

https://dspace.org/

Party ideology in South Africa

Rohanlall, Letitia

2014-10-22
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/15787

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

PARTY IDEOLOGY IN SOUTH AFRICA

LETITIA ROHANLALL

SUPERVISOR: PROFESSOR DARYL GLASER

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Humanities, University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, in fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Master's by Dissertation (Political Science)

Johannesburg, 2014

ABSTRACT

There is a gap in the South African literature on party ideology. This thesis attempts to fill that gap by examining party ideology in South Africa and will use the left-right spectrum to measure ideology. It will do this by using quantitative and qualitative methodology by engaging in the following approach: manifesto analysis, expert survey and interviews. It looks at thirteen parties as represented in parliament at 2009, that is, the ANC, DA, COPE, IFP, FFP, ID, UDM, ACDP, UCDP, APC, AZAPO, MF, and the PAC. The ideological analysis will be categorized according to three domains: the political, socio-economic and the social-cultural; and will use an intra-domain approach to identify variables within the major ideologies and domains. The findings of this research show that there is a left-right dimension in South Africa. There are right-wing and left-wing parties. Liberalism, socialism-communism, conservatism and nationalism broadly make up the ideologies present among the parties. In the political domain, parties are predominantly centre-right based on liberal and conservative elements; in the socio-economic domain, parties are predominantly centre-left based on modern liberal or social democratic elements; and in the social-cultural domain, parties are made up of centre-right which is based on liberal and nationalist elements, and centre-left which is based on libertarian elements. The predominant ideological position of the majority of the parties does not say something about the non-predominant ideologies of the other parties. In the political domain, there is a centre-left tendency based on participatory democracy, a centre position based on liberal views in politics, and a far right tendency based on centralization. In the socio-economic domain, there is a far left position based on socialism-communism, and a far right tendency based on libertarianism. In the social-cultural domain, there is a centre-left position based on moderate liberalism, and a far right position based on conservatism. It is the argument of this thesis to consider the overall ideology but more importantly to give sufficient attention to domain and intra-domain issues. South African parties must engage more rigorously to identify their own ideological positions instead of projecting their immediate focus on adversarial politics but rather understand what vision and principles they are actually offering to South African citizens and society at large.

DECLARATION

I, Letitia Rohanlall, declare that this research is my own. It has been submitted in fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Master's by Dissertation at the University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted before for any degree or examination in this or any other university. I have given acknowledgement to the works done by others that were used in this research.



05 September 2014

Signed Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my thanks to Professor Daryl Glaser who inspired the topic, took his time to meet with me, and provided guidance. I would like to thank my fiancé, Kenny for his scientific knowledge that helped in the data analysis and for his help throughout the research project. A special thanks is also extended to the internal and external examiners who provided a valuable contribution to the final product of this dissertation. The cooperation of the South African political party representatives, leaders, and the academic experts, largely supported the data in this dissertation, and I would like to acknowledge these individuals. I would also like to thank the University of Witwatersrand for the Merit Scholarship and the University Council Scholarship which enabled me to register for the degree and supported the research initiatives.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW 7

