from around 2000 onwards. Furthermore, the political contexts are also vastly different. The European countries from which the organisations originate (Italy, France, Germany, Spain, Great Britain, and Switzerland) can all be considered consolidated democracies in which the majority of citizens have the majority of their most basic needs

met. This is not the case in South Africa. One of the fundamental problems with uncritically applying theory which emanates in the Global North to situations in the Global South is that it often ignores the very unsubtle differences between the two contexts and the effects these have on the formation of social movements and their activities. This issue shall be addressed at a later stage in the literature review.

Arguments in favour of internal democracy in organisations stem from the belief that democracy is the most desirable organising principle for groups, and should therefore be applied to groups of all types and forms. It is suggested that in any situation where a group of people make decisions which are binding, democratic processes should be incorporated into the decision-making process to ensure that decisions ultimately reflect the will of the people. Furthermore, many social movement organisations make explicit claims to be examples of popular democracy, grassroots democracy, direct democracy, people's democracy or radical democracy. They are also extensively represented as being internally democratic with little analysis of whether this is really the case.

Drawing on theories of applied democracy, participatory democracy and deliberative democracy, this dissertation assumes that the democratic organisation of groups is intrinsically valuable and desirable. Kiloh (1986:14-15) in discussing industrial or workplace democracy proposes when considering the magnitude of work in a working individuals life, and that "it is at work that we are most qualified to contribute to decision-making and most immediately affected by its results" (Kiloh 1986:14) and therefore should have greater access to, and influence on decision-making. A similar argument can be applied to the case of social movement organisations, especially ones organised around survivalist issues such as the provision of basic goods and services. Put more simply, those who are affected by decisions, should have access to the decision-making process. Internal democracy in organisations guarantees participation in decision-making, or in other words, it links the direct stakeholders with the decision-makers and holds them to account. On the other hand, arguments for a more participatory democracy acknowledge the educational value of continued participation, and continuous engagement in democratic organisations (see Pateman, 1970: 45-46). From this perspective one learns democracy through participation in democracy. This argument can further be elaborated to be understood as a critique of the periodic participation in politics experienced in voting in current liberal democracies. Rather,

only through continued participation in democratically oriented organisations can a politically aware citizenry be born and democratic dividends gained. The social movement organisations also play an explicitly educational role, whereby political education is given in meetings and workshops and forums. However, education also functions within the framework of mandated representatives. A representative from an organisation, or affiliate, is sent to a workshop or training session, and then returns to the community to share the knowledge and skills they have gained.

Della Porta (2006: 137-164) discusses the determinants of organisational form, emphasising the fact that social movement organisation form was largely a response to the formal, bureaucratic, hierarchical organisational form of the traditional left, most notably trade unions. This influenced the development of movements which were decentralised, participatory and had decision-making structures which occurred in an open assembly (Della Porta & Diani, 2006: 137-138). The term 'new social movements' includes in it a diverse and wide range of organisations who share a few similarities, one of which is often identified as the desire to create a new form or model of democracy orientated around radical and direct democratic values, such as participation, inclusivity and equality. While organisations may start out 'structureless' (Freeman, 2006) there is a common trend evident as the movements age and grow is towards formalisation, institutionalisation and centralisation. Not all movements age in the same way, and some become more radical as they age, but the general trend is that of declining radicalism and increasing institutionalisation. The early 'new social movements' and their organisational form cannot be ignored in a study of South African social movement organisations as there is much evidence of influence from these movements, albeit with many differences. While this study (Della Porta & Diani, 2006: 137-164) focuses on movements in the European context, certain trends bear similarities to the movements currently in existence in South Africa. Notably, the same importance is attributed to democratic values and there are many similarities in the organisational forms. Della Porta & Diani acknowledge the diverse organisational forms which exist and accept that there is no one model of organisational forms which can be readily applied to studies of social movement organisations. However it can also be acknowledged that there are certain similarities in the organisations which make up the new social movement landscape, and

one of those is some kind of identification with a radical, direct or grassroots form of internal democracy. Della Porta & Diani note that:

> The chosen model of organisation, and its evolution over time, are the product of complex processes of adaptation to the environment, attempts to change it, conscious strategic choices and acceptance of tradition (Della Porta & Diani, 2006: 163-164).

The traditions of internal democracy which originated in the new social movements of the 1960s are evident in the constitutions of social movement organisations in South Africa in which many commit to certain practices of internal democracy.

In one of the only works which explicitly examines internal democracy in social movement organisations in any detail, *Democracy in Movements* (Della Porta, 2009), Della Porta differentiates between internal democratic values and external, or general, democratic values (Della Porta, 2009: 78). Internal democratic values are described simply as "values mentioned when describing the internal functioning of [the] organisations" (Della Porta, 2009: 76-77), in contrast to "general democratic values" (Della Porta, 2009: 76). The internal democratic values include the consensual method, deliberative democracy, participatory democracy, inclusiveness, an explicit critique of delegation/representation, non-hierarchical decision-making, limitation of delegation, the rotation principle and mandate delegation. General democratic values are described as difference/plurality/heterogeneity, transparency, participation, inclusiveness, equality, group or cultural autonomy and individual liberty. This particular study of internal democracy in the Global Social Justice Movement used key documents and the websites of a number of social movement organisations as indicators of internal democracy and conducted interviews and focus groups with a number of participants from the organisations studied.

From the perspective that social movements are arenas for active citizenship, internal democracy is important as it constitutes the establishment of popular democracy from below, outside of and irrespective of the state. Internal democracy in social movement organisations in this sense serves the function of being a critique of the state and the type of democracy championed by the state, or as Neocosmos (2009: 291) proposes, popular democracy makes normative prescriptions on the state. It is not only an alternative *to* the state prescribed notion of democracy but it is a *critique* on that particular form of

democracy and furthermore a critique which provides a viable alternative to the state's particular notion of democracy. As such, it is important that organisations are internally democratic so as not to perpetuate the very problem in response to which they have formed. Stated differently, as a critique of the nature of liberal democracy, social movement organisations should espouse the normative framework of internal democracy that they wish to see in the state (assuming of course that they wish to see a state).

The original new social movements of the 1960s often attempted to be structureless in order to avoid concentrating power in the hands of a few. In a booklet first published in 1970 which sought to "address the need for organisation in the US women's liberation movement" (Freeman, 1996), some principles which suggest how democratic structuring in groups involved in the movement could occur were given. Six principles were given including democratic delegation of authority, accountability of leaders to those who elected them, distribution of power amongst power-holders, rotation of leadership and responsibility, rational allocation of responsibilities, equality in access to and diffusion of information, and equal access to resources. These principles are useful as guideline in establishing a way to evaluate internal democracy in social movements, and include some of the elements usually associated with internal democracy, such as accountability, representation, horizontal equality, transparency and decentralized decision-making. It is acknowledged by Freeman (1996), Pointer (2004) and Combes *et al* (2009) that a lack of structure or informality can mask existing trajectories of inequality and unequal power relations making them more difficult to identify and more difficult to overcome. Experiences of structure versus structurelessness vary in South Africa social movement organisations, with some opting for structure, such as the SECC and the APF, and some opting out of formal structure, such as the Concerned Citizens Forum (CCF), but ultimately resulting in some loose form of structure emerging anyway. During the formative stages of the APF, structurelessness was toyed with, but ultimately discarded in favour of a basic structure for practical purposes (interview Mckinley, 2010). As acknowledged by Freeman, structure is necessary, not only to unmask unequal relations of power, but also from a more pragmatic viewpoint, in order to allocate duties and responsibilities necessary for successful mobilisation.

An important element of internal democracy especially in terms of participation which has gained popularity in the last decade is that of deliberative democracy. Deliberative democracy is defined as "an association whose affairs are governed by the public deliberation of it's members" (Cohen, 1997: 67), "decision-making with the participation of all who will be affected by the decision or their representatives" including "decision-making by means of arguments offered *by* and *to* participants who are committed to the values of rationality and impartiality" (Elster, 1998: 8). In the extensive study of democracy in the Global Justice Movement, Giugni and Nai (2009: 127-149) propose that deliberative democracy is widely accepted as the most desirable form of decision-making with half the organisations studied describing their decision-making model as 'deliberative' (Giugni & Nai, 2009: 127). Elster summarises the various ideas and theories surrounding deliberative democracy in terms of their being united by the idea that "political choice, to be legitimate, must be the outcome of *deliberation among free, equal and rational agents"* (Elster, 1998: 5). Deliberation is often based on the idea of "preference transformation", or more specifically a process whereby through rational argument between free and equal participants, preferences are transformed until an agreement of the public good is reached (Della Porta, 2009: 2). Despite having its critics, for example Mouffe (2000), Laclau and Mouffe (1985) and Shapiro (1999), deliberative democracy has been widely accepted to be valuable in many of the ways previously discussed, and deliberation as a positive democratic value has been adopted by many social movement organisations in South Africa and the internationally.

Deliberative democracy is considered by many to be either an alternative to, or a complementary practice to representative democracy. While from the radical and socialist perspective deliberative democracy is viewed as a critique of liberal democracy, from the liberal perspective, deliberative democracy is viewed as a complementary aid to mere voting which improves the voting process and renders more legitimate outcomes. Discussions of deliberative democracy in contemporary settings typically examine the place of deliberative democracy in the nation-state. However, the argument for deliberative democracy on a smaller scale is certainly also valid, for two main reasons. Firstly, deliberation is often justified in terms of it being a positive process for a number of reasons, ranging from the reaching of more legitimate decisions to its role in the political education

of individuals, amongst many others. Secondly, as a result of the positive justifications of deliberative democracy, and it being considered valuable both in terms of means and ends, it should be applied not only to national level decision-making but all decision-making affecting a group of people. Deliberation as a preface to voting, in order to ensure a more legitimate outcome is also widely discussed, as well as the alternative, deliberation until consensus is reached. Due to the logistical obstacles associated with deliberative democracy, particularly, the issue of scale, it may be said to be even more applicable to smaller groups such as branch structures of social movement organisations.

Participants, actors and levels

When conducting a study of the internal functioning of social movements, it is necessary to differentiate between the various participants and levels of membership in social movements. Social movements comprise loosely affiliated groups, pursuing a common goal. Included in social movements are social movement organisations (SMO's), civil society organisations (CSO's), interest groups (IG's) and various other groups with an interest in the common goal, which generally tends to be counter-hegemonic[i]. Community Based Organisations (CBO's) and Faith Based Organisations (FBO's) may also take an interest in movement activities and associate themselves with movements. These organisations may align themselves with movements and partake in social movement activity, and pursue similar goals. However, they also pursue other goals and serve other functions to their constituents. SMO's primary function is to pursue the issue or goal around which the movement is geared. For example, in South Africa, the anti-neoliberal movement comprises of a variety of groups and organisations, including the APF, regarded by some as a movement in its own right. The SECC and others are considered to be social movement organisations.

For the purpose of this paper, the focus shall fall on SMO's, with a case study of the Soweto Electricity Crisis Committee. The Anti-Privatisation Forum shall also be examined, as the SECC falls under the umbrella of the APF. How the two are related and how this affects internal democracy shall be undertaken. The SECC shall be examined both independently, and as an affiliate of the APF. Recurrent references will be made to other social movement organisations in South Africa to illustrate certain points, and similarities and differences shall

be drawn on. It may be argued that affiliation to the APF subjects organisations to a certain degree of multilevel governance. Although the APF does grant its affiliates a high degree of autonomy, there are certain aspects of affiliation to the APF which subject organisations to certain conditions and rules, which are binding on all affiliates.

It is necessary to distinguish between the various types of participants in social movement organisations, as well as the various levels which comprise SMO's. While social movement organisations pride themselves on being non-hierarchical, with decentralised decision-making structures, a level of executive leadership is still considered necessary to coordinate the affairs of the movement. These leaders should (by the standards of participatory democracy) typically be popularly elected into office, mandated and subject to recall. Leaders who represent the movement as a whole, or on a national level, should be differentiated from leaders of different branches of the movement. The next 'level' of participants are branch leaders, who are elected leaders who oversee the running of the various branches of the movement. They may work part or full time, but are distinguished from paid-up constituent members by a commitment to duties and work in the running and maintenance of the organisation. Activists who are committed to the goals of the organisation and the movement and partake in the running and activities of the movement also make up a particular stratum. While the role played by activists differs from organisation to organisation and from movement to movement, and many different brands of activist partake in many movements, by virtue of the nature of movements, activists are always present in some way. Activists can also be divided into organic activists who come from the constituencies the organisations represent, and inorganic activists who do not come from the constituencies of the organisations but who are involved in the organisation to a degree which extends beyond sympathiser. Finally, with regards to internal membership of the movement, there are the constituent members of the movement, who participate in the movement and its functioning's to varying degrees. These members tend to come from the constituency which the movement claims to represent. Outside of the organisation, but part of the movement is the popular constituency the movement claims to represent, or those whose interests the movement is pursuing. The popular constituency is further divided into active constituents, those people who participate in movement activities to varying degrees, and those who sympathise with the cause of the movement

(sympathetic constituents). The popular consistency is often referred to as 'the community' or 'the grassroots'. Another grouping related to social movements, discussed earlier, is the intellectuals who are either studying or involved in the movements themselves. While activists may be intellectuals, it is necessary to differentiate between activists, activist-intellectuals and intellectuals. The role of intellectuals in movements has been subject to much criticism in recent debates[ii].

The various members and participants in SMO's are subject to varied levels of influence when it comes to decision-making and agenda setting. Batliwala makes a very important distinction between:

> ...those who are negotiating the adverse impacts of economic changes in their own homes, communities and lives – who can be termed *direct stakeholders* – with those who are less directly affected, no matter how committed to the plight of others (Batliwala, 2004: 66).

Batliwala (2004) is describing the manner in which the leaders or champions of movements are more privileged in their ability to "access advocacy opportunities or participation spaces for civil society at the *international* public policy level" (Batliwala, 2004: 67). However, the same argument can be applied to the national, and even local level, especially in South Africa. The leaders of SMO's have access to agenda-setting and policy-making apparatus that the grassroots level, or the "direct stakeholders" do not. It is therefore imperative to examine how the agenda of a movement is set, and how decisions surrounding movement activities are determined. While leadership does often reflect the constituency it claims to represent, there are often others who are not representative of that movement, who have access to both the leadership of the movement, as well as other channels of decision-making and who are pursuing interests different to those of the movement.

Furthermore, while the organisations are independent, they are embedded in networks of similar organisations and affiliated to umbrella organisations to varying degrees. For example, the APF is comprised of a number of affiliated organisations which it seeks to unite under a broader struggle against privatisation. The affiliates participate in the APF to differing degrees, and in order to gain membership to the APF a detailed application process is undertaken. Potential affiliates are scrutinised by the Coordinating Committee of the APF and have final say in their admittance. Affiliates send mandated representatives to APF

meetings to represent their interests in organisation issues and decisions. The APF has a unique structure in that it is more of an umbrella organisation, unifying body or as the name suggests, forum, than a single, independent organisation. The SECC has been an affiliate of the APF since its inception and the organisation share goals and ideological orientation.

With regards to leadership, there appears to be consensus about the fact that leaders of social movements generally tend to come from the middle classes with some form of formal education (Morris & Straggenborg, 2004: 174-177), with explanations accrediting the need for education and access to resources, as well as the skills acquired to frame issues and mobilize people being given. It is proposed by Morris & Straggenborg that leadership should not be treated as a residual element of social movement theory, but warrants its own in-depth analysis. Examinations of whether social movements operate as enclaves of their elite leadership, unrepresentative of their wider populations are certainly useful. From examination of social movements in South Africa, a unique trend with regards to leadership emerges. A trend of a dual leadership structure including direct stakeholders, that is, those directly affected by the issues pursued, as well as those who are not necessarily direct stakeholders affected by the issues pursued. Most of the movements include a stratum of leadership that is inorganic and unrepresentative of the movement's constituencies. These leaders generally tend to have attained higher education levels, are established activists and fall on the Left of the political spectrum. As earlier noted, their role in the organisations is subject to much debate and criticism, where they are sometimes seen as fundamental to the operations of the movements. They are also criticised for dominating the movements, enforcing their own political agendas on the movements and compromising the democratic workings of the movements.

Intellectuals and movements

Discourse on social movements in South Africa typically originates from one of two sources[iii], namely from participants involved in movements, usually activists, and secondly from intellectuals and researchers who are not involved in the movements but who spend an extended period of time studying them. This division roughly corresponds with Gramsci's 'organic' and 'traditional' intellectuals (Gramsci, 1999 as cited in Barker & Cox, 2002). The line between these two sources is by no means clear cut and very often both hats are worn

by individuals. Sometimes intellectuals whose intent is to study movements become involved, and often activists within those movements, who are also attached to an academic institution, comment on or research the movements. However, a line can be drawn between the two sources of discourse which is useful for this particular study.

Firstly, discourse surrounding social movement organisations comes from activists and participants involved in those movements with a vested interest of some sort in the movements. As discussed later, there are usually organic activists who come from within the constituency of the movement and inorganic activists (who may also be intellectual activists). Typically, these inorganic activists have a higher education, a history of activism and often, but not always, come from backgrounds dissimilar to those of the constituents the organisations claim to represent. These 'theorists' or 'commentators' will therefore be referred to as 'intellectual activists'. Activists who write about movements, who typically have some kind of an interest in the movements, tend to valorise the movements and make pleas on behalf of the constituents who they claim to represent. The issue of claiming to speak on behalf of others is topic which has been the centre of much a heated debate recently. Occasionally, an honest and critical piece of commentary comes from these movements, for example Walsh (2008) and Böhmke (2009a, 2009b), but generally they tend to be uncritical and in great awe of the organisation under study. Examples of this include amongst others Desai (2002)[iv] and Pithouse (2006). Considering that these activists are often personally involved in the organisations and have a vested interest in how the organisations are portrayed, this is not surprising. An organisation, such as Abahlali baseMjondolo which is widely heralded as being a prime example of radical grassroots democracy, is far more likely to get funding than an organisation that is portrayed as elitist, unrepresentative and a manifestation of a few careerist individuals. Furthermore, an organisation who can claim a membership base of thousands is also more likely to access funding than a small organisation whose membership base is a few hundred. Objectivity may also become compromised by people involved in the movements who have worked together in the organisation and have formed close and often personal relationships with others within the organisation. However, objectivity is difficult to measure but it cannot be denied that often the discourse surrounding social movement organisations, which comes

from intellectual activists within those movements is uncritical and valorises the movements.

Recently a debate has flared up among intellectuals and activists and those who wear both hats surrounding the valorisation of social movements in South Africa. Sinwell (2010) warns against the "romanticisation" of social movements, and Böhmke (2010) warns that valorising movements does little for building them up especially if "the knowledge disseminated about the movements by its sympathisers is heavy in romance and light on candour". Böhmke's accounts (2009a, 2009b & 2010) criticise commentators and researchers for valorising movements and suggests that inorganic activists have taken to branding movements and presenting them in an illustrious manner far from the truth. In an article entitled "Between the Panga and the Halo" Böhmke attempts to shed lights on the events which took place on Kennedy Road in which a number of people lost their lives. The event was appropriated by Abahlali and presented as an attack on the movement led by the ANC. This view is contradicted by Böhmke who proposes that the victims of the attack were not Abahlali members and the attack was not ANC motivated or led. When it became clear that the victims were not Abahlali members, Abahlali reframed the event as one of gross injustice as Abahlali members were being held without trial. While's Böhmke's (2009) account is not primarily concerned with the role of activists and intellectuals in social movements, he certainly provides a less romanticised view of social movements and those that represent them in literature and discourse. Implicitly challenged in Böhmke's assessment of the portrayal of the events of September 29 is the notion of knowledge production and who has control over the information created about the movement. For an organisation which has such militant views on the production and dissemination of knowledge, the misrepresentation of such a significant event, and particularly the appropriation of the event for self-serving purposes seems to undermine the foundations of "living learning" doctrine which exemplifies the politics of Abahlali. However, in the Sunday Tribune on the 25th of July, an entire page of the newspaper was dedicated to scathing responses to Böhmke's piece. A notable contribution was a small insert credited to a number of academics (many of whom had been on the receiving end of Böhmke's attack) that accused Böhmke of "using these events to score sectarian political points [which] succeeds only in closing spaces of engagement for those concerned about social injustice"

(Ballard *et al,* 2010: 26). Böhmke's criticism was received very unfavourably by academics and intellectuals alike. While the motives behind the scathing attack remain unclear, the article and others that he has written serves as new calls to more responsible theorising on movements and suggests that a degree of critical reflection which would do well to be incorporated into more studies of social movements.

Another point of reflection on academia and social movements comes in the form of conceptualising 'the poor' and the manner in which voice is given to the poor through academics. Sinwell (2010) interrogates the manner in which the poor's voice has been labelled as "a virtuous one that needs no outside political strategy" and illustrates how accepting the voices of subaltern populations as truth has little value. Discussing how people who are involved with movements sometimes become reluctant to "tell poor people what to do" Sinwell suggests rather that the role of outsiders rather needs to be rethought in order to "empower movements from the inside" and implies that there needs to be more external vanguardist leadership in movements.

Also coming from the activist intellectual source are narratives detailing the conditions which contributed to the formation of social movements and the organisations which comprise them. These describe how the movements form, their development and are often an account of the many obstacles faced by the populations discussed as well as their strategies for survival, the terrible conditions under which they live, and the extensive repression by the state.. An example of such is Desai's *We are the Poors*. Desai describes the account as a "story" which:

> ...aims to give some account of the lived experiences of both the human cost of the ANC's capitulation to domestic and international capital and the growing resistance to the ANC. Especially, it hopes to express the conditions for the emergence of such a struggle and communicate the terms upon which it is taking place... (Desai, 2002: 12).

Another source of information surrounding social movements comes from those movements themselves. Websites, key documents, periodicals, speeches, articles and many other forms of information are often produced by the organisations themselves. Obviously, as these originate from the movements themselves and often reflect the ways in which the movements wish to see themselves represented in the media, they tend to be very

uncritical and often even propagandist in nature. For example, Abahlali baseMjondolo, which updates its website daily includes sensationalist pieces highlighting the extreme repression faced by the movement, also indicated by the first banner a user sees when visiting the website which reads “Our Movement is under Attack”.

This source of discourse must be examined in terms of what its aims are. Often discourse coming from within the movements is used to initiate relationships and solidarity with other movements, is used to secure funding and is ultimately the picture the organisations wish to paint of themselves. This is not to say that this discourse has no place in studies of movements, it without a doubt does, but it must be read for what it is, and it must be critically analysed in terms of what it is produced for, and by whom it is produced. Where this literature is useful, is in illustrating the normative aspects of how the organisations wish to be viewed. However, in light of recent debates on representing or giving voice to organisations, it is necessary to interrogate in far more detail whose voice is represented in websites and supposedly internal publications from organisations. The production and dissemination of knowledge on the movements is incorporated into the case study of this paper.

The second main source of discourse on social movements in South Africa is intellectuals who study and analyse movements but do not necessarily have a vested interest in those movements themselves. McKinley says that it is important to differentiate between activists and intellectuals stating that:

> ...there is a huge difference between intellectuals who are outside the movement and activists who are inside the movement and who happen to have intellectual capacity and who happen to be coming from middle class backgrounds and who are beholden to the accountability and democratic structures of that organisation. They are two very very different things, and they have been conflated. So these academic intellectuals who write about social movements, who have resources and who pull in researchers and other things, they’re not part of movements, they’re not accountable to people, they don’t engage in everything, as opposed to those who come from middle class backgrounds and who have some intellectual capabilities and who insert themselves in movements and who put themselves accountable to those particular movements (McKinley, interview, 2010).

Often coming from institutions of higher education, intellectuals with no personal involvement find social movements in South Africa fascinating subjects for study in

particular areas of social science. The 2006 collection *Voices of Protest* is an example of this. Self described as a "outstanding collection of or rich an nuanced papers by some of the leading scholars, public intellectuals and activists working in this field in South Africa" (Padayachee, 2007: xi), the volume includes chapters by senior academics from a variety of institutions characterised by varying degrees of detachment from activism. These studies do tend to be more critical of the movements and provide a more objective view. However they still do not appear to present an entirely well rounded representation of the movements in terms of whose views are represented. In many of the studies coming from intellectuals who have no vested interest in the movement, interviews and commentary on the movements focuses on the views of the leaders in those movements. Executive members and leaders in the movements are often the only ones interviewed, and only their views are represented. The majority of these studies do not consider the viewpoints of the constituents of the movements, movement defectors or competing movements. Once again, those people who are actively involved in the framing and running of the organisation are the only ones whose views are presented. These are very often the same people from which discourse from within the organisations come. For example, taking a random sample of commentators on the SECC, from both the activist pool of discourse and the intellectual pool of discourse: Trevor Ngwane was one of the founding members of the SECC, he is a self proclaimed activist, but can also be considered an activist intellectual due to his higher education and the academic commentary which he often publishes, as well as his history in politics which includes being the local ward councillor in Pimville Soweto before dismissal. Ngwane is the most commonly cited source in Egan & Wafer's study of the SECC (2006)[v]. They do allude twice to an interview with a 'branch member' and to interviews with 'Activist 1', 'Activist 2' and 'Activist 3', but these are very brief. The majority of the commentary on the movement comes from interviews with Ngwane, his own writings, and other literature on the SECC and from the SECC, such as the constitution, pamphlets et cetera. Ngwane also publishes widely himself on the movement, as an activist, but also it could be argued as an intellectual activist[vi]. Obviously, as a founding member, an executive committee member and one of the 'faces' of the movement, Ngwane's perspective is important and his influence is widely evident however the incestuous pool of voices coming from the movements cannot be ignored. The effect this has is that the leadership of the movement effectively has control over how the movement is portrayed in the media and in academic

discourse. Leaders then also control the manner in which the internal workings of the organisation are portrayed, and the control of information has great implications for internal democracy. As noted by Pointer (2004: 273) “representation is all about power relations, about voices being heard and voices silenced”. However this is not to discount all discourse emanating from academia by any means. Most of the theory provided is useful in explaining and understanding phenomena and much of the theory shall be applied in this particular study as much value can be found in this theory.

Academic researchers who spend large amounts of time within the movements are often situated in the head offices where they are exposed mostly to the leaders and those most active in the movements. While leaders are usually more educated and have more skills than constituent members, making them more able to articulate the interests, orientations and ideologies of the organisations, this raises the problem of speaking for others, and claiming to be the voice of others. Many organisations have become disillusioned with activists speaking on behalf of the movements and the issue of “voice” has become a recurring theme in organisations all over South Africa. Issues regarding whose voice should constitute the voice of the organisation and who should represent the organisation have been contentious issues in many social movement organisations in South Africa. For example, Abahlali baseMjondolo has adopted the doctrine of “don’t speak for us, speak to us”. Pointer (2004: 281) suggests that spokespeople and media representatives of the organisations are chosen because of their being more articulate, their ability to interact with the media and having English and Afrikaans communication skills. Social movement organisations often claim to be a ‘voice for the poor’. However they often perpetuate many of the same inequalities and problems of representation as the very institutions they are critical of and formed in opposition to as noted by Pointer (2004: 291) “the techniques of control by a centralised and hierarchical ‘old left’ [...] are not qualitatively much different from the mechanisms of control used by the state” and the same may be said about many organisations in the ‘new left’. As mass movements, the voice of the masses, and not just those who represent the masses should also be represented in the writings and representation of the movements. What transpires then is a very different picture to the ideologically driven, often revolutionary picture painted by activists and intellectuals. Dwyer notes that:

> while a focus on 'leaders' or 'leadership' is important (especially in relations to the debates about internal democracy and transparency), the tendency to concentrate on what the leadership say or do is in danger of reducing the organisation to the question of 'leadership'. This can contribute to the simplification of an organisation or movement to a leader or leaders, so exaggerating their importance and influence (Dwyer, 2006: 100).

Additionally, as mentioned before, a focus on the views of leaders in an organisation does not provide a representative view of the movement. Leaders in an organisation also have a vested interest in portraying the organisation as a highly democratic entity, whilst the grassroots may not share this view.

Independent researchers would also fall into the category of intellectual commentators and many organisations are rife with researchers both local and abroad. Students writing research papers and researchers from a range of institutions are plentiful in the movements, generating a wide and diverse set of papers on the movements. At one APF coordinating committee meeting observed (2010), there were 4 researchers present. Sometimes the writings produced by these researchers are critical such as Siwisa (2008) who examines how the Concerned Citizens Forum (CCF) in Mpumulanga is guilty of crowd renting and is an organisation dominated by an elite group of unrepresentative leaders or Pointer (2004) who discusses power and representation in the Mandela Park Anti-Eviction Campaign (MPAEC) and "how current representation reinforces existing power relations and allows them to thrive unchallenged and unabated" (Pointer, 2004: 273). Sometimes the researchers fall into the same trap of uncritical valorisation, for example, Birkenshaw (2007) who after a few weeks with Abahlali concludes that "the organisation is best known for having democratised the internal governance of the settlements" (Birkenshaw, 2007: 44) and also mentions that "once the settlements have democratised, democracy is taken very seriously" (Birkenshaw, 2007: 45) but makes no attempt to conceptualise how the organisations have "democratised the governance of the settlements" nor what democratic governance actually entails, alluding only briefly to decision-making structures (Birkenshaw, 2007:45-46).

There are numerous examples of the uncritical acceptance of internal democracy within social movements. In Madlingozi (2007: 97) it is stated that "because [these movements] are often organised organically, these social movements have ensured a degree of popular

democracy for their members". However throughout the paper there is no critical evaluation of the movements in question. Madlingozi makes the very valid point that middle class activists may appropriate movements and manipulate and use them for their own gains, but he does not discuss in sufficient detail how and why these organisations in social movements are sites for "popular democracy" (Madlingozi, 2007: 95). What may be missing from these accounts is a comprehensive definition of what constitutes popular democracy, and perhaps a brief description of how this is achieved and practiced.

Gibson (2007) referring to AbM refers to the "autonomous democratic culture" (Gibson, 2007: 77) which AbM has developed. He refers repeatedly to the "democratic governance" (Gibson, 2007: 86) of the organisation, and interprets the day to day struggles for survival as not only a demand for things but also a demand for recognition (Gibson, 2007: 87). Gibson does refer to the democratic principles which govern AbM, such as open meetings and mandated delegation but only a cursory discussion of internal democracy is provided in an article which is largely premised on how the movement has a democratic culture and focuses on democratic governance.

Recently some theorists have begun to incorporate critical reflexivity into their research reflecting on their experiences in researching organisations and movements, and addressing methodological and ontological issues such as power relations, subjectivity and positionality (for example Walsh, 2008 and Dawson, 2010). These issues are addressed later in the paper, and it is suggested that all those who tread the fine line of participation and research could incorporate critical reflexivity into their research in order to ensure a better balance between objectivity and subjectivity which would create more wholesome research.

New v Old Movements

The 'new' social movements which emerged in the 1960's developed largely in response to the "traditional left's bureaucratic structures" (Della Porta & Diani, 2006: 137). What they reacted against influenced their own organisational form. Much of the literature describes the development of new social movements as a direct response to the changing nature of post-industrial societies. Touraine (1971) coined the term post-industrial, describing these societies as "technocratic" (in terms of power relations) and "programmed" in terms of their "production methods and economic organisation" (Touraine, 1971: 3). The particular

societies referred to are Western, post-industrial societies in stages of advanced capitalism in which basic living standards are secured for the majority of the population, resulting in a different set of interests being pursued by social movements, specifically a focus on "quality of life and life-style concerns" (Pichardo, 1997: 414). However, with the security of a post industrial, capitalist society, comes the alienating bureaucracy of the welfare state, and extended areas of reach for the state, or rather "state control in post-industrial society reaches beyond the productive sphere into areas of consumption, services and social relations" (D'Anieri *et al*, 1990: 446), which results in a citizenry which strives to regain control over personal and collective identities. These "new" social movements differ from "old" social movements, as they are not primarily rooted in a labour struggle (Touraine, 1971: 17) or specifically in economic redistribution, which is reflected in the various post materialist interests which they represent, for example, women's rights, gay rights, or ecological interests, or in Touraine's term "cultural revolts" (Touraine, 1971: 19).

Traditionally, new social movements are in some instances defined by their not being grounded in labour struggles (Boggs, 1986: 3) as opposed to "old" social movements which were primarily labour based. As early as 1951, prior to the 1960's, the era most theorists associate with the emergence of new social movements, Heberle identified the fact that social movements were no longer grounded "in the basic institutions of property and labour relations" (Heberle, 1951: 6). However, later theorists identified the defining feature of new social movements as their being post-materialist and interest based. Boggs (1991) proposes that the "total break" thesis which postulates that the radicalism of the 1960's completely collapsed some time between 1968-1970 is in fact incorrect. Instead Boggs suggests that there is in fact a continuity between the radicalism of the 1960's and the emergence of new social movements. He stipulates "a commitment to participatory democracy" (Boggs, 1991: 333) as the unifying principle of the New Left during the 1960's, which has carried through to the new social movements of contemporary times. It is proposed that there is continuity between the radicalism of the new left and the emergence and continued existence of new social movements. Little evidence seems to exist justifying the "total break" thesis, and it seems hardly a coincidence that most theorists locate the emergence of the new social movements at a very similar moment to the decline of radicalism in the 1960's. Boggs describes the continuities in the following terms:

> new social movements are located at the core of social contradictions (class, bureaucratic, patriarchal, ecological and racial) that permeate advanced capitalist societies. The New Left was perhaps the first and clearly the most explosive, glimpse of the cumulative struggles around these contradictions, which were not anticipated by liberalism or Marxism (Boggs, 1991: 349).

What is important about this thesis is that it puts the "new" into new social movements. Moving away from the traditional Left, which was dominated by class struggles, unionism and labour struggles, the New Left dealt with a new and entirely different set of concerns. Concerns which have been described many times as "post-materialist", which embodies both the nature of radicalism during the 1960's and the nature of new social movements, and it seems that the continuities existing between the radicalism of the 1960's and the emergence of the new social movements is undeniable. While Boggs' theory may have seemed innovative at the time, theorists after his time of writing seem to take this continuity as a given, with relatively little discussion surrounding the issue. Notable for a study on internal democracy, is Boggs' claim that the single unifying factor between the diverse movements is their commitment to participatory democracy.

While new social movements in South Africa may not be explicitly grounded in labour struggles, there is certainly evidence of movements which are concerned with similar issues of production and distribution of wealth. Typically referred to as working class movements, anti neoliberal movements or poor movements, a plethora of movements concerned with defeating the capitalist agenda and establishing a new socialist order have emerged in South Africa. However, these movements may be said to differ from the traditional labour struggle in that they are not labour based, are not constituted by trade unions, or even largely by members associated with trade unions. It may also be said that there has been the development of a diverse group of movements whose commonality is their being 'poor movements' or movements who oppose the neoliberal economic agenda of the contemporary regime. The new social movements identified in South Africa also differ from traditional new social movements in a number of ways. The new social movements which new social movement theory deals with have their roots in the student anti-war protests in the USA and the students protests in Berlin and France in 1968 and Italy in 1969 (Pichardo, 1997: 412). However, the new social movements alluded to in South Africa emerged as recently as 2001. The organisations which comprise these movements tend to be

geographically concentrated and issue based with neoliberal policies in their many forms being the central issues, they also tend to be community based organisations having their constituencies based in particular communities. The organisations are integrated into a wider struggle to varying degrees. They would not be considered post-materialist, as the issues pursued by them are essentially survivalist issues and are therefore very much materialist. This results from the context from which they emanate wherein the political systems from which they come are very different to the consolidated liberal democracies of the USA and Europe.

It has been argued in new social movement theory that there exists a contrast between trade unions (the traditional left) and new social movements (emerging from the new left). Where trade unions are held to be focused on 'materialist' or distributional class struggles (especially those of male industrial labour), to be bureaucratically organised and to be incorporated within the capitalist system (within which they fight for some of the proceeds of higher growth), new social movements are argued to be more interested in 'postmaterialist' struggles about identity and quality of life, to mobilise a cross class constituency, to be non-hierarchially organised and to be critical of capitalist industrial modernity. In practice, notably in the South African case, such lines can be hard to draw. Trade unions have undoubtedly influenced social movement struggles in South Africa. . Many of the members were previously members of, or are still members of trade unions, and this has influenced the organisational structure, as well as the processes. Also evident in South Africa is the tendency towards 'social movement unionism' (Webster, 1994:266-281) where unions involve themselves in community affairs and social movement activities. Webster proposes social movement unionism differs from traditional trade unionism in that it:

> ...is concerned with labour as a social and political force, not simply as a commodity to bargained over. As a result, its concerns go beyond the workplace to include the sphere of reproduction. Furthermore, it places a strong emphasis on democracy and workers control (Webster, 1994: 281).

There is also evidence of trade unions, specifically the Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU) calling on social movement organisations to support their causes in what is often perceived to be a one-sided relationship by the social movements as shall be discussed in more detail later (for a detailed look at the uneasy relationship between

COSATU and the new social movements, see Pillay, 2006). Some argue that COSATU has experienced durable internal democracy (Wood & Dibben, 2006) and it would be interesting to determine whether this has had any influence on internal democracy in social movement organisations.

For the purposes of this study, the term 'new social movements' will refer particularly to the social movements which have emerged since 2000 in response to the governments neoliberal ideologies.

The New Social Movement paradigm has been criticised however for a number of key reasons, notably by Pichardo (1997). It is proposed that New Social Movement Theory is problematic because it completely ignores Right-wing movements and it takes as a given the democratic organisation of movements[vii].

The most common theoretical paradigms through which social movements and their activities are examined are Resource Mobilisation Theory and Political Opportunity Structure Theory. However, these theories have by and large been formulated through studies which have taken place in Northern contexts in industrialised Western countries. They have also been formulated using the cases of new social movements which emerged both in the USA and Europe from 1968 onwards.

Resource Mobilisation Theory, first discussed by McCarthy and Zald (1973, 1977, 1987) is essentially a theory of organisation. Prior to their writings, Social Movement Organisations (SMOs) were not viewed as an essential component of the study of social movements. The perspective that McCarthy and Zald adopt is essentially an economic one, wherein the social movement landscape is fundamentally a competitive one with limited resources, and competitive actors all vying for these resources, and while they do acknowledge that organisations within social movements may share many goals, they are essentially competing for both resources and members. While previous theories focussed in a large part on individuals as the main unit of study in the movements (for example theories of collective behaviour, and relative deprivation theory), Resource Mobilisation Theory focuses on organisations. McCarthy & Zald (1987: 16) summarise their theory in the words:

> ...the resource mobilisation approach emphasizes both societal support and constraint of social movement phenomena. It examines the variety of resources that must be mobilised, the linkages of social

> movements to other groups, the dependence of groups upon external support for success, and the tactics used by authorities to control or incorporate movements (McCarthy & Zald, 1987: 16)

Resource mobilisation theory emphasises the role of issue entrepreneurs who may even go as far as creating issues. From this perspective, people are viewed as rational agents, who undertake a cost-benefit analysis of partaking in social movement activity. The particularly economic approach of this theory is evident in their conceptualisation of social movement sectors, social movement industries and social movement organisations. In the case of South Africa, it may be argued that the anti-apartheid struggle played a significant role in shaping the social movement landscape. It may then emerge that participants in contemporary social movements in South Africa learnt during apartheid how valuable protest and mass mobilisation were, and participants have evaluated the benefits of participation in social movements (and the potential danger of that participation) in terms of the benefits outweighing the costs. Interest entrepreneurs may also appear in the form of left intellectuals and activists, as well as political entrepreneurs who pursue movement participation with careerist goals in mind. These participants are people who lead and guide many movements despite their not being direct stakeholders in the movements themselves, that is, they are not representative of the movements constituents. In South Africa, supporters can also be considered a resource much in themselves, and a common phenomenon has been observed whereby the masses are often rallied only when mass support is needed, but not included in the more intricate organisational proceedings or ideological struggles of the movements rendering the movements exclusive and sometime elitest. This would be an element of social movements where internal democracy is not necessarily practiced. The resource mobilisation theory is useful in analysing internal democracy as it acknowledges phenomena such as careerist leaders and exclusion which are detrimental to internal democracy. It is also useful as it acknowledges that the social movement landscape is a competitive one with movements competing for resources and participants. This is a very useful lens through which to examine the splits and collaborations between movements, notably for this study, that of the SECC and the Soweto Concerned Residents (SCR).

Resource Mobilisation theory is also one of the only theories which does not focus on the *emergence* of social movements, and the organisations which comprise these movements,

but also on the organisations during their lifetimes. Their analysis of cycles in movements, start with a criticism of the Weber-Michels model, which views social movements organisations in the following terms:

> [Social movement organisations] attain an economic and social base in the society, as the original charismatic leadership is replaced, a bureaucratic structure emerges and a general accommodation to the society occurs. The participants in this structure have a stake in preserving the organisation, regardless of its ability to attain goals (Zald & Garner: 1987: 121)

Three processes are at work in this analysis, firstly goal transformation, secondly, organisational maintenance and finally, oligarchisation. It is proposed by this model that organisations exhibit tendencies towards conservatism, bureaucratisation and institutionalisation as they mature. However resource mobilisation theory insists that organisations do not *necessarily* exhibit these tendencies, and while it is possible that they may, there are far more complex processes at play. Resource mobilisation theory views the social movement environment in terms of loosely related organisations pursuing common and explicit goals. They have to adapt to both internal and external pressures, and therefore goal transformation is necessary. Referring to goals, leadership, sentiments of the public and the success and failure of organisations in terms of structure and environment, a far more complete understanding of social movement organisations is gained than from the Weber-Michels model, which focuses on the relationship between goals and structure (Zald & Garner, 1987: 138-139). This perspective views organisations within movements as adaptable entities, which respond to their external environment as well as internal pressures in order to ensure their livelihood. This theory however does not explicitly deal with the issue of internal democracy in any detail. While it must be acknowledged that it is not the intention of the theory to explicitly discuss internal democracy, the issue of internal democracy and the internal functioning of organisations would certainly be relevant to resource mobilisation theory in terms of how support is garnered and how the various participants in movements interact with each other.

Secondly, there is the Political Opportunity school of thought which interprets social movements being born out of particular contexts and events. This approach identifies the particular political context of the countries under study, and the constraints and opportunities afforded by those contexts, as the major influencing factor in the emergence

and success of social movements. Movements emerge when there is a perceived opening for the possibility of collective action, which in turn, the state responds to once again reformulating the opportunity structure within it in which agents of social change operate. When states are perceived as vulnerable, weak or failing, opportunity arises for interest groups to stake their claims and mobilize around certain issues, or as Tarrow has stated that:

> ...changes in political opportunity affected the likelihood that mass mobilisation would be repressed or might succeed and this affected people's collective judgement about whether to protest or not (Tarrow, 1996: 53).

Tarrow (1996: 54) defines political opportunity structure as "consistent- but not necessarily formal, permanent, or national - signals to social or political actors which either encourage or discourage them to use their internal resources to form social movements", defining the signals as the "opening of up of political access" (54) which refers to rational members of society recognising windows of opportunity for collective action, "unstable alignments" (55) which refers to electoral instability typically found in liberal democracies, "influential allies" (55-56) who may be an individual or groups who aid in pursuing the interests of the movement, and "dividing elites" (56) which operates in two ways, firstly reducing the power of the elite, and secondly presenting the opportunity for the elite to become allies (Tarrow, 1996: 54-56). Political Opportunity Structure is useful for explaining the emergence of social movements. However it reduces social movements during their lifetimes to reactive and responsive phenomena that merely respond to changes in the political cycle. While this theory explains social movements in a broader context and on a macro level, it fails to deal with the micro level, and the great variety of actors included in social movements. Political Opportunity Structure has little use in a study of internal democracy as it focuses more broadly on social movements within the political process, as opposed to focussing on individual players in movements, such as organisations. Unless one examines the manner in which external factors influence the formation of the organisation and the effects of this on internal democracy, it can only really be used to understand the emergence of movements and periodical responses to changes in the political process.

Ballard *et al* (2006) have highlighted two other important areas of theory, in particular, theories examining the transnational character of new social movements, specifically those

that are anti-neo-liberal, and secondly, theory (specifically that of McAdam, Tarrow and Tilly (2001: 8) which:

> ...seeks to move the focus of inquiry from one of understanding political opportunities and threats, mobilising structures and framing processes to a framework within which greater emphasis is placed upon the very mechanisms and processes that bring about contentious action by connecting these factors (Ballard *et al*, 2006: 8).

It is also possible to incorporate and synthesise resource mobilisation and political opportunity structure theories, and use both in order to get a more comprehensive understanding of social movements. Political opportunity structure is useful in analysing their emergence, and the manner in which they respond to the political system in which they are embedded, while resource mobilisation in particularly useful for understanding social movements on micro level, and particularly when focussing on social movement organisations as the unit of study.

It is noteworthy that these theories primarily attempt to explain the emergence of social movements (with the exception of resource mobilisation theory), and while they do tend to acknowledge the changing nature and organisation of movements as they grow, develop and decline, it seems that more attention could be paid to movements during their life spans. Examination of movements during their life spans typically takes the form of case studies, examining particular factors which were influential in shaping the form of the movement, as well as the particular path it took. Often, these theories follow a line of enquiry similar to that of political opportunity structure theory, examining the role of opportunity and the influence of the wider political environment on the movement. However these theories are by and large formulated around the study of social movements in the Global North, and the applicability of these theories to context of South Africa, and other Southern nations is questioned. What is necessary is the development of theories explaining the emergence of social movements in the Global South taking into account the very difference and particular contexts. However, elements of these theories can be used to explain certain phenomena in social movements in the South.

Social movements and democracy

Social movements are an established and often celebrated part of democratic society and it is important to analyse the relationship between social movements and democracy as contemporary understandings of democracy call for a plurality of powers outside of the state articulating demands on the state. With regards to internal democracy, social movements often emerge as a critique of the state, either in terms of a particular issue or policy, or in terms of its structure and operation which effectively marginalises citizens from participation in the decisions which affect them. From this perspective, internal democracy in social movements is important as they represent a critique of the state and make a normative prescription on how the state *should* be structured or "social movements do not limit themselves to developing special channels of democracy for themselves but ... more or less explicitly, they expound a fundamental critique of conventional politics, thus shifting their endeavours from politics itself to metapolitics" (Della Porta & Diani, 2006: 239). Social movements can be conceptualised either as a part of civil society or as operating in a 'third sphere'[viii]. Radical arguments typically focus on the importance of a more participatory form of democracy extending beyond voting, with internal democracy as an inherent feature. Liberal democracy tends to reduce much of the political participation of the vast majority of citizens to periodic voting and "when, for most people, participation in democracy is principally reduced to voting, elite interests will be systemically privileged in the name of the people as a whole" (Pithouse, 2010). One radical argument posits that with the failure of liberal states to secure democracy, new social movements have assumed the responsibility for democracy themselves (Wainwright, 2003: 2-4). Representative democracy, from this perspective, is considered a "weak" form of democracy, which provides little protection from the overbearing power and reach of state and the private sector. Another radical argument views liberal democracy as a "thin" form of democracy and rather proposes a more participatory form of democracy associated with "a civic culture nearer to the themes of participation, citizenship and political activity" (Barber, 1984: 25). Barber's alternative and the framework (Barber, 1984: 261-307) which he insists must be wholeheartedly adopted can be criticised for three reasons. Firstly, he views implementation of his version of stronger democracy as occurring within the framework of the state. This assumes a state that wishes to increase participation, and also ignores instances, such as the case in South

Africa, where organisations are essentially trying to bypass a state that has failed them. Secondly, the framework he suggests assumes a certain degree of technology which is simply not available to all segments of all populations. Finally, and linked to the first criticism, Barber ignores many alternate sites for participation which stand distinctly outside of the state, such as social movements.

The liberal perspective views new social movements as an additional space for those participants who wish to assume a more active role in politics, and use movements as an area of contestation, which may be used to secure civil and political rights. In the context of many newly democratic countries, social movements have become the main avenue by which to challenge unresponsive states which are failing to fulfil their mandates – this is particularly relevant in the case of nations in the global South, and no less relevant to the case of South Africa. The representative nature of liberal democracy is also challenged in itself by many movements for reducing the opportunities for political participation and engagement, and also for marginalising large portions of the population from participation. As a critique of the state, social movement organisations seek not to replicate the exact inequalities they emerged in opposition to and should therefore be democratically organised.

Social movements are by and large viewed as contributing to and promoting democracy through "the broadening of citizens rights and the public accountability of ruling elites" (Della Porta & Diani, 2006: 245). Emphasizing participation over representation, they tend to support a more direct form of democracy, with increased opportunities for participation, "in the social movement conception of democracy the people themselves (who are naturally interested in politics) must assume direct responsibility for intervening in the decision-making process" (Della Porta & Diani, 2006: 240). Offering the possibility for grassroots control of decision-making apparatus, an arena for active deliberation and opportunities for participation in the context of equality, inclusiveness and transparency, new social movement theory espouses a more direct approach to politics typically associated with the radical left.