2.0 INTRODUCTION 7

2.1 PARTY IDEOLOGY IN THE LITERATURE 9

2.1.1 ANC 9

2.1.2 DA 9

2.1.3 COPE 10

2.1.4 IFP 11

2.1.5 FFP 12

2.1.6 ID 13

2.1.7 UDM 14

2.1.8 ACDP 14

2.1.9 UCDP 15

2.1.10 APC 15

2.1.11 AZAPO 15

2.1.12 MF 17

2.1.13 PAC 17

2.2 CONCLUSION 18

CHAPTER 3: POLITICAL IDEOLOGY 20

3.0 INTRODUCTION 20

3.1 WHAT IS IDEOLOGY? 20

3.2 IMPORTANCE OF IDEOLOGY 21

3.3 WHY THE LEFT-RIGHT DIMENSION? 24

3.4 WHICH IDEOLOGIES? 25

3.5 THE 'RIGHT' IDEOLOGIES 26

3.4.1 Classical liberalism 26

3.4.2 Libertarianism 29

3.4.3 Conservatism 30

3.4.4 Nationalism 31

3.5 THE 'LEFT' IDEOLOGIES 34

3.5.1 Socialism and communism 34

3.5.2 Modern liberalism 36

3.6 CONCLUSION 37

CHAPTER 4: METHODOLOGY 38
4.0 INTRODUCTION 38
4.1 CHOOSING LEFT-RIGHT VARIABLES 38
4.2 MANIFESTO APPROACH 45
4.3 EXPERT SURVEY APPROACH 50
4.4 INTERVIEW APPROACH 54
4.5 CONCLUSION 55
CHAPTER 5: PRESENTATION OF RESULTS 56
5.0 INTRODUCTION 56
5.1 MANIFESTO ANALYSIS 57
5.1.1 Overall ideological indices of Parties in 1994, 1999, 2004 and 2009 57
5.1.2 Ideological indices of Parties per domain in 1994, 1999, 2004 and 2009 59
5.1.3 Intra-domain analysis of parties per year in 1994, 1999, 2004 and 2009 59
5.2 EXPERT SURVEY 71
5.2.1 Overall party ideology 71
5.2.2 Overall ideology on politics and government 72
5.2.3 Party positions on socio-economic issues 73
5.2.4 Party positions on social and cultural issues 78
5.2.5 Knowledge Gap: Frequency of 'Don't Know' 81
CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION OF RESULTS 82
6.0 INTRODUCTION 82
6.1 ANC 82
6.2 DA 85
6.3 COPE 89
6.4 IFP 92
6.5 ID 97
6.6 UDM 100
6.7 FFP 104
6.8 ACDP 109
6.9 UCDP 114
6.10 APC 118
6.11 AZAPO 122
6.12 MF 126
6.13 PAC 131

CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSION **136**
7.0 Is there a left-right dimension in South Africa? 136
7.1 Right-wing parties 137
7.2 Left-wing parties 139
7.3 Ideologies: From liberalism to nationalism 140
7.3.1 Liberalism 140
7.3.2 Conservatism 141
7.3.3 Socialism and communism 143
7.3.4 Nationalism 144
7.4 Degrees of party ideology 144
7.5 Party ideology in South Africa 145
BIBLIOGRAPHY **151**
INTERVIEWS **159**
APPENDICES **160**
Appendix A – Participant Information Sheet: Interview 160
Appendix B – Participant Information Sheet: Expert Survey 161
Appendix C – Consent Form: Interview 162
Appendix D – Consent Form: Expert Survey 163
Appendix E – Interview Questions 164
Appendix F – Expert Survey 165
Appendix G – Manifesto Analysis Raw Data 172
Appendix H – Expert Survey Raw Data 199

LIST OF TABLES & FIGURES

Tables

Table 4.1: Core left-right statements derived by Jahn (2011: 753) 42
Table 4.2: Variables used for left-right dimension per domain 44
Table 4.3: List of Manifestos obtained: Manifesto Analysis 48
Table 4.4: Scale used for the Ideological Index: Manifesto Analysis 49
Table 4.5: Eleven-point Scale used for the Expert Survey 51
Table 4.6: Interquartile reliability range: Expert Survey 51
Table 4.7: Number of experts invited per institution: Expert Survey 53
Table 4.8: Person interviewed per party: Interview 55

Figures

Figure 5.1 Overall Ideological Index of Parties from 1994 to 2009: Manifesto Analysis 58
Figure 5.2 Ideological Index of Parties: Political Domain from 1994 to 2009: Manifesto Analysis 60
Figure 5.3 Ideological Index of Parties: Socio-Economic Domain from 1994 to 2009: Manifesto Analysis..... 61
Figure 5.4 Ideological Index of Parties: Social-Cultural Domain from 1994 to 2009: Manifesto Analysis..... 62
Figure 5.5 Ideological Index of the ANC per Domain from 1994 to 2009: Manifesto Analysis..... 63
Figure 5.6 Ideological Index of the DA per Domain from 1994 to 2009: Manifesto Analysis..... 63
Figure 5.7 Ideological Index of the PAC per Domain from 1994 to 2009: Manifesto Analysis..... 63
Figure 5.8 Ideological Index of the IFP per Domain from 1999 to 2009: Manifesto Analysis..... 63
Figure 5.9 Ideological Index of the ID per Domain from 2004 and 2009: Manifesto Analysis 63
Figure 5.10 Ideological Index of the UDM per Domain from 1999 to 2009: Manifesto Analysis..... 64
Figure 5.11 Ideological Index of the FFP per Domain for 1999 and 2009: Manifesto Analysis..... 64
Figure 5.12 Ideological Index of the ACDP per Domain from 1994, 2004 and 2009: Manifesto Analysis 64
Figure 5.13 Ideological Index of the MF per Domain for 2004 and 2009: Manifesto Analysis..... 64
Figure 5.14 Ideological Index of AZAPO per Domain for 1999 to 2009: Manifesto Analysis 65
Figure 5.15 Ideological Index of the UCDP per Domain for 2009: Manifesto Analysis..... 65
Figure 5.16 Ideological Index of COPE per Domain for 2009: Manifesto Analysis..... 65
Figure 5.17 Ideological Index of the APC per Domain for 2009: Manifesto Analysis 66
Figure 5.18 Domain Emphasis of Parties from 1994 to 2009: Manifesto Analysis 67
Figure 5.19 Number of Statements for the political domain of Parties from 1994 to 2009: Manifesto Analysis 68
Figure 5.20 Number of Statements for the socio-economic domain of Parties from 1994 to 2009: Manifesto Analysis. 69
Figure 5.21 Number of Statements for the social-cultural domain of Parties from 1994 to 2009: Manifesto Analysis ... 70
Figure 5.22 Overall ideology of Parties: Expert Survey 71
Figure 5.23 Overall positions of Parties on politics and government: Expert Survey 72
Figure 5.24 Positions of Parties on taxation and public spending: Expert Survey 73
Figure 5.25 Positions of Parties on economic planning versus market: Expert Survey 74
Figure 5.26 Positions of Parties on ownership and the means of production: Expert Survey 75
Figure 5.27 Positions of Parties on redistribution of wealth from the rich to the poor: Expert Survey 76
Figure 5.28 Positions of Parties on affirmative action measures: Expert Survey 77
Figure 5.29 Overall social and cultural ideology of Parties: Expert Survey 78
Figure 5.30 Positions of Parties on gender equality: Expert Survey 79
Figure 5.31 Positions of Parties on gay and lesbian rights: Expert Survey 80
Figure 5.32 Percentage of 'Don't Know' answers to the question on overall party ideology: Expert Survey 81