North/South

Another problem with much of the discourse surrounding social movement organisations in South Africa is the manner in which theory emanating from the Global North which comprises "the bulk of writing and theorizing on this field" (Thompson & Tapscott, 2010: 1) is uncritically applied to the case of South Africa, ignoring many of the differences between the consolidated democracies of the North and the new and semi-democracies of the South. Often political opportunity structure and resource mobilisation theory which were formulated in contexts vastly different to those in the South are uncritically applied to particular cases and studies in the South. This has significant implications for internal democracy as interpersonal interactions, understandings of democracy and political culture differ between contexts in ways that inform the understanding and practice of internal organisational democracy. Furthermore, both theories were formulated around the so-called new social movements dating back to the 1960s and developed in retrospect to the phenomena observed over generations, whilst many of the 'new social movements' to which they are applied in the global South are relatively younger. Admittedly, this *might* simply mean that they are at different points in their organisational development and that northern theory can predict their future, or be of use in avoiding the same mistakes.

It is also suggested that the point of departure for explaining the emergence of new social movements in the South is significantly different to that of the North. There appears to be consensus between the theorists who do acknowledge the North-South differences that it is the very inequalities that define the differences between the North and the South in the world order which play a fundamental role in forming the "relations of power and patterns of inequality within Southern States" (Thompson & Tapscott, 2010: 2). The economic inequalities and dependencies do not feature in the Northern based analyses "simply because they have not been of any significance in understanding why and how social mobilisation takes place in post-industrial societies" (Thompson & Tapscott, 2010: 2).

However, there is a growing body of discourse emanating from theorists in the South, grounded in the experiences of those in the South examining the emergence of oppositional movements and the contexts in which they operate, including factors which have influenced their emergence and the trajectories which they have followed. Notable here is the

collection of chapters edited by Thompson & Tapscott (2010) which deals particularly with the issue of social movements in the Global South. There is debate over the usefulness of terms such as the 'North' and the 'South' however as noted by Bello (2004: 56) "[as] far as 'North' and 'South' are concerned, the distinction between the super-industrialised, advanced countries, and the rest of the world – or between the centre of the global capitalist economy and the periphery – is clearly valid", furthermore noting that "at the same time, unequal relations of the North-South type are reproduced within the North itself, while there are Third World elites in the South whose economic interests and lifestyles are closely integrated into the North". South Africa is a country of contradictions with inequality as one of the fundamental features of its political economy. It exhibits countless examples of 'First world' experiences occurring side by side with 'Third world' ones. These varied and often paradoxical experiences inform the emergence and content of many social movements in South Africa, in terms of their aims, what they are opposing and what they seek to change.

There are a number of studies containing interesting theory on civil society in the South and the existence of a 'third' sphere, outside of the state and civil society, the traditional political spheres. A notable author emanating from the South and writing on the South is Partha Chatterjee who wrote *Politics of the Governed* (2004). While focussing more on civil society than social movement organisations, the findings of Chatterjee's theory are certainly relevant to an examination of organisations in South Africa which operate on the margins of the political landscape. In Chatterjee's study of civil society in the South entitled *Politics of the Governed* civil society in India is described as "the closed association of modern elite groups, sequestered from the wider life of communities, walled up within enclaves of civic freedom and rational law" (Chatterjee, 2004: 4). He proposes that alongside civil society, there exists a non-elitist political society in which populations and governments interact. Political society is related to the state in terms of the state's responsibility to provide welfare to vulnerable population groups. In political society a series of often illegal actions occurs, by population groups who claim rights to welfare. Whether these demands are met, depends largely on the pressure these groups succeed in making on the state (Greenstein, 2003: 9). The sort of political action and claims staking described by Chatterjee bears many similarities to the movements that have emerged in South Africa in response to state failure

to provide services to vulnerable population groups. For example, the SECC undertakes illegal actions, such as reconnections, based on claims to the right to basic living commodities. They also interact directly with the state and often undertake the state ordained 'legal' routes of making claims, such as trying to communicate with their ward councillor, writing open letters to Eskom and challenging the constitutionality of policy. The scope for interaction in civil society as acknowledged and legitimated by the state is limited to an enclave of elites.. However another realm where a different form of participation occurs is also evident. This is often referred to as "poor movements" (Desai, 2002), and it is suggested that it is in these movements that "active citizenship" (Neocosmos, 2009: 276) can be experienced.

Whether the realm of political society is as non-elitist as claimed is subject to debate, and it is here where the issue of internal democracy is of importance. The organisations that comprise the political society may not be as legitimate as they claim to be should they prove to be as elitist or unrepresentative as civil society. It is also suggested by Chatterjee that it is only in civil society that true and real citizenship is experienced. The implication of this argument is that only those located in civil society experience full citizenship, while those operating in political society do not experience life as full rights-bearing citizens. "Most of the inhabitants of India are only tenuously, and even contextually, rights-bearing citizens in the sense imagined by the constitution. They are not, therefore, proper members of civil society and are not regarded as such by members of the state" (Chatterjee, 2004: 38). It is also argued by Cornwell & Coelho (2007: 1-2) that the arena in which social movements operate is part of neither the state nor of civil society but rather constitutes a third sphere, what they term the "participatory sphere" (Cornwell & Coelho, 2007: 1). It is furthermore subject to debate whether this participatory sphere is really as participatory as proposed for the masses, or whether it is only participatory for a small group of committed activists. The institutions of this 'third sphere' are furthermore designated as:

> [having] a semi-autonomous existence, outside and apart from the institutions of formal politics, bureaucracy and everyday associational life, although they are often threaded through with preoccupations and positions formed in them" (Cornwell & Coelho: 2007: 2).

Many of the social movements of 'the poor' in South Africa do occur outside of the legitimate institutions of the state, as much of their action is considered illegal, and also in

terms of their not falling in to the state's conception of what constitutes civil society. Specifically, in line with Neocosmos' argument, the conception of civil society as ordained by neo-liberal thought, only applies to those participants whose presence is ordained and legitimised by the state. However, the new social movements in South Africa do also engage in legal practices, and as such, they appear to straddle civil and political society, but with much of their activity occurring in the realm of political society.

The civil society/ political society distinction drawn by Chatterjee is overlaid in South Africa (and presumably other ex-colonial states) by the divide, described by Mamdani (1996), between urban 'citizens' and rural 'subjects'. This divide tracks the distinction, central to white rule, between participants in the realm of political and legal rights (mainly whites but with urbanised blacks, coloureds and Indians knocking on the door) and those subject in agrarian reserves to indirect rule via traditional chiefs.

Whether marginalised within urban space or from it, a large portion of South Africa's population does not have access to the most basic rights as outlined by the constitution. This has led to the emergence of rights-based advocacy groups, staking claims on a state that largely ignores their plight. Neocosmos (2009: 276) is however also critical of the idea of a rights-based politics and states that "citizenship, from an emancipatory perspective is not about subjects bearing rights conferred by the state..." but rather that citizenship is realised through active participation in politics, not necessarily politics of engagement with the state, but more that of activists and militants. With the ideological shift from the socio-democratic RDP economic strategy to the neo-liberal GEAR, a variety of groups contesting the new ideological orientation of the government emerged. When considering the marginal participation of large groups of the population in politics in South Africa, it seems important that the participation which is apparent occurs in a meaningful way and does not merely perpetuate the very inequalities which keep this particular stratum of people on the margins of political society.

The elitist nature of civil society is certainly relevant to studies of both India and South Africa, and civil society in South Africa is certainly not equally open to all citizens. Whether all citizens in South Africa have access to civil society as conceptualised by Chatterjee is certainly a question worth asking, which would call into serious question the legitimacy of

the state and conceptions of citizenship in the new South Africa. It is also worth noting the North-South difference may be salient in this discussion, as the 'enclaves of elites' who have access to civil society is probably more inclusive (but not wholly so) in established liberal democracies, typically found in the Global North. This study shall be premised on the idea that the 'new' social movements that have recently emerged in South Africa operate in both civil society and political society. Their action in civil society occurs through the legal institutional means, such as legal protests, engagement with the state through court cases *et cetera*, but these occur alongside activities outside of civil society, such as illegal reconnections, boycotts, marches on prominent politician's houses et cetera. The new social movements have acknowledged the value of both legal and illegal forms of action and they employ each as the need arises.

Many accounts of social movements in the South only acknowledge the existence of survivalist social movements. However, South Africa is a nation marred by inequality with some people experiencing life in a first world state and others living from hand to mouth merely trying to survive. It comes as no surprise then that in South Africa there is a coexistence of Touraine's 'post materialist' social movements and the survivalist movements which exist in or outside the margins of civil society as described by Chatterjee, Coelho and others. Evidence of the 'new' social movements described in much of the literature, such as green movements and LBGTI movements, indicate that post-materialist organisations are a significant part of the social movement landscape in South Africa. However, alongside these organisations, there also exist a plethora of 'survivalist' organisations whose central concern is to secure the basic amenities necessary for survival, as promised by the government at liberation. It must also be acknowledged that some of these organisations, whose initial goals were the securing of basic services, have experienced extensive goal transformation. While securing the basic services necessary for survival is still considered a goal of the movements, there has been a distinct move towards the radicalisation and intellectualisation of movements. This manifests in movements making claims about for example direct democracy and giving a voice to those who have been silenced as goals and aims, which signals a significant shift from the earlier rhetoric which centred around basic goods and services[ix]. Furthermore, there is evidence of collaboration between the 'post materialist' movements and the 'survivalist' ones. Often

these relationships are as shallow as 'borrowing bodies' for protests, but often they do extend deeper than mere solidarity and enduring collaborations are established. This is later discussed in terms of the relationship between Earthlife Africa and the SECC.

It is necessary to acknowledge that the survivalist movements in South Africa have something in common - and connections - with the antiglobalisation/anticapitalism movement which is at least in part a northern movement. Indeed the shift to new forms of poor people's struggle in South Africa post-2000 is in part inspired by and shadows the post-Seattle movement globally. The North/South distinction is thus not clear cut in this respect - the focus on material issues may challenge the post materialist thesis in both north and south. The new materialist movements may nevertheless differ from the old: new materialist movements may disproportionately mobilise the socially marginal (unemployed, students, informal sector workers) rather than the organised workers who formed the basis of the left's older social movements. They might thus be based less in the working class, or in a definable class as such, than in those outside the economic and class structure.

There are a number of other factors that need to be acknowledged when discussing the disjuncture between Northern theory on social movements and the reality of Southern contexts. A range of disproportionately southern phenomena may have a bearing on political and organisational relationships in the south: these include traditional communitarianism, patrimonialism and clientelism. Foweraker (1995) is critical of the application of traditional social movement theory to social movements in Latin America, which he claims have a unique history, which has largely influenced the formation of society in Latin America, as well as the state-society relations, stating that:

> ...both European and North American theory tend to assume the presence of dense, articulate and communicative civil society (as well as the dissemination of liberal values within this society), just as they tend to assume liberal democratic regimes... But neither the liberal regime, nor the civil society can be taken for granted in the Latin American context... (Foweraker, 1995: 6).

This is certainly the case in Africa, where democracy is sparse and where communitarian values which may not be entirely compatible with liberal values dominate, with great implications for internal democracy. Social movements in South Africa are also unique in that the history out of which they come differs vastly from those in Northern contexts. The

influence which the anti-apartheid struggle has had on social movements in South Africa, in terms of repertoires of action, as well as framing processes cannot be denied, and much of the struggle rhetoric lingers on in the contemporary movements. It is also not uncommon to draw parallels between apartheid and the present situation faced by the poor majority who feel a sense of exclusion similar to that experienced during apartheid. Mohanty (1998), also critical of the Western bias in theory on civil society, proposes that the liberal individualist notions located in Western liberalism are not concurrent with the realities of associational activity and specifically civil society in non-First World, non-Western contexts. Considering the communitarian values which define many African cultures, this is an interesting consideration which warrants further explanation and analysis[x].

When undertaking a study of an African context, it is imperative to acknowledge the colonial history of the country and the effects this has had on the form politics and society has taken, and especially the unique form democracy on the continent has taken, none of which Northern countries have experienced. While there exists a body of theory (Parekh, 1994) pertaining specifically to the incompatibility of liberal democracy and the communitarian values inherent in much African culture, this is largely applied to effects on the state. It is argued that African citizens do not operate in societies defined by the same level of individuation and disconnection from the communities in which they live (bearing in mind that freedom of the individual is one of the most cherished values of liberalism), but rather the communitarian values inherent in Africa culture renders them inextricable from the community from which they come (Chabal & Daloz, 1998), or put another way, ties of kinship and ethnicity define associational activity in a manner that differs vastly from the individualist based notion of civil society (Lewis, 2002: 579-580). This is used to explain the nepotism and patrimonialism which define African politics to such a great extent. I believe the same principles may be applied to social movements, especially when considering the distributive role many play. Robins suggests that South Africa's polity and society is:

> ...not characterised by primordial ties of tradition and communal solidarity, but neither does it comprise atomised lone citizens of the variety that are deemed to inhabit modern Western democracies. Instead, South Africa is a modern state with a constitutional democracy that promotes liberal individualist notions of the rights bearing citizen while also accommodating and protecting traditional leadership and African communitarian values (Robins, 2008: 81).

Citizens in South Africa, according to Robins (2008), have acknowledged the necessity of embedding themselves in networks of patronage and clientelism in order to secure resources, contrasting the manner in which individuals operate as "lone citizens" in established Western Democracies. This view casts citizens in African countries not as primordially tied members of communities, but rather as rational individuals who acknowledge the benefit of manipulating primordial ties, and the associated networks to further their own interests. In a discussion of how the various segments of social movement organisations operate in the South African context, it cannot be ignored that patrimonial and clientelist tendencies prevail in many cases, especially in the context of NGO-led development. This has a great effect on internal democracy, as nepotism is nowhere considered a positive democratic value, but rather a huge impediment to democracy. A certain degree of nepotism has been pointed to between well resourced organisations and the affiliated organisations which depend on them (discussed later).

Another difference which has emerged between Northern and Southern based theories on social movements is the class-based nature of movements. Theories rooted in Northern thinking typically view new social movements as distinctly non-class based, often citing the "new" in "new social movements" as pertaining to the move from class-based struggles to struggles which typically form around other "post-materialist" issues. However, in studying the literature on social movements in the Global South, it becomes quite clear that the issue of class cannot be divorced from theory on social movements in the South (Mohanty, 1998: 9-10), and many nations in the South are defined by high degrees of social inequality. South Africa has one of the highest Gini coefficients in the world, and is distinctly organised following class lines, which has many implications for citizenship, and participation in civil society. Foweraker (1995: 40-45) in contrast discusses the arguments surrounding the "newness" of new social movements, concluding that both new and old social movements in both the North and the South have a class-based aspect to their constitution. In terms of the class-based aspect for the purposes of this particular study, it cannot be ignored that the anti-neoliberal movement in South Africa is typically thought to be supported by the poor population and it certainly seems that the main constituents of this movement are the poor and the working class. This contrasts with the view shared by many that new social movements draw the majority of their supporters from the middle classes (Foweraker,

1995: 44-45), and also contrasts Chatterjee's proposition that in general only a middle class elite has meaningful access to civil society, in the form of those who constitute the leadership of a movement (as shall be discussed below). However, in South Africa the middle class is often represented in the leadership of organisations while not necessarily being representative of the constituencies the organisations claim to represent. What remains largely unexamined is the manner in which the poor population, what may be referred to as the constituency of the movement, interacts with leadership in the movement, and the type of participation they experience. Who compromises the various segments of social movements, such as leaders, activists, supporters and sympathisers shall be examined, as well as the relationship between these segments.

III. The South African Context

Four elements of the context in which the new social movements in South Africa arose warrant a mention. Firstly, the spatial hangover of apartheid's ethnoterritorial project which divided population groups spatially, whose divisions are still evident countrywide today. During apartheid the spatial divisions between racial groups were afforded highly different treatment in terms of goods and services provided, with the white population being highly privileged. Secondly, the economic policies of the ANC government which led to the emergence of a variety of movements are defined as being anti-neoliberal. Third, the culture of protest that was established and learned during the anti-apartheid struggle is discussed as well as the value of participation in grassroots struggles. Finally, the failure of local government reforms to extend political participation to the grassroots in an inclusive manner, and the perceived service delivery failure of the state in providing basic services to everyone.

Geographic

One of the main effects of apartheid which lingers today is the separation of population groups along racial lines. Apartheid was based on a system of separate development which manifested in geographic separation of racial groups and to a certain extent ethnic groups. The Native Land Act and the Group Areas Act sought to prevent the non-white population from owning land outside designated reserves and from living in the same areas as the white population, respectively. What resulted was the establishment of peri-urban areas of non-white settlement, close to but not actually in, urban hubs in South Africa. These spatial divisions which linger on today "reinforce existing structures of privilege and make it difficult to create a just, democratic, and egalitarian society" (Tomlinson *et al*, 2003: 1). Initially there was a conscious effort to curb the urbanisation of the black population, but ultimately it became evident that the process was irreversible and unstoppable. However, there was a high degree of control of movement of the black population which was epitomised by the pass laws. The establishment of townships forged a unique pattern of racially segregated settlement which remains largely unchanged today and "there seems to be more continuity than *caesura* between apartheid and democratic-era urban planning and policy" (Bohmke, 2010b).

The townships which developed around (and eventually in) cities all over South Africa still bear the mark of apartheid lines of privilege. Access to basic services such as water and electricity are still very much restricted in the townships. The state has made progress in improving basic services in the townships but the perception, by participants in social movements, is that the state has not made sufficient effort and has failed to fulfil the promises made in 1994 and at every elections since then. In response to this perceived failure, many of the social movements emerged to demand that the promises of basic goods and services be fulfilled. The differences between the more privileged areas (traditionally the white areas) and the less privileged areas (traditionally the black areas) also informs many of the organisations rhetoric. Furthermore, the spatial concentration of a mass of disgruntled individuals who share many discontents facilitates the development of organisations and protest.

The rise of Anti-Neoliberalism

It is necessary to contextualise the rise of the 'social movements of the poor' in contemporary South Africa in terms of the socioeconomic context in which they developed. Following democratisation 'a better life for all' was promised by the ANC and its first socio-economic program the Reconstruction and Development Program reflected the programme of growth and development. Etzo (2010:564) suggests that South Africa's transition to democracy was the first African liberation to take place in the context of globalisation and "in a world dominated by neoliberal ideology" however this view is debatable. What is important is that the disjuncture between what was arguably the internationally dominant ideology at the time of the transition and the socialist and social democratic ideologies advocated by the ANC helps to explain conflicts that arose in the late 1990's and influenced the formation of the anti-neoliberal movements in South Africa.

The anti neoliberal movement that emerged in South Africa was a response to the "deviation from the new government's mandate" (Bond, 2000: 3). This "deviation" refers to the move from the social democratic mandate of the Reconstruction and Development Program (RDP), which sought redistribution and development as primary goals, to the neoliberal framework embodied by the Growth, Employment and Redistribution (Gear) program. The RDP sought substantive restructuring of the economy with a focus on "growth

through redistribution" while GEAR is defined by neoliberal goals and processes, with a commitment to a clearly free-market capitalist agenda.

The RDP differed from GEAR in two ways which are particularly relevant for the purpose of this study. Firstly and most obviously, in terms of the framework each approach embodies, and secondly and perhaps less obviously, in terms of their formulation. In terms of the latter, the RDP is described as "product of consultation, debate and reflection on what we need and what is possible" (RDP policy document, 1994), which incorporated consultation from "the ANC, its Alliance partners and other mass organisations in the wider civil society" (RDP policy document, 1994). Implicit in the process of the formulation of this document was the establishment of a direct link between stakeholders, decision makers and implementers of the policy. The broad consultation between representatives from all sectors was aligned with the inclusive and celebratory mood of the immediate post-apartheid moment in South Africa. This is illustrated by the constant reference to broad inclusion of stakeholders. Constant allusions are made to the inclusiveness of the process and the language is that of participatory development, for example "With this document we will now consult very widely to ensure that all considered views are available to the policy making process. We are encouraging local communities to begin developing their own priorities" (RDP policy document, 1994), and "those organisations within civil society that participated in the development of the RDP will be encouraged by an ANC government to be active in and responsible for the effective implementation of the RDP" (RDP policy document, 1994). In terms of the socioeconomic framework which the RDP espoused, as the name suggests it sought to reconstruct the economy in order to be more inclusive, and redistribute resources more equitably. The RDP policy document describes itself as being "people-driven" and as the primary objective being "to begin to meet the basic needs of people - jobs, land, housing, water, electricity, telecommunications, transport, a clean and healthy environment, nutrition, health care and social welfare" (RDP policy document, 1994). Without going into too much detail, the RDP identified the provision of basic services for all as its primary goal. Echoes of this unfulfilled promise still permeate social movement rhetoric today, for example in the SECC's slogan of "free basic services for all". The RDP also served a significant symbolic function, outlining and exemplifying the ideological orientation of the new government. Chipkin (2007:154) views the RDP as being "conceived as a non-

revolutionary path to socialism" indicative of the fact that the RDP was placed well on the Left of the political spectrum.

In contrast with the inclusive and participatory formulation of the RDP, Gear was formulated behind closed doors by an exclusive group of 15 economists excluding even high ranking leaders in the ANC (Williams & Taylor, 2000: 32). Furthermore, the policies proposed by Gear were distinctly and explicitly more neoliberal in character and represented a distinct ideological shift from Left to Centre Right, or as Terreblanche puts it:

> While the ANC in 1990 took a position on the economic ideological spectrum well to the left of centre, its present position can be described as centre-right. In ideological terms the ANC walked quite a long distance from the RDP to GEAR (Terreblanche, 1999: 86).

This "ideological quantum leap" (Terreblanche, 1999:89) has been variously explained as a reaction to the failure of the RDP, a behind the scenes ideological battle in which the Right prevailed or on the legacy of apartheid and the socioeconomic trends whose continuity in post-apartheid South Africa still shape the economic potential of the country. Despite references to the provision of basic services for all, GEAR's key document focuses far more on achieving "accelerated growth" (Gear Policy Document, 1996) to be achieved through a "competitive, outward-orientated economy" (Terreblanche, 1999: 86). This document and the ideology it represented were not a product of consultation, and didn't reflect the Left leaning orientation that the ANC brought into power. With what would later be termed 'trickle down growth', the policy sought to pursue a capitalist agenda which would then in some unmentioned time frame reach the masses. Broad based redistribution was not a key aim of the document and only vaguely referred to. Terreblanche sums the shift from the RDP to GEAR up in the following terms:

> "Perhaps the most important difference between the RDP and GEAR was that, while the former expected the state to conduct a people-orientated developmental policy, the latter saw South Africa's economic 'salvation' in a high economy growth rate that would result from a sharp increase in private capital accumulation in an unbridled capitalistic system" (Terreblanche, 1999: 86).

Broadly falling under the framework of an international Anti-Globalisation movement or Global Justice Movement (see Kingsnorth, 2004; Taylor, 2004; Cock, 2004), an anti-neoliberal movement has emerged in South Africa, in the context of poverty, rising

unemployment, and rising inequality as well as the perceived failure of the state in terms of service delivery. It is suggested that:

> a crucial impetus for social movements in South Africa that provided coherence to activists and social movements was the emergence of the so-called anti-globalisation movement, first in Seattle in 1999, and later in other cities in North America and Europe. Activist circles across the world, including those in South Africa that were feeling rather rudderless, were buoyed by these events and found them convenient as reference points in the anti-globalisation struggle (Buhlungu, 2006: 70).

These movements are also referred to as 'poor movements' (Desai, 2002) both from within the movements, and by commentators outside of the movements. With approximately half the population living in poverty, and with many of the promises of basic service delivery from the government going unfulfilled, the movement has identified the neo-liberal nature of the government's economic strategy as the main culprit of the severity of their current situations (Naidoo & Veriava, date unknown: 15-19). It must be noted that the movement in South Africa occurs in a global context where many nations at similar levels of development, and those who are considered to be more developed than South Africa are also experiencing anti-neoliberal movements which fall under the broader banner of the social justice movement. While the role played by the global context shall not be examined here, it is worthy to note that inspiration has been drawn from international occurrences such as Seattle 1999, and other successful anti-neoliberal campaigns. It must also be noted that movements in South Africa are integrated into the networks which operate in the international movement, drawing on resources, experience and support from the global movement to varying degrees at various times. While the intellectual leadership of various anti-neoliberal organisations do interact with the global players, and are embedded in an international network of movements and organisations, the grassroots level or the direct stakeholders, appear to be largely excluded from the global level of the operations of their organisation. Concerned far more with the actual "bread and butter" issues, the grassroots in South Africa, appear to by and large operate more on a local level and on more of an immediate needs-based basis and do not engage in activities which are transnational in nature. This contrasts with the intellectual elite who appear to be fighting an ongoing ideological battle. The division between elite left intellectuals and the grassroots leaders and members of organisations is a contentious issue, and the role of left intellectual activists

has been subject to criticism as already noted (see Siwisa, 2008). The dynamics of this are discussed at a later stage in the paper.

Continuity

The civic organisations which developed in the townships across South Africa played a fundamental role in anti-apartheid struggle and in the establishment of local government structures. Whether continuity exists between these movements and the social movement organisations which now dominate local politics in townships is subject to much debate. Numerous accounts of these continuities exist, with many theorists focussing on the civic associations which developed in the townships, and were a formidable force of resistance against the apartheid regime (see Adler & Steenberg, 2000, Heller 2003). Many fell under the affiliation of the UDF, but others remained independent based on ideological differences. However most important to note is a culture of organisation, resistance and mobilisation was bred under the oppressive apartheid regime. While there are certain authors who deny the continuity of associational activity, there are many authors (Bond, 2004; Zeurn, 2001) who vehemently propose that there has in fact been great continuity of associational activity in the post-apartheid social movements which has emerged. It seems self-evident that a certain amount of continuity must exist between the old and the new forms of civic association as a culture of resistance and mobilisation had been created and learnt during the anti-apartheid struggle. The civics played an invaluable role in the establishment of an inclusive local government. Some go so far as to suggest that "without the civics, the local negotiations would have proceeded very differently, if at all" (Tomlinson *et* al, 2003: 8). At least arguably, people learnt the value of protest, and how to mobilize, during the anti-apartheid struggle. The successes achieved by the civic movements during the anti-apartheid struggle was also an indication of how valuable a form of resistance, mass mobilisation, was to people who have relatively very little, but who have been promised much. Many similarities are shared between movements in the old regime and those in the new. Ironically the call to a state of 'ungovernability' by the ANC in the rent boycotts of the 1980's shares uncanny similarities to the unlawful behaviour evident in the water and electricity reconnections (Naidoo & Veriava, date unknown: 15-19) occurring in townships as a form of protest against cost-recovery and expensive basic services in the post-apartheid era. Furthermore, the issues around which the civics organised bear many similarities to

many of the social movement organisations which now exist in Soweto and other townships all over South Africa. In the case of both the civics and the new social movement organisations, many survivalist issues around housing and basic services were pursued. In the same way that the civics emerged as a "revolt against the illegitimacy of Black Local Authorities" (Heller, 2003: 157), the social movements organisations have developed in response to what are perceived as corrupt and incompetent local government structures. Unresponsive and unaccountable ward councillors are often bypassed by social movement organisation when issues arise and there is a distinct lack of faith in ward councillors to have the ability or desire to help residents in their wards.

Following democratisation, many of the civic organisations joined together to form the South African National Civic Organisation (SANCO). However, the role SANCO was to play in the new South Africa[xi] proved to be a very contentious issue. Generally, in the post-apartheid moment, it was agreed that SANCO would play a watchdog role on the state, while being an implementer of development policy on a local level. However, alignment with the ANC, co-option of much of its leadership into government and centralising tendencies have led to the marginalisation, decline and demobilisation of the organisation, with many members of civil society choosing organisations that are not aligned with SANCO over those that are. SANCO's relevance and strength have been questioned time and again, and there has been a plethora of organisations pursuing similar goals to those of SANCO but which refuse to fall under the banner of SANCO (Seekings, 1997; Zeurn, 2004). Critics of SANCO have argued that "as a national organisation, [it] has become so hierarchical and bureaucratised that internal democracy has become a sham and branches have lost their autonomy" (Heller, 2003: 160).

Heller (2003: 157-158) identifies two peaks in the history of civics, firstly during the mid 1980's when the civics peaked as a movement, and secondly in early 1990's when the civics peaked as a corporatist structure. During the second peak, the civics play an indispensable role in the formation of the Local Government Transition Act and in the establishment of the RDP (discussed above). Following this second peak, SANCO was increasingly coopted into government, contributing to the decline of its legitimacy. The relationship between SANCO and the new social movements in South Africa is highly contentious one, with some social

movement organisations denying any affiliation to SANCO, and some working with SANCO. What it important to note, is that the failure of local government coupled with the depoliticisation of the civics which played such a vital role in the governance of the townships during apartheid, has left a void in governance at the local level, one which has to a certain extent for many people living in townships been filled by new social movement organisations.

Local Government

During apartheid, those areas deemed non-white were effectively excluded from local government in the Republic of South Africa, although in 1962 the Group Areas Act (1950) was amended to make provisions for local government (albeit a very limited local government) in Indian and Coloured areas. As the black population were not considered citizens of South Africa, but rather mere "temporary sojourners" (Ndletyana & Muzondidya, 2009: 23-24), those areas that were inhabited by black populations, for example the peri-urban townships, were seriously neglected. In the late 1970's it became clear that the urbanisation of the black population was irreversible and influx control was ineffective leading to the establishment in 1982 of the Black Authorities Act. The Black Local Authorities however lacked resources and capacity and were by and large considered illegitimate and "a cynical ploy by the apartheid government to reform apartheid, instead of abolishing it" (Ndletyana & Muzondidya, 2009: 24). The black areas were excluded from the municipalities of the white areas and their revenue bases. The only revenue available to the BLA's was from rents and services, and these were insufficient for the running of the townships and were ultimately boycotted during the 1980s in a prolonged rent and services boycott in which 52 of the 84 local authorities in the Transvaal experienced boycotts (Tomlinson *et al*, 2003:9). In 1985 the Regional Services Councils were established which ultimately centralised rather than decentralised power.

The establishment of post-apartheid local government "has been an intricate and prolonged affair" (Piper & Nadvi, 2010: 216) extending from 1990-2000. Within the framework of representative democracy, local government is supposed to provide a space for 'participatory governance'. Participation is generally understood to include opportunities for participation in the political process beyond periodic voting. The value of participation is

rooted in the 'democratic dividends' gained from participation, such as political education (especially in the context of deliberative democracy). It is also considered "good for citizenship" (Piper & von Lieres, 2008) in that it "opens up new spaces for political agency in the pursuit of group or collective goods" (Piper & von Lieres, 2008).

Bariechievy (in Piper & Nadvi, 2010: 217) proposes that there are three aspects of participatory governance, namely "the redefinition of the municipality, requirements for public participation and ward committees" and local government rhetoric is still abundant with references to participation as a key theme[xii]. These state ordained participatory spaces are termed "invited spaces" (Cornwell, 2002), which are contrasted with the invented spaces forged by popular organisations and movements outside the state. The ward system is by and large judged to have been a failure as ward councillors are more accountable to the party than to the people.

The post-apartheid local government is viewed by many new social movements to be a failure in structural terms for not expanding scope for public participation and in more material terms in the failure of service delivery. Ward councillors are supposed to be at the very forefront of local democracy in South Africa. Acting as a representative of the community as well as being an intermediary between provincial and national government and the community, ward councillors are supposed to be close to the community and provide a voice for the community in institutions of local government. However, numerous studies (Benit-Gbaffou2007; Millstein, 2007, Piper & von Lieres, 2008) have illustrated how insufficient the ward system is in providing a platform for local voices while Benit-Gbaffou shows how ward councillors have little incentive to be accountable to their wards. Firstly because good standing with the party is far more likely to result in re-election, despite the fact that ward councillors are supposed to be non-partisan (this is a point also iterated by Millstein), and secondly because voting patterns in South Africa tend to be identity based as opposed to the result of cost-benefit analysis. Furthermore, Benit-Gbaffou proposes that ward councillors actually have very little power in the local government system. Piper & von Lieres, referring to the failure of public participation in local government, propose that "poor implementation, a lack of political will and the poor design of public participation institutions to date" have lead to the failure of the ward system.

IV. Case Studies

Soweto Electricity Crisis Committee

The SECC's origins are most often traced back to the protests against the Igoli 2002[xiii] plan which represented a manifestation of the seismic shift from the redistributive policies of the mid-1990s ANC to the neoliberal policies of the 2002 ANC and Wits 2001 at Wits. Wits 2001 was a restructuring progamme which sought to make Wits more financially viable and competitive in the tertiary education industry. It resulted in the retrenchment of 613 workers, and was surrounded by extensive protests by staff, academics and students. In 1997, the Johannesburg Metropolitan council experienced an acute budgetary crisis which was mainly the hangover of the unpaid debts of the rent and services boycotts in the townships during the final years of apartheid ultimately resulting in an economic reorienatation geared towards cost recovery and privatisation (Egan & Wafer, 2006: 47; Peyroux, 2006: 11). For Eskom, a large part of becoming financially viable included cost recovery and in 2001, Eskom announced that those not paying for services or those in arrears would be cut off. The neoliberal policies based on privatisation and cost recovery were implemented from the top down, an approach that stood in direct contrast to the justification for local government, that is, including communities in decisions and policies which affect their lives. When Trevor Ngwane, who was at that stage a ward councillor in Pimville, Soweto, opposed the Igoli 2002 plan, the ANC suspended him from his post. It was proposed that should he retract from his position, his suspension of 2 years would be reduced to 9 months, which he believes was intentionally to coincide with the next municipal election (Ngwane, 2003: 45). Ngwane was a popular candidate and it was believed that he would be another ward councillor in the bag for the ANC. The SECC (at that stage not formally organised) started a series of illegal reconnections which were deemed criminal and the SECC was attacked by Eskom for "engendering a 'criminal culture' and being antagonistic to the ANC" (Naidoo & Veriavia, 2009: 326). At around the same time a number of activists were mobilising around the Urban Futures Conference at Wits, and this mobilisation ultimately formalised into the APF.

Since its beginnings in 2000/2001, the SECC has overcome a number of obstacles and faced a number of challenges. In all social movements, there are cycles of protest around which

participation and mobilisation increases and decreases. As with many social movement organisations, it appears that the SECC peaked early in its lifetime and now survives "as a shadow of its former self" (interview, McKinley, 2010).

The SECC and Democracy

The SECC does have a formalised structure, as do many of the new social movement organisations in South Africa, which is one of the many factors differentiating them from some of the more libertarian organisations found in USA and Europe during their early days of new social movements. With regards to the relationship between social movements and democracy, it appears that the SECC certainly provides an arena of participation beyond periodic voting for those members who choose to participate, as well as being a means by which to challenge the state (on a local level) and a means by which to try secure basic rights. Participation may not be as continuous as idealised by the radical conception of democracy, but for the members of the organisation participation in political activity is indeed increased by participation in the movements. Local political structures do provide occasional opportunities for participation in local politics. However many interviewees expressed sentiment that "official" local politics, or "ANC politics" as they are sometimes referred to, are meaningless, and cannot truly be used to achieve desired ends. It was suggested that the SECC and similar organisations "get things done" in a way that official local structures do not.

It may be useful to differentiate between democracy in the state, democracy in society and democracy in social movements and the organisations which comprise them. Democracy in the state refers to the implementation of democratic institutions and structures of government, which have taken a liberal form in South Africa. This would include such elements as universal franchise, direct election of lawmaking assemblies at various levels of government, freedoms of expression and association, political pluralism, separation of powers, constitutionalism and the rule of law. Democracy in the state also includes participatory invited spaces such as the ward committees. Democracy in society refers to the ability to be able to access the rights prescribed by the constitution, as well as be protected from the encroachment of the state and other parties. Democracy in society, is then shown to only extend to a small portion of the population: those who have access to

decision-makers and power structures, those who can claim their democratic rights, and make use of the democratic institutions which South Africa takes such pride in parading. The vulnerable are not able to participate in democratic society in a meaningful way. They are viewed as the poor, the weak, and those with little power to pose any significant challenge to the status quo. In light of this, the importance of popular democratic participation in both engagement with the state and in society becomes evident. The vulnerable and poor, who are by and large excluded from participating in the spaces provided for participation by the democratic state, have therefore found an alternative manner in which to exercise their political subjectivity and experience an empowered citizenship of sorts. It is for this reason that internal democracy in social movements and social movement organisations is important. In order to not perpetuate the same inequalities, exclusion and limited means for participation practiced by the state, the organisations should themselves be internally democratic.

Structure of the SECC

The SECC falls under the broader anti-neoliberal movement in South Africa, which is also an international movement, and under the broader international social justice movement. It is an affiliate of the APF and partakes in APF activities relatively regularly. However, the extent to which the various segments of participants in the movement relate to the broader international movement varies. Desai (2002) suggests that while the leaders of movements may be embedded in international networks, the grassroots levels of the movements experience the movements only in terms of their periodic mass mobilisation. Grassroots members also appear to be less concerned with their role in the greater struggle and more concerned with the immediate issues with which they are faced.

The movement was formed in the post-apartheid era which separates it from anti-apartheid liberation movements in terms of goals and it stands in opposition to the state, seeking a particular alteration of the status quo, specifically of the neo-liberal cost recovery policies the government has chosen to pursue in terms of electricity provision. In the context of cost recovery and the privatisation of basic services, many South Africans are experiencing what Richard Pithouse terms “exclusion from substantive citizenship” (Pithouse, 2008: page

unknown) and it is in this light that the SECC is demanding basic rights as espoused by the constitution.

The SECC formed in 2001 in response to the adoption and implementation of the neo-liberal economic program GEAR and specifically Igoli 2002 which was an "extensive privatisation plan for the city" (Ngwane, 2003:44). In its mission statement, the SECC describes its goal as "free basic services for all" (SECC, 2003: 1). Initially an organisation focussing on the free provision of electricity, it has now adopted a broader approach whereby it demands that all basic services be provided to all human beings. Basic services are "all the things that a human being needs to live such as a job, food, housing, health care, education, electricity, water, sanitation, recreation, and other basic necessities of modern life" (SECC, 2003: 1). Defining their main constituency as the poor and the working class, their ultimate goal is achieving a minimum standard of living for all by pursuing a socialist vision of wealth produced to satisfy human need.

The Constitution of the SECC (2003), section 2 (e) stipulates that "the SECC and its struggle must be run and controlled by residents, workers and youth according to *democratic principles*" [my emphasis] indicating a constitutional commitment to internal democracy within the organisation. It is further stipulated that in section 2 (h) that "all office bearers and elected leaders of the SECC are subject to the principle of right of recall. Structures can recall and replace a comrade who is failing to carry out their duties or who is seriously undermining the work of the SECC by omission or commission before their term of office is over. The right of recall should be exercised democratically and in a reasonable manner". In Section 5 of the constitution, entitled "Decision-making", it is again emphasised that all decision-making processes should occur in accordance with democratic principles, which is stated to mean "decisions must be made collectively after informed discussion and debate, *majority rules and the position of the minority is noted not suppressed"* (their emphasis). Furthermore, the constitution can only be amended at the Annual General Meeting, and by a two-thirds majority, and the organisation can only be dissolved under the same circumstances. This constitution satisfies many of the requisites of democracy such as collective decision-making, the right to recall and accountability.

Egan and Wafer (2006: 46-47) describe the leadership of both the SECC and the APF as being educated, and coming from a higher class than the constituents they claim to represent. While the leadership is described as comprising of older, educated, literate, middle class males, the majority of the constituents are retired women, living off pensions (Egan & Wafer, 2006: 48-51). While the class and gendered disjuncture between the leadership and the constituents may be subject to criticism, Egan & Wafer (2006: 48) suggest that "there is a common issue that gives the SECC cohesion". The necessity of having leaders who are educated and articulate was identified by the SECC, but it seems that the need to breed a new generation of leaders has also been identified. Trevor Ngwane has allegedly tried to develop a group of what he calls "organic intellectuals" to compliment the "traditional intellectual" leadership of the movement (Egan & Wafer, 2006: 48-49). However it has been noted by outside observers that the gap "between [the] vanguardist leadership and the movement's base, has never been filled despite efforts to reform and the presence of 'mediators'..." (Etzo: 2010: 571). With regards to the disproportional gender representation, observation of Executive Committee meetings, showed that there was an approximately 50-50 representation between male and female members of the Executive Committee. The majority of the Executive Committee is over the ages of 50. However there are a few younger members and a stratum of youth leadership is evident. While the presence of males on the committee was not in proportion to the number of males in the general constituency, with men being overrepresented in the leadership, women and men seemed to participate equally in proceedings. The disproportional representation of men in the general constituent membership of the organisations was explained as "men usually spend time in taverns, they talk and discuss politics there. Women like the organisations" (interview with constituent member, SECC, 2009) and "women are affected by these issues [of cost recovery] they have families to look after and can't pay for the services with their state pensions" (interview with constituent member, SECC, 2009). The most active members in the organisation, what one might refer to as the core group of activists, are generally articulate in English, outspoken and have experience in activism and are more politically educated than those constituent members who participated in the research.

Generally, Executive Committee members are unemployed and receive state pensions as their primary income. However many of them do participate in other activities for financial

gain when the opportunity arises. With the exception of the 'administrator' and the organiser, none of the Executive Committee members receives remuneration for their participation in the organisation. Observing a forum meeting in 2009, the administrator's salary was deliberated and discussed and collectively agreed on through a majority vote. This was explained as in accordance with the organisations claims to be a "working class democracy" (comment made by constituent member, 2009). Every member of the Executive Committee asserted that they had been voted into office (which was confirmed by branch level members). However the majority of the Executive Committee members interviewed had been in office since the establishment of the organisation in 2001, indicating that there may not be a rotation in leadership and no maximum term in office is mentioned in the constitution. This was also evident in the APF where many of the Office Bearers of the APF had held Office, although different positions, since the formation of the APF. At the AGM in 2010, however, there was a significant shift in the leadership of the office bearers.

Decision-making

In a structural sense, decision-making in the SECC occurs at all levels and while the Executive Committee enjoys quite a high degree of decision-making power, the branches also have extensive autonomy in the running of their branches, although they are accountable to the executive committee and are expected to abide by the rules and decisions made by the executive committee. The constitution regards the AGM as the highest decision-making body of the SECC, with the Extended Executive Committee (EEC) being the highest decision-making body between AGMs. The Executive Committee consists of "a chairperson, deputy chairperson, secretary, deputy secretary, treasurer and 9 leaders of functional of desks of subcommittees" (SECC Constitution). The Extended Executive Committee consists of "the executive committee members and representatives from each of the SECC's branches or local structures" (SECC Constitution). Furthermore, the constitution states that "ordinary members of the SECC, committees and sub committees can also attend the Extended Executive Committee meeting. There seems to be very little difference then between the Extended Executive Committee meeting and the Forum meeting as both include the Executive Committee, representatives from the branches, and anyone else who wishes to join. In practice, the Extended Executive Committee meetings occur weekly and are commonly referred to as "Executive Committee Meetings". It is in this space that decisions

seem to be made and strategies formulated, while the Forum meeting appears to be the place where these decisions and strategies are communicated to the rest of the organisation. Because the Forum meeting occurs directly after the Executive Committee Meeting, many of the attendees are those who were present at the Executive Committee meeting, other attendees include branch representatives, who did not attend the Executive Committee meeting and ordinary members who have some business they wish to have addressed by the executive of the organisation.

It was suggested by one Executive Committee member that the forum meeting is the highest body with regards to decision-making, as opposed to the Executive Committee. However in light of the dynamics of the forum meeting, it is debatable as to whether this is really the case. The forum meeting is supposed to consist of the executive committee and at least one branch representative from each branch. However, the registers of forum meetings throughout the year show relatively low attendance and the intermittent absence of certain branches. The AGM which is supposed to be the highest decision-making body has been also poorly attended in recent years, and was mostly attended by the people who became the incumbent Executive Committee. The AGM is supposed to be attended by at least 10 representatives from each branch and anyone else who wishes to attend, but the register of the 2010 AGM included only 37 names. This draws the legitimacy of the leadership into question, firstly because one must question whether the decision of the 37 people in attendance truly represents a legitimate outcome, but also because of the lack of rotation in leadership with most of those who hold leadership positions having held them since the organisation was formed, with the exception of a few new members. The Constitution of the SECC does however allow for the Extended Executive Committee to "reduce the number of delegates attending the AGM in respect of specific branches or local structures within reason and can also decide to invite other structures to attend the AGM and specify their role in the AGM". The reducing of representatives from specific branches presumably is included in the constitution in order to prevent the domination of one branch in the Executive Committee which could make the organisation unrepresentative (in terms of the branches) and could concentrate a high degree of power in one branch.

In a forum meeting which was observed in 2009, a comment was made by a constituent member that there is a need to foster more of a culture of debate within the organisation,

as there is a tendency "to agree with opinions and propositions of other comrades" (interview, constituent member, 2009). While deliberation is encouraged within the organisation there does appear to be a tendency to agree with others. This is a well documented downside of deliberative democracy, whereby minority views are suppressed, and due to the consensual nature by which deliberative democracy operates, minority interests are left undocumented. Ackerman & Fishkin (2003: 7-30) discuss the possibility of deliberation as a predecessor to voting. Arguing that public opinion can be improved and result in more desirable voting behaviour; it is suggested that deliberation prior to voting can "improve the character of public opinion itself" (Ackerman & Fishkin, 2003: 11). The SECC appears to agree align itself with this type of deliberative politics as the constitution states that "the SECC makes all its decisions according to democratic principles. This means decisions must be taken collectively after informed discussion and debate, *majority rules and the position of the minority is noted not suppressed"* [their emphasis] (SECC Constitution).



Forum Meeting, 2010

It is further asserted by Egan & Wafer (2006) that communication between branches and leaders is uncoordinated and minimal. Branch level members seldom participate in movement activities beyond occasional mass meetings and marches. Communication

between branch level members and executive committee members was mediated through branch leaders who were supposed to attend a weekly forum meeting at the SECC head offices. These meetings were open to all members but were compulsory for branch leaders, and served as a forum whereby grievances of branch members were articulated through the branch leaders to the executive committee. Attendance at the forum meetings varied depending on a number of factors, discussed below. The branch leaders were mandated by their branches and deviance from the mandate did appear to be subject to discipline. This was evident when a branch leader who had deviated from the SECC's mandate on a public forum was subject to criticism and given the option of recalling her statement or stepping down from her decision and her position. At the forum meeting, decisions regarding the grievances of branches were discussed in an open forum where everyone had the opportunity to speak their mind and give their input (Observation of Forum Meeting, 2009/2010). The members' interviews appeared to be aware of how the organisation is structured and the correct channels through which to have their issues placed on the agenda but did not seem to know too much about the organisation beyond their branches. Most identified their branch leaders as the leaders of the organisations and only some respondents could identify the executive committee. The fact that many of the constituent members are members of the organisation as a result of their being in a struggle for survival, may influence the fact that continuous participation is not always prioritised.

At a branch meeting at one of the poorest, if not the poorest areas in Soweto, Chiawelo, a number of branch members were interviewed. Questions relating to their role in the organisation, how the organisation has served them, and their relationship to the local government, which is ANC dominated, were posed. Responses indicated that the SECC was fulfilling many of the roles that they expected the local government to fulfil, the provision of electricity not the least of the lot. One of the main issues on the agenda at the particular meeting was that of the lack of accountability from the local government. A memorandum had been sent to both the local ward councillor and a representative of Eskom to visit the area for an inspection of the area and a discussion of the various problems the inhabitants were facing. The ward councillor never responded and Eskom sent a letter apologising for not being able to attend the meeting and inspection, and acknowledging a problem but not proposing a solution. It was suggested that a vote of no confidence in the ward councillor

should be made. This is an indication that the branch was aware of the correct institutional channels to follow, but due to a lack of response from those institutions, the organisation felt it was left with no other option than to pursue its own agenda and means of fixing the problem, namely, illegally reconnecting the electricity themselves. The organisation had clearly tried to engage with the state but was rewarded with silence and saw the illegal means as a necessary retaliation. This also indicates how the legal institutional means of engaging with the state are known and are used by the organisation, but the lack of response from the state resulted in illegal means (reconnections) being used again.