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ACDP	African Christian Democratic Party
ANC	African National Congress
APC	African People's Convention
AZAPO	Azanian People's Organization
COPE	Congress of the People
CMP	Comparative Manifesto Project
DA	Democratic Alliance
FFP	Freedom Front Plus
ID	Independent Democrats
IFP	Inkatha Freedom Party
MF	Minority Front
PAC	Pan Africanist Congress
UCDP	United Christian Democratic Party
UDM	United Democratic Movement

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

What are we to make of political parties? The vast literature on political parties that has developed over the years reflects the importance of such an institution. In essence, political parties play a crucial role in democracy. Parties have come to be inextricably tied to democracy. Duverger (1954) explains the growth of parties and states that it is historically linked to the extension of popular suffrage. One of the main intellectual champions of the idea of parties and the democratic link is Schattschneider (1942: 1), who stated that "[t]he rise of political parties is indubitably one of the principal distinguishing marks of modern government." Moreover, parties are not only the developers of modern government but it is the centre of it (Schattschneider 1942). This is shared by LaPalombara and Weiner (1966: 3) who view the party as a symbol of political modernity, stating that the "political party is a creature of modern and modernizing political systems." This can be called the 'centrality of party' thesis which encompasses a twofold recognition of the relevance of parties as a 'durable and permanent' institution in democracy and as offering a positive contribution in democratic consolidation (van Biezen 2003). Parties matter in politics.

The competing view is that parties are not once what they were. Parties are failing to perform their functions (van Biezen 2003). Van Biezen (2003: 174) looks at the 'paradox of parties', showing that the tension is between the "continuing or even increasing centrality of political parties as key institutions of modern democracy" and their "increasing failure to perform many of the functions seen as essential to a healthy performance of democracy." Van Biezen argues that the reality is that they seem to be losing relevance as a vehicle of representation, mobilisation, articulation and aggregation, and we have to come to terms with this ambiguity. Dalton and Wattenberg (2000: 275) also mention this ambiguity, stating that in contemporary politics there is mounting evidence pointing to the declining role of political parties in shaping politics; however they argue that it nevertheless "remains difficult to think of national government functioning without parties playing a significant role in connecting the various elements of the political process." They further state that if democracy without parties is unthinkable as described by Schattschneider (1942), "we should be asking what will happen *if* the parties are in decline, and what such a decline

portends for the politics of advanced industrial democracies" (Dalton and Wattenberg, 2000: 5).

Parties are key institutions for a variety of reasons. First, parties play a critical function in taking public office. Many view a party as being defined by its aim to win public office, making it distinct from pressure or interest groups (Yanai 1999). Wolinetz (2002) calls it 'office-seeking'. Schattschneider (1942: 36) points out that the "life of the parties revolves about the present possession of power or the bid for power." Second, parties mobilize support for their candidates and for their policies (Yanai 1999). Wolinetz (2002) calls this 'vote-seeking'. Parties want to gain popular consent for their public policy direction (Stokes 1999). Parties play a role in getting people to vote and also wanting to get the vote (Dalton and Wattenberg 2000). This makes parties concerned with popular appeal and gaining electoral support for the purpose of office-taking. Third, parties play a crucial role as representatives. Katz and Mair (1992) state that parties are the primary representative and legitimizing link between citizens and the state.