Some branch meeting was comprised of roughly equal men and women, but most had more women present than men and the majority of them were pensioner aged. However, due to the fact that the meeting was held during the day, on a weekday, many of the members who are employed could not have attended even if they had wanted to. The members who had attended the meetings had been members of the organisation for any duration from 6 months to 9 years. Aside from one interviewee, they were all card carrying members. When asked what the SECC has done for them responses ranged from reconnecting the electricity and water of the members to helping one member find an elderly family member who could no longer care for herself, and who the member could not look after on her own.

It also emerged that many of the branch members still voted for the ANC in local and national elections, despite their dismal performance in the area of service delivery. Those who did not vote for the ANC usually did not vote in the elections at all indicating a degree of apathy to the formal institutional sphere of politics and also disillusionment with the ANC. In early 2006 leaders of Operation Khanyisa decided to contest the local elections and formed the political party Operation Khanyisa Movement (OKM). Around this time, Operation Khanyisa had garnered a lot of support and was receiving considerable attention in the media resulting from a number of successful protests and particularly vocal leadership. One of the highly publicised protests included a march on Johannesburg Mayor, Amos Masondo's house and the disconnection of his electricity. However, despite the media attention, OKM's performance at the polls was nothing short of dismal. They secured only 4305 of a total 1384327 of the votes cast (IEC, 2006) which translated into only one seat on the Johannesburg Metro Council. After the election, the party's leadership downplayed their

uninspiring performance (see Ndletyana, 2007: 101-103). However, there are plans to contest the forthcoming elections in 2011[xiv].

The members of the SECC do, however, exhibit a deep understanding of the local politics, and of who to approach and how to get things done. They acknowledge that the ANC is in power in local government, and also acknowledge that their pensions are paid by the state. It appears to be believed that social grants come from the ANC, and this may be one of the many reasons used to explain the ANC's persistent winning of votes. However, it is also acknowledged that in order for immediate results to problems to be realised, the SECC and other similar organisations are far more effective and responsive. The members of the population have effectively bypassed the state and formed parallel means of having their needs met, needs which the state is traditionally supposed to satisfy. The branch level members also exhibited knowledge of the channels by which leadership could be reached, noting that in order to air grievances, or have issues put on the agenda at an Executive Committee meeting, they needed to go through their Branch leader. They appeared to feel represented by their branch leader, expressing that they approach them with all kinds of problems. Many of the respondents however identified their branch leaders as the leaders of the organisation and did not know many of the executive committee members. Furthermore, attendance at the forum meetings was very low and most respondents had only been to the forum meeting once or twice and only ever went to the head office of the organisation when it was the assembly point for a march or protest.

Interviews with branch members revealed a complex and mutually beneficial relationship between the organisation, at branch level, and the leadership at executive level. Despite the "material immediacy" (Egan & Wafer, 2006: 61) of the needs of the constituent members, there was a mutually beneficial role for the members to play, come protest time. While it is questioned whether the members are aware of their relevance in a broader anti-neoliberal and anti-globalisation struggle, their role in providing a formidable force in protest cannot be underestimated. They are certainly conscious of the social inequality which negatively affects many aspects of their lives, and they are certainly ready to stand in protest against this and take to the streets when the time comes. However, they may not be aware of their role in a broader international movement, which the leaders are aware of. Perhaps the relationship can be viewed as a transaction: in return for electricity reconnections, members

offer their services in protest and collective action for a movement which is conscious of its wider relevance. This can also be understood in the economic terms of resource mobilisation theory.

One of the fundamental aspects of radical or grassroots democracy is a critique of the distance between decision-makers and stakeholders, both literal and symbolic. Decisions are often taken at a national level with huge repercussions on the ground, without any consultation with the grassroots. Bearing this in mind, social movement organisations seek to bridge the gap between decision makers and stakeholders and establish a direct link of sorts between decision makers and those whom decisions impact on. However, the study revealed that while decisions were often taken at the leadership movement, the majority of respondents did not regularly attend the forum meetings or visit the Careers Centre, the headquarters of the SECC, where Executive Committee Meetings and Forum Meetings are held. Furthermore, the respondents identified their branch leaders and the leaders of the movement and had very little knowledge of the executive committee. Very few respondents had attended the 2009 or 2010 AGM, and therefore had not taken part in the voting process which established the executive committee.

One of the fundamental aspects of internal democracy in new social movement theory is that of non-hierarchical decision-making. However, the decision-making structures evident in the SECC appears to be nothing short of hierarchical. Furthermore, the principle of mandated delegation is extended as far as the AGM, which should by the standards of New Social Movement Theory, be open to all and essentially be the place where the entire assembly comes together. However, despite the commitment to inclusivity in the constitution, the SECC's AGM is not open to all, extremely poorly attended and seems to be the domain of a very small and unrepresentative group of people who consolidate their power through the AGM and, purposefully or not purposefully, exclude the vast majority of the constituents from the process which ultimately has a great influence on the path the organisation is to follow for that year. The AGM is considered the "highest decision-making body" of the SECC, but most constituent members are excluded from that process. This calls into serious question the legitimacy of a leadership which is elected in a process which is not free and fair nor inclusive.

Representation and Leadership

Despite claiming mass support[xv], the leaders of the SECC are only really representative of a very small percentage of the population of Soweto that is estimated to be around one and a half million. Claiming representation of the whole community is problematic for a number of reasons. Firstly, the active membership base of the SECC is far smaller than it is often presented to be. Secondly, claiming to represent a community that is diverse in its make up and diverse in its issues through a single voice is problematic. Third, every area in which the SECC has a branch is still an ANC stronghold, which means that for whatever reason, there are still a significant number of people who support the ANC and view it as a legitimate government in some way.

The leadership of the movement is also unrepresentative in that a disproportionate number of males hold leadership positions relative to the largely female membership base of the organisation. The Executive Committee has an almost equal number of male and female members, but every branch meeting had a far larger proportion of female members in attendance indicating that of the active membership base, the majority is female. This is echoed in the reference to the constituents as the "grannies of Soweto", and not "the grannies and grandpas of Soweto".

The organisation largely functions though the principle of mandated delegation where an individual is appointed as a representative of the organisation with a clear and strict mandate to represent the organisation. Deviance from this mandate can result in recall or disciplinary action. As mentioned earlier, it was observed at branch level that where a representative from a branch deviated from the organisations mandate on a public platform, she was invited to withdraw her statement or to step down and be expelled from the organisation. Another example of recall was in the case of the Operation Khanyisa Movement (OKM) councillor. A councillor was popularly elected by the community through the organisation of the OKM to be a representative in local government. The representative was to be a representative of the poor communities and their interests. The councillor who was originally elected was recalled after she defected to the DA which the community perceived as a deviance from the pledge she made to "abide by the rules of the people and of the OKM" (interview, EC member 2009). Floor crossing was disallowed by the

organisation and her failure to abide by its rules resulted in her being recalled. A new councillor was then appointed and she replaced the original councillor on the council.

The SECC does not at this stage have a constant presence of inorganic activists. At varying times throughout the organisation's existence, there have been researchers present and activists involved in particular projects, but the phenomenon of inorganic intellectuals doesn't appear in the day to day organisation of the movement. Certain inorganic activists affiliated to the APF partake in SECC activities, but there is a genuine culture of autonomy within the movement and a sense that the movement does truly represent the will and interests of the community. When an executive committee member was asked about the presence of inorganic activists, he responded that researchers came and went, but "the SECC doesn't have white activists like the APF". When pressed about the role of white activists he noted that "of course they come and press their agendas but they are also very important". He further explained that, especially when it came to handling financial issues, the "white activists" played a fundamental role in both teaching the others about financial management, but also playing a role in the financial management of the organisation. A sentiment reiterated by APF members was that Mckinley, who was treasurer for years (not uncontroversially), was the most qualified person for the job. One APF member proposed that "when people who have nothing are given power with money, it can lead to bad outcomes" (interview, APF member).

Inclusivity and Membership

Inclusivity is an important democratic value to be considered as "all citizens with a stake in the decisions to be taken must be included in the process and able to express their views" (Della Porta, 2009: 2). Della Porta (2009: 35) defines structural inclusiveness in terms of "the lack of requirements for membership [...] and of provisions to expel members." Aside from structural inclusivity, another type of inclusivity needs to be conceptualised, specifically in terms of the socioeconomic circumstances of many of the members of social movements in South Africa. I thereby differentiate between structural inclusivity and formal inclusivity. Formal inclusivity refers to the costs of participation and how this affects the degree of inclusivity of organisations. For example, the only prerequisite for being a member of the SECC is being an inhabitant of Soweto, or as stated in the SECC constitution "all Sowetans

irrespective of political affiliation or creed, can support or join the SECC's campaign and activities as individuals". On the structural front, then, the organisation may be said to be inclusive, as anyone who lives in Soweto can join the organisation. However on the substantive front, there are other factors which limit how inclusive the organisation is. One example of this would be meetings times, which usually occur on weekdays, during work hours. The implication of this is that many potential members are effectively excluded from participation. The main participants of the organisations are unemployed, yet it is unclear whether unemployment is a reason for joining the organisation, or the membership of the organisation stems from the relatively low degree of substantive inclusivity. The SECC promotes itself as a movement of the unemployed and the working class. However, those in the working class who are employed are restricted from much of the meaningful participation of the movement. It is furthermore stated that other organisations may affiliate themselves with the SECC so long as they work in accordance with and do not contradict the aims and principles of the SECC. However, when Winnie Mandela applied for membership in 2002, it was discussed by the SECC Executive Committee and the APF, but it was not granted.

Membership and Participation

The concept of membership is not unproblematic. Many of the social movement organisations claim membership bases of the tens of thousands. However observation of branch and forum meetings as well as protests revealed a very different picture. How membership is understood has not been critically examined in any of the literature on social movements, rather they uncritically refer to the movements as mass movements representing thousands of people, or as Egan and Wafer (2007) put it "mini mass movements". If being a member of the movement is understood as having had some sort of contact with or involvement in the movement, then perhaps these assertations are correct. However, if membership is understood in terms of actual, regular participation in the movements' activities, then the size of the 'membership base' decreases significantly. The weekly forum meetings of the SECC are attended by a small number of people in comparison to the claimed membership base of "10 000" people. To give an idea of numbers, the register of a random selection of forum meetings spanning from January 2010 to November 2010 was analysed with the following results:

Ave no of Participants in Forum Meeting (Total no of meetings)	Median no of participants in Forum Meeting (Total no of meetings)	Ave no of participants in Executive Committee Meeting (Total no of meetings)	Median no of participants in Executive Meetings (Total no of meetings)
42.9 (13)	21.5 (13)	11.5 (10)	10.5 (10)

No. Of Participants at Forum and Branch Meetings

The forum meeting is the space where the regular participation on the assembly could and perhaps should occur. It is open to everyone, but a representative from each branch is required to attend, usually the branch leader, but if they are unable, then another member may attend as the mandated representative of that branch. There is no maximum number of attendees at a forum meeting. Participation at these meetings ebbs and flows with a number of factors influencing the attendance. For example, during cold or rainy weather, attendance is typically lower than when the weather is pleasant. So for example, on the 6th of June, a particularly cold day, only 18 people attended the forum meeting. The majority of those who attended were from the executive committee which has their meeting from 9:00am to 11:00am, that is, the two hours preceding the forum meeting. On the 9th of November, a rainy day, only 23 members attended the forum meeting, 9 of whom had been at the executive committee meeting before[xvi]. Participation increases when there is a contentious issue affecting many members, such as a spate of electricity cutoffs or evictions. The forum meetings should have at the very least between 50-60 attendees if there are 2 representatives from each of the 25 branches and the Executive Committee, however this is rarely achieved.

Many factors affect participation, but that which is most to blame must be a lack of resources. Considering that branches are far away from the Careers Centre where the forum and executive committee meetings are held, transportation is a huge obstacle. The representatives from each branch who do attend the meetings are often provided with funding for transportation. At a branch meeting in Dube on the 8th of November 2010, a collection tin was passed around in which voluntary donations were made to raise funds for the representative to attend the weekly forum meeting the following day. Branch meetings

are easier to attend purely because of their locality, their being in the area of the branch, and most often in walking distance of many of the branch members. Any branch members who wish to attend the forum meeting are required to raise the necessary funds for transport themselves in order to attend, if they are not going specifically as a representative of that branch. Of the 37 constituent members questioned, only 7 had attended a forum meeting, and only 5 had attended more than one forum meeting. Most of them had only ever been to the head offices at the Careers Centre when it was used as the congregation area for transportation to a march or protest.

Ave no of Participants in Branch Meeting (Total no of meetings)	Median no of Participants in Branch Meeting (Total no of meetings)
36 (26)	24 (26)

Branch meeting attendance

Even at marches, where a number of different organisations are represented, and transport is provided, a group of 10 000 has yet to be seen. Establishing an accurate figure of the membership base is problematic for a number of reasons. Firstly, what exactly characterises a member. Is it the carrying of a card? Or the continued participation in organisation activities? The SECC does write numbers on the cards to keep track of the membership but these numbers appear to be renewed monthly. Secondly, many people who associate with the organisation are not card carrying members, and membership is for some relatively informal, with participation waxing and waning. Thirdly, many who might be considered members by broader definitions of membership only contact the organisation when they need something, for example a reconnection. It appears that the involvement of members has dwindled since the movement's inception. However the movement continues to lay claim to its initial large show of support. Overrepresentation of membership serves a functional purpose in accruing funds from overseas donors and also in lending legitimacy to the movement. It was acknowledged by an EC member that membership of the SECC and particularly participation in SECC activities and events has declined drastically since 2005 when there was a split in the SECC which ultimately resulted in the formation of the Soweto Concerned Residents (SCR). The relationship between the SECC and SCR is a complicated one, at times competitive and at time collaborative. If one adopts the resource mobilisation

approach, the two organisations, which have broadly similar goals, are essentially in competition with each other in terms of trying to attract members and trying to mobilise other resources. Considering that they are both affiliates of the APF and are both concentrated in the same geographical areas, it can be clearly seen that they are in competition for funding and other resources which the APF can provide. The SCR's membership in the APF did not go unchallenged by the SECC who "vehemently opposed it" (Naidoo & Veravia, 2009: 333) and proposed rather that the SECC and SCR try to overcome their differences and reintegrate into a single organisation. However, in July 2006, the SCR was accepted into the APF as an affiliate independent of the SECC and this further strained SECC-APF relations.

SECC-SCR relations "were characterised by tensions related to the 'sides' taken by individuals in the debate for a very long time" (Naidoo & Veravia, 2009: 334). While they identify many common areas of interest, they differ in many ways too. One key difference is in terms of *modus operandi* of electricity reconnections: the SECC removes prepaid meters from the yards of members, while the SCR rather bypasses those meters leaving them intact. Both organisations, however, are committed to the achievement of free basic services and a socialist ideology. Despite the differences and tensions between the SCR and the SECC, both recognise the value of solidarity and there are many instances of collaboration. For example, both organisations are mobilising support for OKM to participate in the local elections of 2011. Competition still pervades the relationship, however, as was observed during a march in Meadowlands organised by the SECC. The SCR were invited to the march to rally support and increase the numbers, but also because the issue around which the march was organised (that of prepaid water meters) was one which the SCR also opposed. At the march, there appeared to be more SCR members than SECC members, and when the chance to speak arose, SCR speakers took the platform. Some members of the SECC were disgruntled by this and one noted that "this is our march, not theirs" (comment by SECC member, 2010).

New members are constantly joining the SECC. In November 2010 alone, 51 new members signed up, and there are ever more appearing at branch meetings wanting to sign up. However, the new membership base is not without problems. An activist and reconnector[xvii] with the SECC commented that "new members are joining the movement, but they are

joining because they want us to help them. They don't come to the marches, or the meetings, they just join because they want us to reconnect them, they use us" (interview activist and reconnector, 2010). The implication of this is that there is an inactive membership base who has merely joined the organisation for the functional purposes it can serve them. The SECC offers a diversified range of services to its constituents, including water and electricity reconnections, legal advocacy and advice and general support. The same activist and reconnector also commented that "some of these people are members of 30 or 40 organisations just for the help they give" indicating overlapping membership. It seems to be largely the inactive membership base that are members of more than one organisation as all interviewees at the branch level claimed to be part only of the SECC and not affiliated with any other social movement organisation.

Participation

Social movements "express a fundamental critique of conventional politics, affirming the legitimacy (if not the primacy) of alternatives to representative models of democracy" (Reiter, 2009: 44). Participation is viewed as valuable in that it contributes to the deepening of democracy, as Ballard (2008: 17) observes that:

> Without participation, one is left with occasional elections that require a population to aggregate all their concerns and beliefs about the way things should be done into a single mark on a ballot. Many societies fall within a narrow definition of democracy as the periodic holding of elections. Elections are taken to be a moment of democratic completeness, rather than just one of the criteria of democracy alongside active citizens shaping their government (Ballard, 2008: 17)

Extending beyond periodic voting, social movements provide an additional space for participation and for expression of the will of the people. Normatively, participation should occur on the basis of inclusivity and equality. Della Porta (2009: 35) measure structural participation in terms of the general assembly meeting more than once a year, and whether leaders at the executive level are elected by the general assembly. Furthermore, in Reiter's study of the level of participation in social movement organisations of the Global Justice Movement, differing levels of delegation are specified. High delegation (not held to be a positive value) is characterised by "a traditional organisational structure, with an assembly of delegates meeting less than once a year and an executive holding strong decisions making powers" (Reiter, 2009: 46). Medium-high delegation is distinguished from High

Delegation by “innovative features such as frequent assembly meetings or mandated delegation” (Reiter, 2009: 46). Medium-Low Delegation “combines an assembly of all members or whoever wants to participate with presence of a strong executive committee” (Reiter, 2009: 46), and Low Delegation is defined as those organisations “with an assembly of all members or whoever wants to participate and a weak executive committee with only coordinating powers” (Reiter, 2009: 47). This typology is underpinned by the idea that low delegation and a weak executive are more democratic as more power is invested in the hands of the stakeholders and constituent members.

With regards to all the organisations under study, participation varied between the levels of the organisation. For example, in the SECC, the executive committee meets weekly, and branch meetings are supposed to happen weekly, but in some branches, this does not occur. Extended Executive Committee meetings do occur weekly with differing attendees each week. Forum meetings do occur weekly, and branch leaders are required to attend these weekly forum meetings, or have a representative present. The executive committee members are generally present at the weekly meeting, and the branches do usually have a representative at the weekly forum. However, at the branch level, which can be roughly equated with the assembly, predictably, attendance at meetings waxes and wanes, but cumulatively does certainly not constitute the membership base that the organisation claims to be in the thousands. The very basis of *grassroots participation* is the participation of those who represent the grassroots, and this is limited to protests, marches and other key events. On the contrary those involved at executive level and in leadership positions participate regularly and meaningfully. While the irregularity of participation is to be expected, it may be argued that the fact that constituent members’ participation being largely limited to marches and protests renders them as bodies in a crowd. It is to be expected that those who organise and maintain an organisation are involved to a much higher degree. However, periodic and insubstantial participation in organisations that claim membership bases of over 10 000 calls into question the plausibility of their claims to be mass formations. Leaders in the executive positions are typically elected at the Annual General Meeting of the organisation which is typically the only time the assembly comes together. However, even attendance at these meetings is decreasing. The register for the 2010 AGM only included 37 names. The SECC therefore, by Reiters (2009) typology, may be

classified as a High Delegation organisation, due to the fact that the assembly only meets annually (despite the provision of the weekly forum meetings for grassroots participation), and the strong decision-making powers of the Executive Committee. Furthermore, mandated delegation is the primary means of communication between the executive and the branches.

It cannot be ignored that financial and resource constraints hinder the continuous participation of members of the organisations. However participation is also hampered by meeting times. Branch meetings, which are the primary opportunity for continuous participation in the meetings, are held on weekdays and mostly during work hours. The meeting times were as follows:

Branch meetings during work hours (9:00am – 17:00)	Branch meetings starting at 17:00.	Branch meetings not during work hours (18:00 -)	Total no of branch meetings per week
9	9	7	25

Branch Meeting times

If travelling time is taken into account, those who work are effectively excluded from meetings starting at 17:00 as they would likely miss some of the meeting. This means that of the 25 branch meetings which occur weekly, 72% of them occur at a time when people occupied during an average working day would not be able to attend. While most of the constituents are unemployed or living on a state pension, there is the possibility that the inaccessible working times are hindering the participation of many other potential members.

Knowledge, Information and Education

Wainwright (2003) explores a unique perspective on the role of social movements in reclaiming democracy, specifically the role played by knowledge and knowledge networks. Critical of what she calls the “social engineering state” and the neoliberal state, Wainwright proposes that ways of sharing knowledge rooted in the social movements of the 1960’s and 1970’s play a fundamental role in establishing an alternative to the weak representative

democracy of contemporary times. With reference to the sources of knowledge and how knowledge becomes viewed as valuable, she is critical of the hierarchized nature of the modern state which isolates many important forms of knowledge from having any influence on decision-making. Wainwright essentially believes that political power should be put back in the hands of the population, which she believes is isolated from the state, through the incorporation of all citizens who seek democratic reformation. As sites of knowledge, which understand and incorporate the nature of knowledge as "practical and social" (Wainwright, 2003: 28), social movements, and the horizontal networks in which they are embedded, play an intrinsic role in the reconceptualisation and realisation of a true democracy (Wainwright, 2003: 14-29). One of the key reasons which emerged for the formation of social movements in South Africa was that the direct stakeholders in many communities had been excluded both from the dissemination of information and the production of knowledge which informed policy formulation and decision-making. As previously discussed, the RDP was an inclusive process whereby a range of actors contributed to the establishment of the national economic policy, whilst GEAR was the complete opposite excluding almost everyone, including many of those within the alliance. One of the most criticised aspects of the shift to neoliberalism was the exclusion of any input from the communities directly affected by policies and decisions. Communities are systematically denied access to information and excluded from decision-making processes in the formal institutional channels. Furthermore, the 'formal institutional channels' are viewed widely by the members of the organisations as being unresponsive and a waste of time in terms of making claims. Overcoming this exclusion from information has become a key feature of many social movements in South Africa. For example, the SECC ensures that it is up to date with policy and changes in the provision of energy and water to the community. Eskom incorporates a series of sly techniques to trick members of the community into signing contracts which legally bind people to accepting prepaid meters for example. The SECC informs the community, through the branch representatives, of their rights and the threats posed by Eskom. Where Eskom tries to trick people into signing contracts without full disclosure of information, the SECC tries to prevent this from happening by providing information and knowledge to the members of the community[xviii].

In South Africa the issue of knowledge and knowledge networks has special relevance in that trends towards inclusion and exclusion from knowledge networks can be identified. This is also relevant in the discussion of the relationship between academics, activists and constituent members of social movement organisations, and how they share in and shape the ideological orientation of the movement as well as information surrounding the core issues of the movement. Awareness of the issues is another relevant element whereby members may be included or excluded from the realm of ideas under which the movement operates.

Two very different pictures of how knowledge is used, disseminated and abused in social movement organisations emerge in the context of South African social movements. Knowledge and information can be related to inclusion, and whether social movement organisations are inclined to inclusiveness, which is widely held to be a democratic value. Whether knowledge and information concerning the issues around which the organisation is formed are shared within the movement, or whether knowledge and the ideological orientation of the movement is concentrated in the hands of an elite few emerges as a central issue determining the democratic tendency of movements.

There is evidence of social movement organisations excluding the majority of their constituencies from information and knowledge, and merely using them when numbers are needed for mass mobilisation. This was observed in the instance of the concerned CCF in Mpumalanga where it was noted that most of the constituent members of the organisations had little to no knowledge of the ideological struggle they were supposedly a part of, nor of the main issues surrounding the policies they were mobilised to protest against. It is noted by Siwisa (2009) that the members were systematically excluded from any educational processes and were distinctly underinformed about the struggle of which they were a part. Siwisa (2009: 931-932) describes this in terms of there being a disjuncture between the leadership who were typically Leftist intellectual activists and the constituent members who were typically poor and uneducated:

> The differences between leadership and grassroots in these sorts of movements can, perhaps, be best explained by differences in political ideologies and consciousness. Although it is often assumed that participants in social movements share the same ideologies and level of consciousness as the leadership, such commonality is often lacking (Siwisa, 2009: 932).

However, what this example highlights, is the disjuncture which often exists between the leadership, who may be pursuing ideological goals, and the constituent members who are more concerned with the survivalist issues at hand. This particular tension is highlighted by Walsh, who notes that a distinct 'conceptual shift' occurred in AbM from when the movement first started and the movement mobilised around the issues of "land, housing and the frustration of waiting too long for service delivery" (Walsh, 2008: 263) to the issue of 'voice' and the 'right to speak for themselves'. It is suggested that the newer reason for mobilisation coincides with the goals and ideas of the activists involved in the movement.

Within the SECC knowledge is shared in a variety of ways, and as mentioned previously, participation in the SECC is considered to be valuable in terms of the education gained from participation. Mandated delegation is an important manner in which knowledge sharing occurs. When representatives attend workshops or lectures, they are expected to take what they have learnt back to their branches and share that knowledge with the rest of the branch, however, this does lead to diluted and inaccurate repetitions. The SECC offices are also littered with educational (and also propagandist) posters and notices, describing for example, the theory behind socialism or human rights based claims to basic services. The SECC also plays a very important role in educating its constituency about changes in policy related to basic services, updates in relations with the APF, Eskom, the ANC and COSATU, and also even current issues.

On the other hand there are positive examples of the productions and sharing of knowledge. Abahlali baseMjondolo is widely cited as an example of an organisation that incorporates both knowledge sharing and knowledge production into its activities and uses knowledge and education as a tool to include wider constituent members and to formulate relationships between left intellectuals and social movement leaders and members supposedly based on equality and a sharing of knowledge and information. Referring to many of the branches as "universities", for example, 'the Kennedy Road University', educating the leaders of the movement, and then mandating the leaders to disseminate what they have learnt to their broader constituents, has been a key element of the movement. This was furthered by a collaboration with the University of KwaZulu Natal and

'militants' from two movements, Abahlali and the Rural Network, whereby a series of participatory discussions were held "to expand space for careful and critical reflection, and to explore the connections between the experience of being a militant, faced with real threats of landlessness and repression and abuse by authorities, on the one hand, with that of being an academic student engaging other written experiences from a range of contexts" (Ntseng & Philpot, 2009: 5). This was called "Living Learning" and culminated in the publication of a notebook of the same name. The whole process whereby the discussions were coordinated sought to overcome the disjuncture between academics and activists, and include critical reflection from activists in academia. The booklet describes the relationship between academics and militants (as they refer to themselves in the booklet) in the following terms:

> It is not about heavy things to be learned by us 'fools' from 'smarter' people. Publishing a booklet out of our Living Learning could also be there for those 'smarter' people to learn from the 'fools' (Figlan *et al*, 2009: 7).

The participants in the discussions were mandated to take the knowledge they had gained from the discussions and disseminate it to their constituencies. The discussions were reportedly participatory in nature with issues being put on the agenda by the participants themselves as opposed to one of the academics formulating an agenda which would then be followed by all. The publication of the booklet was based on the idea that academics could also learn from the militants, and that militants were open to criticism. This arguably stands in stark contrast to the example of CCF in Mpumlanga where constituent members were excluded from all knowledge processes and information and merely mobilised when numbers were needed. AbM is ostensibly committed to the idea of 'living politics' and to participation in the movement as an educational process. It advances a critique of knowledge as passed down from those of superior intellectual backgrounds, emphasising the manner in which knowledge can be gained through living, not only through academic learning.

The relationship between AbM and activists and intellectuals however, declined substantially in 2006 with AbM effectively ending all ties with the Centre for Civil Society Studies. It has also come to light recently in debates, previously discussed, that the production of knowledge on Abahlali is not unproblematic. As previously mentioned, the

relationships between academia and activists have recently come under fire for their romanticisation of movements in political discourse and popular commentary with AbM at the centre of the debates.

A similar issue was experienced within the SECC whereby a forum meeting in 2009 witnessed by this author, which was open to all constituent members, was used as a mean to provide a small educational platform. A presentation on Rosa Luxembourg was given, and a brief discussion on the type of socialist ideologies embodied by her. It was a presentation by one of the executive committee members given in a distinctly pedagogical position, imparting knowledge to the rest of the forum. It was not participatory, nor was the theory substantive, but rather it was of a biographical nature. While the SECC does not make the education of its members a priority, it is clearly attempting to incorporate an element of education into the organisation. However, it seems that this is not done in the same inclusive and participatory manner in which AbM claims its knowledge construction occurs. What may be missing in the instance of the SECC is the collaboration with intellectuals who may influence the discursive and inclusive manner in which AbM operates. However this view is speculative rather than based on substantive observation.

Many of the interviewees referred to the educational value of being part of the organisations. An Executive Committee member of the SECC explicitly stated that one of the main reasons why he is a member of the SECC and of the Executive Committee of the SECC is that it is a space where he can learn from others, learn to address others and gain skills (Interview, SECC EC member, 2009). This sentiment was repeated by members of the APF who recognised that participation in the organisation served an educational function. There is the opportunity for the development of basic skills, such as typing and emailing, but also for intellectual development. As most of the members of the organisation are unemployed, participation in the organisation serves as a regular daytime activity, and view the education gained through participation as invaluable. An Executive Committee member stated that “the SECC is how I keep myself busy every day, this way I don’t spend a lot of money” (interview, EC member, 2009).

It did become apparent however, that constituent members of the SECC were far less aware of the ideology underpinning the movement. While interviewees from the leadership, and especially the executive level of leadership, could give relatively complex descriptions of why internal democracy is important, and describe the socialist orientation of the movement, constituent members generally didn't show the same critical awareness of such issues. For example, when asked what democracy means to them as individuals, one respondent said "I don't know what democracy means, but I know that now I am free when before I wasn't and I am told this is democracy" (SECC constituent member interview, 2009). Constituent members also showed a very limited understanding about socialism and what it meant despite the fact that they regularly sang the song *that's why I'm a socialist*. When asked what kind of organisation the SECC was, only a handful identified the movement primarily as a socialist one, but when asked what this meant, the responses were very vague. The respondents either did not know, or expressed their understanding of socialism in terms of haves and have-nots. For example, one respondent said socialism means "we must fight for the poor" and another said "life for everybody must be reasonable, there must be balance between those who have and those who don't". Another interesting observation was that many of the respondents saw socialism and democracy as mutually exclusive. This may have been because of the way the questions were structured as they were first asked what democracy means, and then asked what socialism means but many saw the two as incompatible, with one respondent saying "socialism is the opposite to what we have, its opposite to the democracy. Democracy doesn't mean anything to us" (branch member interviews, 2010). By contrast members of the leadership of the committee were aware of the organisation's constitution, had seen the constitution and showed a far deeper understanding of democracy and socialism, as well as other ideological themes that pervaded the movement's rhetoric. This could perhaps be attributed to the fact they spend more time involved in movement activities but also that their involvement is more substantial than the branch meetings which typically deal with day to day issues and particular cases. The leadership is more exposed to the ideological struggle, largely led by the APF, and is involved in establishing and pursuing the strategic direction of the organisation. Some members of the leadership level, specifically the Executive level, are embedded in networks with other organisations and are exposed on more regularly to the more ideological elements of the movement. Attendance at conferences, APF meetings,

meetings with other like-minded organisations and interaction with intellectuals and activists often means more of a consciousness of the ideological struggle which underpins the material struggle experienced at the grassroots.

The dissemination of information to the wider constituencies is another issue related to the use and abuse of information in the movement. The APF acts as a centralising and unifying forum for the affiliated organisations. They take on a large amount of the responsibility for disseminating information pertaining to activities, issues, strategies to the various affiliates and have a broad repertoire of means by which to disseminate information. General information as discussed at Office Bearer or Executive Committee meetings is disseminated to members of the various organisations via their leaders. However, there have been many cases where this channel of communication fails. It is suggested by McKinley (interview, 2010) that the correct structures are in place for a successful communication between various levels of the organisations and organisations within the APF. However in the absence of committed leaders and activists, these channels may fail.

Exclusion from the production of knowledge on social movements is another topic which warrants discussion. For example, the Decade of Dissent conference held at the University of Johannesburg from 12-14 November 2010 included only members of academia and those activists who were academics too or attached to an academic institution. The elitist nature of the conference was briefly alluded to in the closing address by one of the organisers but no explanation was given. Conceptualised as an academic conversation and reflection on the last decade, many social movement organisations were discussed and critically examined. However, aside from one or two activists who are involved in organisations, but who are *also* considered to be academics, representatives from the organisations discussed were entirely absent. Dale McKinley and John Appolis from the APF were present and often drew on their experiences in the APF during the discussions, but the many organisations presented on were not represented by members from within their ranks. This symbolised the elitist nature of theorisation on social movements from some of the very same people who were very critical of the role of intellectuals within movements[xix].

Framing

The SECC is an organisation with an explicitly socialist ideology. The constitution of the SECC states "our dream is socialism, a society where the working class owns and controls the wealth and means of producing this wealth". The "Vision" subsection of the constitution concludes with the slogan "forward to socialism" (SECC Constitution, 2003). It is observed by many social movement researchers (for example Sinwell, 2010 and Runciman, 2010) in South Africa that "there is a sharp disjuncture between ideologies manufactured by intellectuals and the world views that the working class and poor possess" (Sinwell, 2010). A similar phenomenon was observed in the SECC. Very few respondents at the grassroots level could define either socialism or democracy. A focus group on internal democracy was conducted at a forum meeting in November 2010. One of the questions was "what is the ideology of the SECC?". Present at the meeting were a number of executive committee members, branch leaders and a few branch members. The question was posed and then explained as the beliefs of the organisation. All of the responses were framed in terms of what the organisation sought to achieve and referred to the achievement of basic services for all. Clearly the slogan of "free basic services for all" had penetrated all levels of the organisation. Responses included "ideology of SECC is to see everybody having houses; electricity and water, education. People having jobs (permanent)" and "the SECC is to help the community on the basic services, eg water electricity evictions – to win the struggle of all the people services" (direct transcription from focus group worksheets). However, none of the respondents explicitly identified socialism as the ideology of the movement.

Mngeni (2010) however takes a different point of view of the issue of the disjuncture between the ideologies of the organisation's leadership and the grassroots. He proposes rather that while grassroots may not be conceptually aware of neo liberalism, in their militant opposition to neoliberal policies and practices they are still essentially enacting anti-neoliberal processes. He proposes that it is "politically and analytically incorrect" to assume that only the leadership of the movement is anti neoliberal. He suggests that:

> Some of the militants in our communities may not know what neo-liberalism is, but the fact that they organise and mobilise against the direct effects of neo-liberalism is a clear testimony of direct challenge to neo -liberalism (Mngeni, 2010: page unknown).

When considered from this point of view, clearly the constituent members of the social movement organisations which oppose neo liberalism in South Africa are effectively

challenging neo liberalism through praxis, which may not necessarily be reflected in their consciousness of neo liberalism. What is necessary then is for a deeper reading of the ideologies of the grassroots of organisations as opposed to merely assuming that their practices of protest in response to specific policies necessarily reflect a deeper understanding of the ideologies underpinning those policies. While they may not explicitly acknowledge or recognise socialism as the ideology of the organisation, they do subscribe to many socialist beliefs, and through *praxis* exemplify the stance of anti neo liberalism and in many ways socialism too.

Not all the leaders of the organisation, who are typically responsible for the framing of issues, have a grasp on the underlying ideologies of the organisation, which ultimately inform the organisations actions. This is problematic in the framework of mandated delegation where branch leaders for example, are responsible for portraying communication back to their branches. Combined with the mandated delegate role and educators, a process of "broken telephone" was evident where messages often became watered down, or mixed up during the communication process.

Digital Democracy

Inextricably related to the production and dissemination of knowledge is this issue of digital democracy. In the last decade and a half, the role of Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) has pervaded all spheres of human activity, not the least of those, the formal sphere of politics. With the dawning of the "information age", the role of ICTs in politics has generated a fair amount of discussion, with debates ranging from the role of ICTs in creating a more participatory and direct form of democracy to debates surrounding accessibility, amongst many other issues. However, one of the key issues surrounding the use of ICTs as a tool for expanding citizen participation, is that of access and it is suggested by Hague and Loader (1999: 9) that "the potential of ICTs to facilitate 'strong democracy' must be seriously questioned if people are systematically denied access on the basis of economic status, gender, geographic location, educational attainment, and so on" while van Dijk (2005) suggests that the "digital divide" is not only widening, but where it is already wide, it is deepening. While access to ICTs is increasing exponentially, it is important to

remember that ICTs do remain the domain of a small and privileged elite (Hague & Loader, 1999: 9-14), especially in countries which are dominated by such vast inequalities as South Africa is. The effect of unequal access to ICTs, unequal access to information and the implicit unequal access to the widespread information pertaining to the movement shall be examined. Cell phones have been one ICT which many subaltern populations have access to and the role they could play in the democratisation of African countries has been discussed by Dugmore (2009) who stresses that the new media and specifically ICTs "are going to make a significant difference to democracy, to transparency, to political participation... [in Africa]". While Dugmore is speaking specifically on the role of ICTs in electoral politics in Africa, there is certainly potential for cell phones to play a role in the enhancement of democracy in social movement organisations. While internet penetration in Soweto is only 2.7% (IT-online, 2008), there is potential for increased internet access on cell phones. It is suggested that of urban cell phone users in South Africa, 65% have the capacity to access the internet on their cell phones, but only 28% of the urban cell phone using population does access the internet on their cell phones (Mansfield, 2010). It is believed that most people do not know how to use the internet applications on their phones (Mansfield, 2010). Considering the demographics of the constituencies of the new social movements in South Africa (pensioners, limited education) it is no surprise that internet has not been incorporated as a main form of communication. Furthermore, surveys have shown that the majority of South African cell phone users believe that cell phone costs are excessive (Mail and Guardian online, 2010). It comes as no surprise then that the SECC and APF do not appear to use cell phones as a key tool of communication with their constituencies very frequently.

The issue of technology and the movements of the poor is one where the disjuncture between the constituents and some of the intellectual-activists comes to a fore. The majority of the constituent members of the organisations do not have access to the website, either to post entries, or to see what has been posted For example between 2009 and 2010, only two people posted anything on the APF website. Those two were Nic and Dale McKinley. Before this time, there was only one other named contributor to the website, that of Ahmed Veriava. The website is possibly the most important interface between the APF and other similar movements from other countries. However, the website represents the

views of those who have access to it, particularly an elite stratum of activists. The implication of this is that only a very small group of people involved in the organisations has control over the type of information being disseminated in the name of the website. The APF website is not an open source website whereby any visitor to the site can add information, but rather only those who are named as administrators of the website can. The majority of the constituents who the website is supposed to represent do not have regular or any access to the technologies necessary to access the information portrayed on the website. One has to question, then, whose views does the website represent? Does it represent the elite few who have access to it, or does it truly represent the organisations views? Secondly, what function does the website serve? It is certainly not a tool for communication for the grassroots constituents of the organisation as the majority of them do not have access to it. It must be said that the website was not established with the intention of being a means for communication within the movement, but rather as a means of communicating with other movements. McKinley claims that the development and maintenance of the website has never been a priority of the APF (McKinley, 2010). However, as previously mentioned, the website is one of the most important forums whereby the APF is integrated into a global network. The website was furthermore described by the administrator as a "marketing tool" and was said to be the means by which the website markets itself to the rest of the world (Interview, APF Administrator, 2010). Sinwell (2010) notes that "while websites do much to publicise movements to a group of left leaning South African and international activists and scholars, they do little to actually mobilise and strengthen movements" which could perhaps be attributed to the digital divide and the exclusion of the majority of movements' constituencies from access to internet and other ICTs.

Local and Global, Collaborations and 'body borrowing'

The SECC is an organisation primarily concerned with local issues, such as electricity, water and housing. However, they are often conceptualised as being part of the broader global justice movement. The constituent members of the organisation tend to stay involved on a local level. However, for select members of the leadership level, there is the possibility for integration in national and international networks, and the formation of relationships and

solidarity expanding far beyond the borders of Soweto. The reasons for this are that the leadership level is in regular contact with the well-resourced and well-connected APF (and other organisations) and also they leadership level has access to communication technology which is in many way inaccessible to the grassroots level. Many of the respondents were aware of the APF but were very unclear on the relationship between the SECC and the APF.

Some members of the leadership level of the organisation have the opportunity to travel and engage with other like-minded activists. They experience a wider network and are far more integrated into the national and international levels of the struggle. Ngwane, for example, writes for the London-based New Left Review. A select few of the executive leadership have travelled, both within South Africa and abroad, as representatives of the SECC. Those activists who are most involved in the organisation are aware of their links to a global struggle, and those who have travelled have networked with activists the world over, however, this is a very small and elite group within the leadership the constituent members were neither aware of nor concerned with their role in the larger struggle.

The SECC is also involved with the environmental organisation Earthlife. This is an example of collaboration between a 'survivalist' and 'post materialist' organisation. Earthlife has provided education on sustainable and green energy to the SECC and their relationship is cemented by their shared anti-Eskom sentiments. When questioned further about the relationship between Earthlife and the SECC, an SECC activist noted that Earthlife sometimes provided "food and transportation" (interview, executive committee member, 2010) for the SECC in return for the SECC supporting their marches and picketing, although it was acknowledged that Earthlife did not give funding in the form of cash to the organisation. This is an interesting relationship when considered in terms of the resource mobilisation school of thought. The relationship between the SECC and Earthlife is essentially an economic one, whereby a transaction occurs (at least according to the interviewee). In return for support at Earthlife events, the SECC is given resources they need. Ultimately the social movement landscape can be understood as a market: from Earthlife's side, there is a demand for bodies or support, while on the SECC side there is a demand for resources. Each demand can be fulfilled by the other and so a transaction of sorts takes place. As previously discussed, the social movement landscape is also a

competitive one, and other organisations also compete with the SECC for the resources thatEarthlife can provide, and there are other organisations (such as Cosatu) who borrow bodies from the SECC when they require mass support.

The Anti Privatisation Forum

When looking at the SECC it is almost impossible not to include reference to the APF. The organisations started around the same time and have been inextricably linked since their inception. It may even be said that the SECC, and other affiliates, are subject to a certain degree of multilevel governance by affiliation with the APF. While the APF does allow for a high degree of autonomy within the affiliates, some decisions taken by the APF are binding on all of its affiliates. Furthermore, the SECC and the APF have many overlapping leaders, and there was evidence of very intricate relations between the two organisations, although this appears to have diminished in recent years, also in part due to the split in the SECC resulting in the formation of the SCR. However, the APF and the SECC still do have very strong ties to each other. The APF is an organisation founded in 2000 similarly to the SECC in response to the iGoli 2002 Plan and Wits 2001. However, it differs fundamentally in that it is essentially an umbrella organisation, or a *forum* (Buhlungu, 2006: 71) which seeks to "unite struggles against privatisation in the workplace and community" (APF, 2001). One of its key aims is to link and unite organisations who are actively involved in the struggle against privatisation and it "provides a forum for communities and workers to share their experiences and to strategise collectively" (APF, 2001).

Structure

When the APF was originally formed, and the structure it was to take was debated, there were many within the movement who sought to institute a completely non-hierarchical, totally horizontal structure. However, it was acknowledged that this type of 'structurelessness' could breed the exact type of tyranny it sought to oppose. McKinley describes the decision to adopt formal structures in the following terms:

> We felt in particular that there had to be democratic structures set up where you had elected leadership, because otherwise it would devolve into powerful personalities. People who happen to be the best in meetings or who happen to have particular skills would eventually move towards the top

> and take those positions without having any kind of structural accountability. So in that context the setting up of Office Bearers, of the Coordinating Committee, of Executive might seem quite hierarchical and quite structural but our experience in the APF has been that that is what has held the organisation together (Interview: McKinley, 2010).

The executive level of the APF comprises of three main bodies, namely, the Executive Committee, the Co-ordinating Committee and the Office Bearers. The Co-ordinating Committee is the "highest decision-making body of the APF in between the Annual General Meetings..." (APF, 2007: 4) and is comprised of delegates from community based affiliates of the APF, the elected Office Bearers and Co-ordinators of sub-committees. The Executive Committee comprises of the same participants however in different ratios. As no reason for this is explicitly stated in the constitution, it can be surmised that this is related to the relative responsibilities of the two committees and the ratios are to ensure voting reflects representatively the wills of the various affiliates of the APF. It is suggested that the structure of the APF is to ensure that the key decisions are taken by the largest number of people possible, for example, issues concerning strategy and the election of leadership occurs at the Annual General Meeting, while the day-to-day and organisational issues are considered in the Office Bearers and Executive Committee meetings (interviews with APF members). The next level of the APF is the regional structures of which there are four, Tshwane, the Vaal, the East Rand and Johannesburg. Each region has an elected leader who participates in executive committee meetings.

The structure of the APF reflects the nature of the movement, that of it being an umbrella movement under which affiliated organisations can pursue similar goals as a unified front. This is reflected in the fact that all affiliates are represented at both Coordinating Committee meetings and Executive Committee meetings. Organisations who wish to be affiliated need to apply to the Coordinating Committee who determines the "conditions upon which organisations of members thereof may become affiliated with, or expelled from the APF" (APF, 2007:5). Affiliates enjoy a high degree of autonomy and an extremely heterogeneous set of organisations are affiliated to the APF, but affiliation to the APF does subject members to certain conditions.

The existence of a constitution is itself arguably a democratic value and considered an indication of *formalisation* (Della Porta, 2009: 35), as it provides a set of rules which are

binding on the members of the organisation, and can increase and improve the accountability of members. It sets out a normative framework of what the organisation strives to be and the values that it should advocate. The Constitution of the APF makes sporadic allusions to the internal structures of the organisation. However the constitution lacks the coherence and detail regarding democratic proceedings and values which other constitutions do espouse. While the constitution alludes to internal democracy, it never explicitly states what is meant by the terms democracy or how "mass democratic organisation" should occur. In section 2, it is suggested as an objective of the APF that the organisation "should use working class methods of struggle including mass democratic organisation..." (APF, 2007: 1) and it is furthermore outlined that affiliates "are expected to operate on the basis of democracy and community control over the organisation" (APF, 2007: 3). The constitution suggests that "mass meetings, mandates and accountability must be the operative principles of affiliates" (APF, 2007: 3), and a structure of mandated delegation seems to be the primary representational method expected by the affiliates in relation to the role they play in the APF. From this is can be surmised that the APF does value internal democracy, but that a certain degree of independence and interpretation of how affiliates should operate is granted to affiliates, or in other words the APF does not wish to prescribe ideals or particular structures on the affiliated groups.

The relationship between the APF and its various affiliates differs from affiliation to affiliation. What the APF does do, however, is provide a forum wherein all those organisations which are pursuing loosely related goals can come together. It also provides resources for its affiliates. Largely under-resourced itself, the APF does have some international funders, and the large number of middle class activists in the movement means that there are global ties to a number or organisations abroad. One of the biggest roles the APF plays in the lives of its affiliates is that of providing resources. For example, when an affiliate decides to hold a protest or march, they can apply to the APF for funding for that event, the APF will then decide whether or not to grant the transport. The APF also provides other resources such as the use of telephones and photocopying. It used to publish a quarterly newspaper. However, one hasn't been published since 2009. It also provides information to the affiliates about other marches and occurrences around South Africa and

is a very important part of solidarity networks which have developed between the movements in South Africa.

Deliberation

Regarding deliberation, it appears that consensus is most frequently used to resolve disagreements and this is enshrined in the constitution which states that "...decisions pertaining to the APF shall be undertaken first by consensus and if no consensus then by a simple majority of votes" (APF, 2007: 4) and it is further noted that each delegate is entitled to a single vote. The culture of deliberation appears to have been fostered during the APF's formative years and is attributed to the leadership style of John Appolis. Deliberation however, does seem evident, but rather as a means to an end as opposed to an end in itself. It may be surmised therefore, that the varying numbers of delegates to be included in Coordinating Committee meetings and Executive Committee meetings ensures issues voted on receive relevant weighting in terms of relevance to the appropriate bodies. In practice, active deliberation is ongoing and open to all participants at meetings. However the goal of preference transformation is usually not attained, as voting is regularly implemented to make quick decisions. Processes of deliberation are widely criticised for being time consuming and inefficient, and this certainly appeared the case in observations of meetings of the APF, where a large portion of the meeting was devoted to discussing the methodology of the meeting and how it should be conducted, with many differing opinions of how the meeting should be conducted being considered and evaluated. Deliberation is furthermore criticised for being biased in favour of those who are more eloquent and forceful in the expression of their point of view suppressing the views of others who are not as vocal or expressive. As in many instances where a group of people come together to collectively discuss issues and make important decisions which are binding on a larger group of people, a few voices dominate and many others seem to be suppressed which stands in contrast to the deliberative democratic ideal of deliberation "among free, equal and rational agents" (Elster, 1998: 5). The ideal of equality does not seem to be enforced in this particular setting with debates typically being dominated by the stronger personalities and it seems also often to boil down to personal agendas and rivalries between members which stands in contrast to the ideal as laid down in the constitution of those partaking in the meetings being mandated representatives expressing the will of a larger group.

Equality between participants is considered an important deliberative value. However the trajectory of power that exists between movement participants cannot be ignored. It has been described by other observers and participants of movements how race, class, gender and education can influence the way one is viewed by others in the movement. Walsh (2008) describes the uncomfortable situation in which she was valorised in an almost spiritual manner for some work she did with a social movement organisation. Furthermore, while many activists do claim to relinquish their role as academics and rather take on the role of activist when participating in movements, they are still privileged in many ways over their counterparts with non-academic backgrounds. This gives them an advantage in terms of appearing more knowledgeable, and being more influential, as well as in terms of their having more skills which are necessary to the movement's continuance. As a former member of the APF said of a particularly involved activist (who had came from a middle class intellectual background), "he made himself indispensable to the movement" (conversation with Former APF member, 2010). The importance of intellectual-activists within movements should not be underestimated. However it must be acknowledged that their participation is not always on the basis of equality, but rather they do at times adopt a pedagogical position, and they do come from positions of privilege in terms of skills and knowledge.

Considering that one of the goals of deliberation is that of achieving consensus through rational argument and preference transformation, it is necessary to acknowledge the possible tension associated with deliberative democracy which operates in the framework of mandated delegation. For example, if a delegate is carrying a binding mandate, such that straying from the mandate may result in recall or expulsion, how does that leave the delegate with any scope for preference transformation in a meeting with other delegates? The only way this might work is if a delegate whose preference has been transformed does not express this transformed preference in a vote until he or she has gone back to the voters who issued the mandate and obtained their permission to vote differently. However, this is would be an extremely time consuming and logistically impossible way to operate. Mandated delegates are therefore faced with the choice of possible deviation from the mandate, should their preferences be transformed, or maintaining their mandate which may lead to a deadlock in the deliberative process. The other alternative is that the delegate

could deviate from the mandate and then upon returning to their branch, attempt to transform the preferences of their fellow members, thus extended the process of preference transformation into the mandated delegation model or representation. This tension was not observed in any of the meetings attended, but needs to be addressed in a discussion of the role of deliberation in framework of mandated delegation.

Inclusivity

The APF is open to the "the working class of the world regardless of colour, creed, gender, age, sexual orientation or place or origin" (APF, 2007: 1). With regards to representivity, roughly equal numbers of men and women were represented at the meetings, and a wide variety of age groups. In contrast with the SECC who tended to have a far older age range of executive members, there appears to be more of a representative age range present in the APF.

One of the most important factors hampering inclusivity of the APF, and many other social movement organisations is the issue of meeting times and venues. While transport to venues is widely held to be hugely problematic for those wishing to attend, the fact that the meetings occur on weekdays during office hours excludes many potential participants from participation. The organisations tend to draw support from the poor and the unemployed due to their ideological orientation and stance. However the unaccommodating meeting times mean that even employed people who support the cause are unlikely to be able to participate in many of the regular activities of the organisation. Having a full-time job is likely to preclude the possibility of a leadership position or regular interaction in the organisation. It appears that some participants in the movement have an additional source of income, besides the state grants which the majority of participants depended on as their primary source of income. Hiring out of phones, running tuck shops and other forms of part time employment were pursued by many members but, by and large, state grants were the primary source of income. Interestingly, state grants are referred to as "ANC grants" by most interviewees. It was also repeatedly acknowledged that grants came from the ANC, but other functions that local ward councillors were to fulfil went unfulfilled by the relevant structures, and social movement organisations, church groups and other social and political groups provided many of these functions.

Participation

Social movements are heralded as spaces where the radical ideal of continuous and meaningful participation can occur. This is one of the main reasons for their existence, the provision of a space for meaningful political participation. For those members who hold leadership positions, participation is regular and continuous, as the presence of leaders as representatives of their constituencies is required regularly at meetings. Each affiliate has autonomy in how often meetings are to be held, but representatives from each affiliate are expected to be present at every Executive Committee and every Office Bearers Meeting. Applying Reiter's (2009) typology of participation, I would classify the APF as medium high, as the executive committee does hold significantly strong decision-making powers, and the assembly meets at least once a year at the AGM, but it was suggested by Executive Committee members that the assembly does come together more often than the annual AGM.

One of the key issues obstructing many of the affiliates and their members from continuous participation is a lack of resources which is one of the reasons for the development of the representative structure of the forum. As McKinley notes: "you cannot, due to extremely minimal financial resources, bring large numbers of people together so there had to be a representative structure" (interview McKinley, 2010). From the members perspectives, as movements whose constituencies are 'the poor', the working class and the unemployed, the costs associated with transport and the opportunity cost associated with constantly attending meetings and being involved in organisational activities cannot be downplayed. From the organisation's perspective, the cost of hiring a venue, disseminating information about the event and providing transport to the event on a regular basis is too high. It is common practice for the APF to provide transport to members for events such as marches and protests, as well as covering the transport costs of the leaders of the APF and the affiliated organisations for meetings at the APF offices.

Accountability

One of the elements of internal democracy that seems to be distinctly lacking in the APF is that of accountability. Funds are regularly stolen or misused for non-organisational activities. On the day of an Office Bearers meeting observed in 2010, a large sum of money was stolen out of the safe. Many of those present at the meeting expressed anger and frustration, but it was acknowledged by almost everyone that nothing would ultimately be done, and the offender would get off without punishment of any sort. The general attitude of most of those present was summed up in the comment of one of the Office Bearers who said "well, why would this time be any different? Let's stop fooling ourselves and get on with the meeting, nothing is going to get done about it" (observation, Office Bearers Meeting). This attitude was further echoed by another member of the executive committee who described how money was regularly misused with no disciplinary action for those who committed the offences.

Nepotism

Rumours about nepotism in the APF are rife within the organised working class, both affiliated to the APF and not affiliated to the APF. An executive committee member of the SECC directly stated that nepotism within the APF occurred, further stating "at the moment, the SCR is the sweetheart of the APF" when asking for an example, he stated that when the SECC had requested 4 buses for a march, only 2 were sent, but when the SCR requested 8 buses, all 8 were sent. "It happens all the time" that unequal privilege is afforded to different affiliates" the SECC member stated.

Oligarchy?

An organisations ability to remain internally democratic is another aspect of internal democracy which has not received the attention it deserves. Regarding the SECC, it appears that the iron law of oligarchy holds, due to a number of facts. The fact that there has been a distinct lack in rotation of leadership, as well as a noticed decline in the role and participation of the masses indicates the tendency towards oligarchisation in the SECC. It appears that not only power, but also opportunity for participation are increasingly centralised in the Executive Committee, as the majority of the claimed tens of thousands

membership base only partake in periodic SECC activities (if that). In a casual conversation with another researcher from abroad, it was suggested that another organisation (the Schubert Park Residents) should perhaps be studied as it is "newer and still practices a very direct form of democracy". This offhand comments is suggestive of the implicit if not accepted fact that as organisations age, they become less democratic and tend to abide by Michels's Iron Law. This also appears to be the case with Abahlali as despite their proclaimed emphasis on democracy, and proclaimed emphasis on rotation, their leadership base has remained resolutely intact since their inception. Abahlali is however, a younger organisation, and a substantive conclusion on their tendencies towards oligarchisation cannot and should not be prematurely drawn, however it is clear that a small coterie of activists dominates the leadership of the organisation, and the long-time chairperson S'bu Zikode, who has been described as having been attributed "near mythical qualities" (Böhmke, 2010b), is extremely powerful within the organisation. Despite many of the organisations commitments to internal democracy, many of them are dominated by a single, or small group, of charismatic leaders, this is evident in the SECC (Trevor Ngwane), APF (Dale McKinley, George Appolis) and Abahlali (S'bu Zikode). There does appear to be a noticeable tendency in social movement organisations for a small group of core activists to dominate the executive leadership of the organisations and participate to a much higher degree than branch leaders and members. While there is the need for a core group of activists to be present to maintain the day-to-day running of the organisation, it appears that there is rarely a rotation of these members. What appears to happen is that this group of leaders makes a profession out of their activism, making it their primary occupation, often making themselves indispensable to the movement and precluding the possibility of a rotation of leadership.

Spatial dynamics and effects on democracy

Organisations which are resource scarce face many problems when trying to mobilise and include the masses in a meaningful way. This compounded with the spatial dynamics of organisations has great implications for internal democracy. Dwyer (2006: 101) differentiates between a community leadership which is localised and organic, and "city-based comrades" who make up an informal leadership. This is noted in reference to the CCF in Durban, but a similar trend can be observed in the APF. As an umbrella organisation, the

APF has a head office in Johannesburg CBD which serves as the site where the activities of affiliates are coordinated and where most APF meetings occur. This is geographically distant from many of the affiliated organisations, and there are many costs associated with going to the APF offices. Transport costs are sometimes covered by the APF, for example when representatives and office bearers have to come to the offices for meetings. However, the physical distance and the costs associated with coming to the offices may impede inclusivity and participation for members who wish to make direct claims on the APF. This physical difference reinforces the role and importance of mandated representatives as it is through them that claim have to be made.

A similar situation is evident in the SECC, where the offices are situated at the Careers Centre in Diepkloof. The weekly forum meeting which is open to the assembly is held at the same venue, but the opportunity costs associated with travelling to the venue may be hampering the constituents' participation in what should be an inclusive and participatory meeting. Furthermore, branch leaders who do travel to the head offices and attend the meetings are often reimbursed for their efforts, but obviously due to a lack of resources, not all members of the assembly can have their travels costs provided by the organisation. As previously discussed, branch representatives who attend the forum meeting have their travel costs covered by donations from the branch. This is an example of how hidden patterns of exclusivity influence the unequal participation in the movement.

Kitchen Table Politics

While waiting for meetings to begin, sitting in waiting rooms, many informal conversations between people were observed. These conversations were often more informative than observing the meetings and were a prime example of how many important decisions were influenced and made outside of the official decision-making structures. The debates that went on in the meetings were sometimes something of a facade for decisions that had clearly been taken elsewhere already. This is a commonly observed phenomenon in new social movements as noted by a leader of a movement in an organisation in Germany:

> Assemblies were public, but a small group would sit down in a cafe and decide in half an hour what had not been decided there in five hours. It was necessary. We could not do otherwise. We could not leave everything to spontaneity (cited in Della Porta and Diani, 2006: 137-138).

While deliberative democracy and inclusive decision-making are considered inherently valuable, and attempts are made to include large numbers of people in decision-making, the reality is that many important decisions are actually taken by a few in the top ranks of the organisations. This undermines the inclusive participatory structures and shows them often to be a mere facade. This is also a very difficult phenomenon to measure and observe as these conversations which were ultimately of great importance for the organisations were personal and therefore difficult to observe. What this did reveal however was that personal loyalties did play a role in the organisation and perhaps impeded certain democratic practices, such as decision-making and deliberation.

The core groups (including the organiser, administrator, chairperson, treasurer) involved in the running of both the SECC and the APF interacted with each other on a far more regular basis than branch leaders and normal members. They therefore had more of an opportunity to forge alliances, reveal their beliefs and try to transform the preferences of others before deliberation or voting in the assembly. While it is unrealistic to suggest that all decisions affecting the organisation should occur in the open assembly, there are certainly a core group of people involved in the organisations who establish the agenda and strategy of the organisation with more than a little of their own agenda woven in. They also discuss SECC issues constantly with each other and in small groups.

An interesting phenomenon was experienced at the focus group held in a forum meeting with the SECC. The participants were asked to organise themselves into groups of 5 to 6. There were roughly enough people to make 5 equally sized groups. Of these groups 2 groups contained only women, 2 comprised of women and men and one group comprised of men only. The male only group showed a distinct reluctance to engage with the activity and to engage with me during the discussion period, and their attitude to the exercise bordered on hostility. Of all the groups, they were the only one which did not write their responses in English. While it had been stipulated that responses could be in any language, all the other groups responded in English. Responding in English had appeared throughout the research to be a means by which people showed their willingness to cooperate with the researcher and to try accommodate the researcher by communicating in their researcher's first language, despite there always being a translator present. What fuelled this hostility from the group of men was not clear but what it did illustrate was the bonds and loyalties

evident in the group. Of these men, one was usually friendly with me and always willing to talk and help me, however when in the group with the other two men, he became as hostile of them. This shows how the presence of some, perhaps more influential members, affects the decisions individuals make, how they react and how they change according to the company. Without dwelling on the intricacies of group behaviour, it is important to note that in the presence of certain individuals, others changed their behaviour which may also be a common occurrence in meetings where important decisions are made.

Conclusion

When discussing internal democracy in social movement organisations, it would be foolish to merely categorise organisations as either democratic, or non-democratic. Rather it needs to be acknowledged that degrees of democracy exist, and there are certain areas in which certain organisations may be more democratic than others. Furthermore it must be acknowledged that understandings and conceptions of democracy that are developed and advocated in normative terms in academia may not be congruent with praxis in movements. This is not an aspect that has been examined here, but in light of debates surrounding the place of academics and by association academic institutions in social movements which represent subaltern populations, it is an area of study in its own right.

While drawing general conclusions about new social movements in South Africa from one case study would be erroneous, what this research has attempted to do is show that internal democracy is a vitally important area of research in social movement theory, and one which has gone largely unresearched, particularly in the context of new social movements in the South, and in South Africa particular.

The social movements which have emerged in the last decade in South Africa have been the focus of much research, however this research often draws on theory that has been formulated in the North and is particular to their Northern context. It has been shown here that uncritically applying Northern theory to Southern contexts is associated with many problems. An issue that has not been addressed in this essay, but is an area of study in its own right, is the issue of interpreting democracy and the democratic ideals that inform many of the social movements in South Africa in a manner which incorporates African culture and a brand of African democracy, that is, not merely applying democratic ideals from the North to the South. In other words, reinterpreting democracy through an African lens.

The context in which the 'poor movements' in South Africa have emerged is one defined by the extreme inequality prevalent in South African society. The legacy of apartheid which has lead to the spatial segregation of racial groups prevails in South Africa, and along these spatial divisions there is still vast evidence of privilege along racial lines. Inroads have been made in uplifting the previously oppressed population, but this has not been to the benefit

of the masses, despite promises from the government (especially at election times). Combined with this is the perception that the local government structures which have been implemented in order to enhance participation are defined by corruption, greed and inefficiency. It is in this context that the neo-liberal policies that the ANC government has adopted have been identified as one of the main causes of suffering and discontent in the townships leading to the establishment of the social movements who oppose them. These movements started emerging around 2000 indicating that people were starting to become disillusioned with their liberation government who were not providing the promised basic goods and services fast enough. However, the ANC maintains its political dominance and many of the members of social movement organisations still vote for the ANC or have stopped voting seeing little point in the voting process. The social movements which have sprung up all over South Africa seek both materialistic outcomes (the provision of water, electricity, housing et cetera), but some levels in the organisations also undertake a fundamental critique of politics as practiced by the ANC.

Many social movement organisations in South Africa make a commitment to internal democracy in their constitutions. This is indicative of democratic values being considered important by the movements themselves. However, the actual practice of democracy is easier said than done and there are many areas in which the organisations under study fell short of the democratic ideal. A lack of resources was the most important aspect which contributed to the SECC's inability to further enhance democracy and continue striving towards the democratic ideal. The lack of resources undermined the organisations communication strategies, which was one of the contributing factors to the decreasing membership. It contributed to the superficial participation experienced by many of the constituent members of the organisation. The distribution of the scarce resources which were available, mostly from the APF, lead to nepotism and was one of the contributing factors in the split in the SECC leading to the formation of the SCR. This severely weakened the membership of the SECC and it doesn't seem to have ever fully recovered from the incident. Access to resources has also served as incentive for people to join the movements especially in the executive leadership level of the movement as with these positions there can often be access to phones, computers, money and influential people. This has resulted in some people joining the organisations not because they subscribe to the beliefs of the

organisations but because of the material gains associated with the organisation. These members can have a detrimental affect on the organisation as they are not committed to its cause.

The legitimacy of the SECC may be questioned based on the fact that the vast majority of the constituent members are effectively excluded from any direct participation in decision-making processes. While it seems constituent members have extensive knowledge of the correct channels and processes to get things done within the organisation, the organisation does function through an extensive structure of mandated delegation which it seems leads to a certain amount of "broken telephone" communication and a very indirect and distant relationship between the leadership and the constituency. However, it also emerged that the constituent members were generally very pleased with what the organisation had done for them and they did not seem concerned about their lack of involvement in the organisations activities and decision-making. This once again highlighted the disjuncture between the leadership, pursuing explicitly ideological goals and the constituents who seemed more concerned with the material benefits of association with the organisation.

The issue of the role intellectuals are to play in movements has been discussed in detail with a range of problems associated with their involvement being brought to the fore against the background of current debates in academia. Intellectuals and intellectual-activists often bring their own agenda to organisations and influence the organisations in ways which are not necessarily positive. However, they are often an integral part of the organisations especially in terms of securing and managing funding. This can however become problematic when they become fundamental to the existence of the organisation and their departure from the organisation leaves a void which is very difficult to fill. Furthermore, there are many problems associated with creating knowledge about movements and within movements and about the sharing of knowledge within movements and between outsiders and insiders.

The issue of internal democracy is one which warrants far more detailed analysis in new social movement theory, but also particularly with regards to new social movements in South Africa. It cannot be taken as a given that social movement organisations are internally democratic and considering that much new social movement theory is premised on internal

democracy and that social movement organisations commit to practicing internal democracy, it is an element of new social movement theory that should not be ignored.

Endnotes

[i] It must be noted that what exactly constitutes the 'hegemony' differs from social movement to social movement. So for example, people on the right may see themselves as challenging left wing hegemony while leftists in the same country may see themselves as challenging rightwing hegemony.

[ii] For a heated debate on the role of researchers, activists and intellectuals see Walsh (2008), Bond (2008) and Desai (2008).

[iii] Discussing Abahlali baseMjondolo, Böhmke (2010b) proposes that there are in fact 3 types of intellectuals who dominate the organisation: "left-leaning social scientists", "lawyers" and "the gatekeepers", an elite group of activists inextricably involved in the organisation.

[iv] Desai has more recently aligned himself with the argument that intellectuals and activists alike should be more honest and critical of social movement organisations.

[v] Ngwane is cited a total of 11 times, while the sum total citations of "activists", "branch members" and "organiser" is 8 times.

[vi] Ngwane has been published in *The New Left Review, The Mail and Guardian,* books such as *A Movement of Movements*, and is cited repeatedly as a source, if not the primary source, in most articles on the SECC.

[vii] For a detailed criticism of the New Social Movement Paradigm, see Pichardo (1997)

[viii] Also called "political society" by Partha Chatterjee.

[ix] AbM is often heralded as a prime example of one of these organisations. Originally starting out as an organisation concerned with poor service delivery particularly in terms of housing and land, it is now an organisation concerned with giving voice to the poor (Walsh, 2009: 262-263) and maintaining an autonomous democratic tradition (Gibson, 2003).

[x] For a more detailed discussion on the incompatibility of Western notions of civil society and many situations in the Global South, see Hann (1996) and Goody (2001).

[xi] Heller (2003: 159) suggests that there were four main ways in which the civics could contribute to the deepening of democracy. Firstly, by providing a space where townships residents could "associate and deliberate around community issues. Secondly, they can provide the resources and the framework for mobilisation and engagement with the state. Third, they could play a watchdog role on the state, and finally, they can participate in policy formulation as an interest group.

[xii] For example, "The City of Johannesburg is committed to strengthening and extending public participation of communities in all aspects of the life of council" (City of Johannesburg, 2002).

[xiii] iGoli 2002 " was essentially a three-year strategic plan with its emphasis on the structural transformation of the city. It sought to ensure cost-effective service delivery by reducing fragmentation, eliminating duplication, improving accountability, focusing on human development and providing performance incentives" (City of Johannesburg, 2002).

[xiv] Interestingly, in the run-up to the 2011 local elections which OKM plans to contest, Eskom and a variety of other business interests including Crime Line, Primedia, and Proudly South African have launched an extensive media campaign entitled "Operation Khanyisa" which seeks to raise awareness about electricity theft (read illegal reconnections). It also provides a platform for reporting electricity theft and warns of the dangers, both personal and legal, associated with electricity theft (see www.operationkhanyisa.co.za). It is highly ironic, and definitely not a coincidence, that this extensive media campaign has the same name as the political party, and they support the exact opposite ideas. Whether this will be to the detriment of Operation Khanyisa Movement (the political party) or to its advantage remains to be seen but it may happen that the publicity generated by Operation Khanyisa's extensive and expensive media campaign will contribute to awareness of OKM (the political party).

[xv] Estimates vary from about 7000 (Egan and Wafer) to 10 000 (executive committee member).

[xvi] Data obtained from the registers of Executive Committee Meetings and Forum Meetings, both of which were attended by the researcher.

[xvii] Reconnectors are individuals who reconnect electricity that has been disconnected. SECC members can approach the organisation and request that their electricity be reconnected, the organisations will then send a reconnector to do the reconnection. The reconnectors spoken to learnt how to reconnect from an acquaintance who was employed by Eskom in the late 1990's. The skill was then passed on as the need for reconnectors grew.

[xviii] The SECC has a strict policy of not signing anything which is not fully understood. There have been many cases where people, especially the old and vulnerable, have been tricked into signing contracts agreeing to the installation of prepaid electricity and water metres. It has also been alleged that food vouchers are distributed in the community and the signatures used to sign for them are actually on a petition used to show support for prepaid water metres in the community thereby legitimising their installation. It has not been possible to verify this validity of these claims, but there is widespread belief throughout the communities that this is in fact the case.

[xix] Most notably, Böhmke and Desai were to present a paper during the "Legal Struggles and the role of 'outsiders' in Social Movements" session, but both pulled out allegedly at the last minute.

Bibliography

Abahlali baseMjondolo. 2008. "A List of Key Incidents of Police Harassment Suffered by Abahlali baseMjondolo" Abahlali baseMjondolo online. http://abahlali.org/node/3245 accessed 28/10/2009.

Abahlali baseMjondolo website. http://www.abahlali.org/.

Ackerman, B & Fishkin, J S. 2003. "Deliberation Day" in Debating Deliberative Democracy Fishkin & Lasllett (eds).Blackwell Publishing. London.

Adler, G & Steenberg, J. 2000. From Comrade to Citizens. Macmillan. London.

Anti Privatisation Forum website. http://apf.org.za/

APF. 2001. "About the Anti Privatisation Forum". APF online. http://apf.org.za/spip.php?article2 accessed 28/10/2009.

Ballard, R. 2008. "Participation, democracy and social movements" *Critical Dialogue.* Centre for Public Participation.

Ballard R, Habib A, & Valodia I. (eds). 2006. Voices of Protest. Social Movements in Post-Apartheid South Africa. University of KwaZulu-Natal Press. Pietermaritzburg.

Ballard R, Chance C, Cooper-Knock S, Copello S, Dugard J, Gas'l'aldon F, Huchzermeyer M, Legassick M, Majavu M, Mondini F, Nicholson J, Patel R, Pithouse R, Sacks J, Selmeczi A, Tissington K. 2010. "Closing the Spaces for Engagement". *The Sunday Tribune*. 25 July 2010.

Barber, B. 1984. Strong Democracy. University of California Press. Berkley.

Barker, C & Cox, L. 2002. "What have the Romans ever done for us? Academic and Activist forms of movement theorising". Conference on Alternative Future and Popular Protest. Manchester Metropolitan University. Http://www.winhec.org/docs/pdfs/Journal/Marie%20Battiste%20copy.pdf (accessed 22/10/2010).

Batliwala, S. 2004. "Grassroots Movements as Transnational Actors: Implications for Global Civil Society" in R Taylor Creating a Better World: Interpretting Global Civil Society. Kumarian Press, Inc. Bloomfield.

Beall, J, Gelb, S & Hassim, S. 2005. "Fragile Stability and Society in Democratic South Africa". *Journal of Southern African Studies.* Vol. 31. No. 4. Pp. 681-700.

Bello, W. 2004. "The Global South" in T Mertes (ed) A Movement of Movements. Verso. London.

Benit-Gbaffou, C. 2007. "Local Councillors: Scapegoats for a Dysfunctional Participatory Democratic System? Lessons from Practices of Local Democracy in Johannesburg". *Critical Dialogue*. Centre for Public Participation.

Birkenshaw, M. 2007. “Rights, Democracy, Social Movements: Abahlali baseMjondolo: a Living Politics”. Unpublished MA Dissertation. Available at http://www.abahlali.org/node/3203

Bohman, J & Rehg, W (eds). 1997. Deliberative Democracy. MIT Press. Michigan.

Böhmke, H. 2009a. “Between the Halo and the Panga: Accounts of Abahlali base Mjondolo on 26 September 2009”. Unpublished Paper. Available online at http://dispositionsjournal.blogspot.com/2010_07_01_archive.html

Böhmke, H. 2009b. “The Branding of Social Movements in South Africa”. Unpublished Paper. Available online at http://dispositionsjournal.blogspot.com/2010/04/i-branding-of-social-movements-in-south.html

Böhmke, H. 2010a. “The Shackdwellers and the Intellectuals”. *The Africa Report*. 21 October 2010. http://theafricareport.com/archives2/society-a-culture/3296829-dont-talk-about-us-talking-about-the-poor.html accessed 25/10/2010

Böhmke, H. 2010b. “Don’t talk about us talking about the poor”. *The Africa Report. 19 October 2010.* http://www.theafricareport.com/archives2/society-a-culture/3296829-dont-talk-about-us-talking-about-the-poor.html

Bond, P. 2000. Elite Transition. Pluto Press. London.

Bond, P. 2004. “South Africa’s Urban Social Movements. The Case of Johannesburg, 1984, 1994, 2004”. *Centre for Civil Society Research Report No.22.* Centre for Civil Society. Durban.

Bond, P. 2008. “Rejoinder: Collaborations, Co-optations & Contestations in Praxis-Based Knowledge Production**”.** *Review of African Political Economy.* No.116. PP: 271-274.

Boggs, C. 1986. Social Movements & Political Power. Temple University Press. Philadelphia.

Buhlungu (ed). 2006. Trade Unions and Democracy. HSRC Press. Cape Town.

Burnham P, Lutz K G, Grant, W & Layton-Henry, Z. 2008. Research Methods in Politics (2nd Ed). Palgrave Macmillan. New York.

Chipkin, I. 2007. Do South Africans Exist?. Wits University Press. Johannesburg.

Cock, J. 2004. “The WSF and New Forms of Social Activism” in Creating a Better World, Taylor (ed). Kumarien Press. Bloomfield.

Chabal, P & Daloz, J-P. 1999. Africa Works. Disorder as Political Instrument. James Curry. Oxford.

Chatterjee, P. 2004. The Politics of the Governed. Columbia University Press. New York.

Cherry, J. 2001. “Cynicism at the Grassroots? Political Opposition in Kwazakele Township, Port Elizabeth” in Opposition and Democracy in South Africa. Frank Cass. London.

City of Johannesburg. 2002. “Annual Report 2001/2002”. City of Johannesburg. Available online at http://www.joburg-archive.co.za/city_vision/ accessed 20/10/2010.

Cohen, J. 1985. “Strategy or Identity: New Theoretical Paradigms and Contemporary Social Movements”. *Social Research.* Vol. 52. No. 4. Pp: 663-716.

Cohen, J. 1997. “Deliberation and Democratic Legitimacy” in Deliberative Democracy. Bohman, J & Rehg, W (eds). MIT Press. Michigan.

Combes H, Haeringer N & Sommier I. 2009. “The Generational Issue: The Impact of Organizations’ Age on Visions of Democracy” in Della Porta (ed). Democracy in Social Movements. Palgrave Macmillan. Basingstoke.

A. 2002. “Locating Citizen Participation”. *IDS Bulletin.* Vol 33. Issue 2.

Cornwall A & Coelho V. (eds) 2007**.** Spaces for change? : the politics of citizen participation in new democratic arenas. Zed Books. London.

Cornwall A & Coelho V. 2007. “Spaces for change? The politics of participation in new democratic arenas” in Cornwall A & Coelho V. (eds) Spaces for change? : the politics of citizen participation in new democratic arenas. Zed Books. London.

D’Anieri P, Ernst C, Kier E. 1990. “New social movements in historical perspective”. *Comparative Politics Vol.* 22. PP:445–58
Cornwell,

Dawson, M. 2010. “Academia and Activism: Challenging Boundaries Between Different Sites of Research, Knowledge Production and Social Justice”. Paper presented at “Decade of Dissent”. University of Johannesburg. 12-14 November 2010.

Della Porta, D. 2009. “Organizational Structures and Visions of Democracy in the Global Justice Movement: An Introduction” in Della Porta, D (ed) Democracy in Social Movements. Palgrave Macmillan. Basingstoke.

Della Porta, D (ed). 2009. Democracy in Social Movements. Palgrave Macmillan. Basingstoke.

Della Porta D & Diani M. 2006. Social Movements: An Introduction. Blackwell Publishing. Malden.

Desai, A. 2002. We are the Poors. Monthly Review Press. New York.

Desai, A & Pithouse, R. 2004. “’What stank in the past is the present’s perfume: Dispossession, Resistance and Repression in Mandela Park”. *The South Atlantic Quarterly.* Vol 104, No. 3. Pp. 841-875.

Duncan, J. 2010. “The Return of State Repression”. The South African Civil Society Information Service (online). http://www.sacsis.org.za/site/article/489.1 accessed 01/06/2010.

Dugmore, H. 2009. “Cellphones and Democracy in Africa”. Paper presented at “Elections Times: Harnessing the power of new media” conference. 19 March 2009. Video of paper available at http://2009.inwent-iij-lab.org/?p=571. Accessed 05/01/2011

Dwyer, P. 2006. “The Concerned Citizens Forum, a Fight within a Fight” in Ballard *et al* (eds) Voices of Protest. Social Movements in Post-Apartheid South Africa. University of KwaZulu-Natal Press. Pietermaritzburg.

Egan, A & Wafer, A. 2006. “Dynamics of a ‘Mini-Mass Movement’:Origins, Identity and Ideological Pluralism in the Soweto Electricity Crisis Committee” in Ballard *et al* (eds) Voices of Protest. Social Movements in Post-Apartheid South Africa. University of KwaZulu-Natal Press. Pietermaritzburg.

Elster, J. 1998. Deliberative Democracy. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.

Escobar, A & Alvarez, S. 1992. The Making of Social Movements in Latin America. Westview Press. Boulder.

Escobar, A & Alvarez, S. 1992. “Introduction: The Making of Social Movements in Latin America” in Escobar & Alvarez The Making of Social Movements in Latin America. Westview Press. Boulder.

Etzo, S. 2010. “The unfinished business of democratization’: struggles for services and accountability in South African Cities”. *Democratisation.* Vol. 17. No. 3. PP: 564-586.

Figlan L, Mavuso R, Ngema B, Nsibande Z, Sibisi S & Zikode S. Living Learning Booklet. Abahlali baseMjondolo. Available at http://abahlali.org/node/5843. Accessed 06/04/2010.

Fishkin, J S & Laslett, P. 2003. Debating Deliberative Democracy. Blackwell Publishing. London.

Fuller, D. 1999. “Part of the action, or ‘going native’? Learning to cope with the ‘politics of integration”. *Area.* Vol. 31. No.3. PP: 221-227.

Foweraker, J. 1995. Theorising Social Movements. Pluto Press. London.

Freeman, J. 1996. “The Tyranny of Structurelessness”. http://flagblackened.net/revolt/hist_texts/structurelessness.html. Date accessed 2010/02/10.

Gibson, N. 2007. “Zabalalaza, Unfinished Struggles Against Apartheid: The Shackdwellers’ Movement in Durban” *Socialism and Democracy.* Vol 12. Issue 3. Pp: 60-96.

Giugni M & Nai A. 2009. “Why Are Social Movement Organisations Deliberative? Structural and Cultural Determinants of Internal Decision-making in the Global Justice Movement” in Della Porta (ed). Democracy in Social Movements. Palgrave Macmillan. Basingstoke.

Goody, J. 2001. “Civil Society in an Extra-European Perspective” in Kaviraj & Khilnani Civil Society. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.

Greenstein, R. 2003. “State, Civil Society and the Reconfiguration of Power in Post-Apartheid South Africa”. *Centre For Civil Society Research Report 8.* Centre For Civil Society. University of Kwa-Zulu Natal.

Hague,B & Loader,N (eds). 1999. Digital Democracy. Discourse and Decision-making in the Information Age. Routledge. London.

Hague, B & Loader, N. 1999. “Digital Democracy: An Introduction” in Hague & Loader (eds). Digital Democracy. Discourse and Decision-making in the Information Age. Routledge. London.

Hann, C & Dunn, E. 1996. Civil Society: Challenging Western Models. Routledge. London.

Held,D (ed). 1994. Prospects for Democracy. Polity Press. Cambridge.

Held, D & Pollitt, C (eds). 1986. New Forms of Democracy**.** Sage. London.

Heller, P. 2003. Reclaiming Democratic Spaces. Civics and Politics in posttransition Johannesburg” in Tomlinson, R, Beauregard, R, Bremner, L & Mangcu X (eds) Emerging Johannesburg. Taylor Francis. New York.

Herberle, R. 1951. Social Movements: an introduction to Political Sociology. Appleton-Century-Crofts. New York.

Independent Electoral Commission. 2006. “Local Elections 2006. Seat Calculation Summary”. Available online at http://www.elections.org.za/content/Pages/LGE_NPE_Reports/LGE_NPE_Reports_Search.aspx?lEEtypeID=3&id=1427&name=Elections

IT-online. 2008. “Fibre in Broadband-strapped Soweto welcomed”. Available at http://www.it-online.co.za/content/view/516651/95/ accessed 05/01/2011.

Jackson, P., Muzondidya, J., Naidoo, V., Ndletyana, M and Sithole, M. 2009. South African Governance in Review. HSRC Press. Cape Town.

Johnson, K. 2002. “State and Civil Society in Contemporary South Africa” in Thabo Mbeki’s World: The Politics of Ideology in the South African President. University of Natal Press. Scottsville.

Kiloh, M. (1986) 'Industrial Democracy', in New Forms of Democracy**.** Held, D & Pollitt, C (eds). Sage. London.

Kingsnorth, P. 2004. One No, Many Yeses. Free Press. London.

Laclau, E & Mouffe, C. 1985. Hegemony And Socialist Strategy: Towards A Radical Democratic Politics. Verso. London.

Lewis, D. 2002. “Civil Society in African Contexts: Reflections on the Usefulness of a Context”. *Development and Change.* Vol.33 No. 4. Pp: 569-586.

Madlingozi, T. 2007. “Post-Apartheid Social Movements and the Quest for the Elusive 'New' South Africa”. *Journal of Law & Society*, Vol. 34, Issue 1, pp. 77-98.

Mail and Guardian. 2010. South Africans find cellphone costs excessive”. Available at http://www.mg.co.za/article/2010-02-12-south-africans-find-cellphone-costs-excessive accessed 05/01/2010.

Makumbe, J. 1998. “Is there a Civil Society in Africa?”. *International Affairs*. Vol. 74. No. 2. Pp: 305-317.

Mamdani, M. 1996. Citizen and Subject. Fountain Press. Kampala.

Mamdani. M. 1998. “Africa: Democratic Theory and Democratic Struggles” in Mohanty *et al* (eds) People’s Rights. Social Movements and The State in the Third World. Sage Publications. New Dehli.

Mansfield, 2010. “Mobile Internet Usage Booms in South Africa”. *Cellular News. http://www.cellular-news.com/story/43524.php accessed 05/01/2011.*

Markoff, J. 1996. Waves of Democracy. Social Movements and Political Change. Pine Forge Press. Thousand Oaks.

Mautner, N & Doucet, A. 2003. “Reflexive Accounts and Accounts of Reflexivity in Qualitative Data Analysis”. *Sociology.* Vol 37. No 3.

McAdam D, McCarthy J & Zald M (eds). 1996. Comparative Perspectives on Social Movments. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.

McAdam, Tarrow & Tilly. 2001. In VOP.****

McCarthy J & Zald M. 1973. The Trend of Social Movements in America: Professionalisation and Resource Mobilisation. General Learning Corporation. New Jersey.

McCarthy J & Zald M. 1987. Social Movements In An Organizational Society: Collected Essays. Transaction Books. New Jersey.

McKinley, D. 2005. “Statement on ANC Assault in Soweto”. APF online. http://apf.org.za/spip.php?article90. Accessed 22/02/2010.

McCarthy J & Zald M. 1977. “Resource Mobilisation & Social Movements: A Partial Theory” in *American Journal of Sociology*. No 82. Pp. 1212-1241.

Mertes, T (ed). 2004. A Movement of Movements. Verso. London.

Millstein, M. 2007. “Challenges to Community Organising in a context of spatial fragmentations: Some experiences from Delft. Cape Town”. *Critical Dialogue*. Centre for Public Participation.

Mngeni, M. 2010. “In Defence of the Defensive Social Movements” paper presented at *a Decade of Dissent* conference. University of Johannesburg, 12-14 November 2010.

Mohanty, M. 1998. "Introduction: Towards a Creative Theory of Social Transformation" in Mohanty *et al* (eds) People's Rights. Social Movements and The State in the Third World. Sage Publications. New Dehli.

Morris, A & Staggenborg, S. 2004. "Leadership in Social Movements" in Snow *et al* (eds) The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements. Blackwell. Malden.

Naidoo, P & Veriava, A. Date unknown. "Re-membering Movements: Trade Unions and New Social Movements in Neoliberal South Africa". *Centre for Civil Society Research Report No. 28*. Centre for Civil Society. Durban.

Ndletyana, M. 2007. "The Municipal Elections 2006: protests, independent candidates and cross border municipalities". State of the Nation. South Africa 2007. HSRC Press. Cape Town.

Ndletyana, M, & Muzondidya, J. 2009. "Reviewing Municipal Capacity in the Context of Local Government Reform: 1994-2009" in Jackson *et al* South African Governance in Review. HSRC Press. Cape Town.

Neocosmos, M. 2009. "Civil society, citizenship and the politics of the (im)possible: rethinking militancy in Africa today". *Interface.* Vol 1. No.2. PP: 263-334.

Ngwane, T. 2003. "Sparks in the Township". *New Left Review*. Vol 22. PP: 36-56.

Ntseng, D & Philpot, G. 2009. "Preface" in Figlan *et al* (eds) Living Learning Booklet. Available at http://abahlali.org/node/5843. Accessed 06/04/2010.

Padayachee, A. 2006. "Forward" in Ballard *et al* (eds) Voices of Protest. Social Movements in Post-Apartheid South Africa. University of KwaZulu-Natal Press. Pietermaritzburg.

Parekh, B. 1994. "The Cultural Particularity of Liberal Democracy" in Held (ed) Prospects for Democracy. Polity Press. Cambridge.

Pateman, C. 1970. Participation and Democratic Theory. Cambridge University Press. New York.

Peyroux. E. 2006. "City Improvement Districts (CIDs) in Johannesburg". *Trialogue.* Vol 89. No 2.

Pichardo, NA. 1997. "New Social Movements: A Critical Review". *Annual Review of Sociology*. Vol 23.

Pillay, D. 2006. "COSATU, alliances and working-class politics" in Buhlungu (ed). Trade Unions and Democracy. HSRC Press. Cape Town.

Piper, L.,and Nadvi, L. 2010. "Popular mobilization, party dominance and participatory governance in South Africa" in Thompson, L and Tapscott, C. (eds). Citizens and Social Movements: Perspectives from the Global South. Zed Books. London

Piper, L & von Lieres, B. 2008. "Inviting Failure: Citizen Participation and Local Governance in South Africa" in *Citizenship DRC.* Special Issue 1, Vol 1. Janurary 2008.

Pithouse, R. 2006. "'Our Struggle is thought, on the ground, running' The University of Abahlali baseMjondolo". *Centre for Civil Society Research Reports*. Vol.1

Pithouse, R. 2008. "The May 2008 Pogroms: xenophobia, Evictions, Liberalism, and Democratic Grassroots Militancy in South Africa". Sanhati.com

Pithouse, R. 2010. "We need a properly democratic defence of democracy". *The South African Civil Society Information Site.* http://www.sacsis.org.za/site/article/537.1 accessed 30/11/2010.

Pointer, R. 2004. "Questioning the Representation of South Africa's 'New Social Movements': A case study of the Mandela Park Anti-Eviction Campaign". *Journal of Asian and African Studies.* Vol 39. Issue 4. Pp 271-294.

Rabkin, F. 2009. "Slum Law Evicitions Ruled to be Unlawful". Business Day (online). Posted 2009/10/15. http://www.businessday.co.za/articles/Content.aspx?id=84038. Accessed 02/06/2010.

The Reconstruction and Development Programme Policy Document. 1994. Available at http://www.polity.org.za/polity/govdocs/rdp/rdp.html accessed 04/06/2010.

Reiter, H. 2009. "Participatory Traditions in the Global Justice Movement" in Della Porta, D (ed). 2009. Democracy in Social Movements. Palgrave Macmillan. Basingstoke.

Robins, S. 2008. From Revolution to Rights in South Africa. James Curry. University of Kwa-Zulu Natal Press. Pietermaritzburg.

Runciman, C. 2010. "Resisting Privatisation: Repetoires of Resistance within the Anti-Privatisation Forum". Paper presented at *A Decade of Dissent* Conference. University of Johannesburg. 12-14 November 2010.

Sachikonye, L. 1995. "Democracy, Civil Socity and Social Movements: an Analytical Frawework" in Sachikonye (ed) Democracy, Civil Society and Social Movements in Southern Africa. SAPES. Harare.

Sachikonye, L. 1995. Democracy, Civil Society and Social Movements in Southern Africa. SAPES. Harare.

Seekings, J. 1997. "SANCO: Strategic Dilemmas in a Democratic South Africa". *Transformation.* 34.

Shapiro, Ian. 1999. "Enough of Deliberation. Politics is about Interests and Power" in Macedo,S (ed.). Deliberative Politics. Essays on 'Democracy and Disagreement. Oxford University Press. New York.

Sinwell, L. 2010. "Defensive Social Movement Battles Need to Engage with Politics". *South African Labour Bulletin*. Vol. 34. No.1. PP: 37 –39.

Siwisa, B. 2008. ""Crowd Renting or Struggling from Below? The Concerned Citizens' Forum in Mpumalanga Township, Durban, 1999-2005". *Journal of Southern African Studies.* Vol 34, Issue 4. Pp: 919-936

Snow, D, Soule, S & Kriesi, H. 2004. The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements. Blackwell. Malden.

Tarrow, S. 1996. "States and Opportunities: The political structuring of social movements" in McAdam D, McCarthy J & Zald M (ed) Comparative Perspectives on Social Movments. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.

Taylor, R (ed). 2004. Creating a Better World. Kumarien Press. Bloomfield.

Taylor, R. 2004. Creating a Better World: Interpretting Global Civil Society. Kumarian Press, Inc. Bloomfield.

Terreblanche, S. 1999. "The Ideological Journey of South Africa: from the RDP to the GEAR Macro Economic Plan". Paper presented at the *ME99 workshop on 'Globalisation, Poverty, Women and the Church in South Africa'.* 16 February 1999.

Thompson, L & Tapscott, C. 2010. (eds) Citizenship and Social Movements: Perspectives From the Global South. Zed Books. London.

Thompson, L & Tapscott, C. 2010. "Introduction: Mobilisation and Social Movements in the South – the challenges of inclusive governance" in Thompson & Tapscott (eds) Citizenship and Social Movements: Perspectives From the Global South. Zed Books. London.

Tilly, C. 2004. Social Movements, 1768-2004. Paradigm Publishers. London.

Tolsi, N. 2009. "Shack dwellers Victory Bus". Mail & Guardian (online). Posted 24/04/2009. http://www.mg.co.za/article/2009-05-24-shack-dwellers-victory-bus. Accessed 02/06/2010.

Tomlinson, R, Beauregard, R, Bremner, L & Mangcu X (eds). 2003. Emerging Johannesburg. Taylor Francis. New York.

Tomlinson, R, Beauregard, R, Bremner, L & Mangcu X. 2003. "Reorganising Space" in Tomlinson, R, Beauregard, R, Bremner, L & Mangcu X (eds) Emerging Johannesburg. Taylor Francis. New York.

Touraine, A. 1971. The Post-Industrial Society. Wildwood House. London.

van der Walt, L, Mokoena, D & Shange, S. 2001. "Cleaned Out: outsourcing at Wits University". *South African Labour Bulletin*. Volume 25. No. 4.

Van Dijk. J. 2005. The Deepening Divid, inequality in the Information Society. Sage Publications. Thousand Oaks.

Veravia, A. 2008. "Book Review: Richard Ballard, Adam Habib and Imraan Valodia (eds). 2006. Voices of Protest: Social Movements in Post-Apartheid South Africa. University of KwaZulu Natal Press.

Wainwright, H. 2003. Reclaim the State: Experiments in Popular Democracy. Verso. London.

Walsh, S. 2008. "'Uncomfortable Collaborations': Contesting Constructions of the Poor in South Africa". *Review of African Political Economy.* No.116. PP: 255-279.

Webster, E. 1994. "The rise of social movement unionism: the two faces of the black trade union movement in South Africa" in Webster *et al* (eds) Work and Industrialisation in South Africa. Ravan Press. Johannesburg.

Webster, E, Alfred, L, Bethlehem, L, Joffe, A & Selikow, T. 1994. (eds) Work and Industrialisation in South Africa. Ravan Press. Johannesburg.

Williams P & Taylor I. 2000. "Neoliberalism and the Political Economy of the 'New' South Africa". *New Political Economy* Vol. 5, No.1. Pp. 21 — 40.

Wood, G & Dibben, P. 2006. "Broadening internal democracy with a diverse workforce: challenges and opportunities" in Buhlungu (ed) Trade Unions and Democracy. HSRC Press. Cape Town.

Zald MN & McCarthy JD. 1987. "Resource Mobilisation and Social Movements" in Zald MN & McCarthy JD (eds) Social Movements in an Organisational Society. Transaction Books. New Brunswick.

Zald & Garner 1987. "Social Movements in Organisations" in Zald MN & McCarthy JD (eds) Social Movements in an Organisational Society. Transaction Books. New Brunswick.

Zeurn, E K. 2001. "South Africa's civics in transition: agents of change or structures of constraint?" in *Politikon*. Vol. 28, No. 1. Pp. 5-20.

Zikode, S. 2005. "The Third Force". Abahlali baseMjondolo (online). http://www.abahlali.org/node/17. Accessed 11/02/2010.

Key Documents

AbM Constitution

AbM Website

APF Constitution (2007)

APF Website

SECC Constitution (2003)

SECC Mission Statement

SECC Registers of Forum Meetings

SECC Registers of Executive Committee Meetings

SECC Registers of AGM 2009/ 2010

SECC Mission Statement

Interviews

Dale McKinley. 29.06.2010.

Michael Neocosmos. 19.02.2010.

APF Administrator. 22.06.2010.

SECC Executive Committee Members. 26.08.2010. 29.09.2009, 06.06.2010, 09.11.2010.

SECC Branch Members (Chiawelo Branch). 16.09.2009

SECC Branch Members (Dube Branch). 08.11.2010.

SECC Branch Members (Naledi Branch). 09.11.2010.

Meetings Observed

APF Office Bearers Meeting. 12.05.2010, 22.06.2010.

APF Protest Organising Committee Meeting. 22.06.2010.

SECC Executive Committee Meetings. 26.08.2009; 29.09.2009, 06.06.2010, 09.11.2010

SECC Forum Meeting. 29.09.2009. 06.06.2010. 09.11.2010.

SECC Branch Meeting (Chiawelo Branch). 16.09.2009.

SECC Branch Meeting (Dube Branch). 08.11.2010.

SECC Branch Meeting (Naledi Branch). 09.11.2010.

Conferences

"Rethinking the Political Under Late Capitalism: What's Left of the Left?". Wits Institute for Social and Economic Research. University of Witwatersrand. 6-15 July 2009.

"Positioning Civil Society Post-Polokwane: Coming to Terms with ANC Political Leadership Changes". Center For Policy Studies. Sunnyside Park Hotel, Johannesburg. 3 December 2009

"A Decade of Dissent: Reflections on Popular Resistance in South Africa, 2000-2010". Social Movements and Popular Protest Working Group. School of Tourism and Hospitality . University of Johannesburg. 12-14 November 2010.