Fourth, parties play an important role in responsiveness. Stokes (1999: 243) shows that the "impact of parties on democratic responsiveness hinges on what parties are – their objectives and organization." Stokes takes this as a claim that instead of democracy inducing government to be responsive to the preferences of the people, it is actually parties that organize politics and then induce democracies to be responsive. Fifth, parties are important for effective political competition. Robertson (1976: 1) states that "to talk, today, about democracy, is to talk about a system of competitive political parties." Powell (1982: 3) also states that "the competitive electoral context, with several political parties organizing the alternatives that face the voters, is the identifying property of the contemporary democratic process." In this sense, in a democratic context, parties assist in evading one-party tendencies and in a two or multiparty systems in an environment of free and fair competition, voters have a choice to decide on the best suitable party they want in government.

All these points put together essentially says that parties have a relationship with consolidated democracy and the advance of democracy in many respects depends on the effectiveness of parties. Stokes (1999: 263) well captures this by stating that:

> Today, more of the world's population lives under democracy than ever before. Hence, it is more urgent than ever before to understand how democracy works and assess how well it performs the functions imputed to it, such as responsiveness, representation, accountability, and realization of the public good. Observers of the myriad new democracies around the globe (but not they alone) complain of the ineffectiveness of democracy in achieving these functions. They not infrequently cast the blame on weak political parties…Conversely, when observers detect a strengthening of parties in new democracies, they expect representation and responsiveness to be similarly strengthened…

As a final reason for the influence of parties on democracy, parties develop views and policies and in this way they carry the vision of society. "Policy-making is one of the most important functions ascribed to parties" (Scarrow et al, 2000: 144). This last issue is what this introduction and essentially this research paper wants to focus on. There are two things encapsulated here. In one sense parties bring together different views which help them form their policy, this can be known as the aggregating role of parties (Budge et al 1987, Beck 1997). Parties are made up of people who share a commonality of beliefs, "parties have frequently been understood as vehicles that bring together those of similar political opinions" (Ware, 1996: 17).

Besides the way parties 'organize' opinions, in another sense parties develop 'party positions' on issues. Janda (1993) calls this 'issues orientation'. In other words, parties take a stand on issues. Parties have then come to be seen as having an organized set of views about society. This has come to be known as the 'ideological' character of parties, which is termed 'party families'. "Party families are groups of parties with similar ideological background or roots" (Pennings et al, 2006: 200, Mair and Mudde 1998). Ideology is understood, as strongly pointed out by Freeden (1996, 2004), as a systematic set of ideas. In an earlier study, Eldersveld (1964: 196) defines party ideology as "particular patterned attitudes towards public policy questions" taken by specific parties. Ware (1996: 17) observes that the "centrality of ideology in party politics is undeniable". Janda (1993: 172) states that the "theoretical centrality of ideology in party theory is demonstrated by the outpouring of empirical research on comparative party ideologies." Ideology is an important part of the life of a party.

The study of party ideology has gained widespread currency (Mair and Mudde 1998). Scholars have begun to increasingly measure party positions. This is largely found in

American and European literature. The longest running research database on party positions is the Comparative Manifesto Project (CMP). It places parties on the left or right of the political spectrum. In as early as the work of Duverger (1954) who looked at the differences between liberal, socialist and conservative parties and concluded that though parties may have the same label there may be ideological differences between them which can be seen by the different ways they respond to issues. In this sense ideology and parties became something that was being examined. Eldersveld (1964) also went on to discuss the ideological direction of parties, examining the ideological dissensus and unity in a party.

According to Mair and Mudde (1998), the 1980s became a time where a more systematic study of parties developed, this saw comparative study of Western European party families especially with the work of Seiler (1980). Later was the work of von Beyme (1985) who also looked at party families and tried to classify them based on their position on economic and cultural issues. Mair and Mudde (1998) present an extensive outline of the work that has been done on party families such as: communist, social democratic, conservative, liberal and nationalist parties. Beside academics who discuss the ideology of parties, there has been a systematic attempt devoted to measuring or estimating party ideology through various means (Castles et al 1984, Budge et al 1987, Laver et al 1990 and 1993, Gabel et al 2000, Benoit et al 2007, Ray 1999, Franzmann et al 2006, Grofman et al 2011, Helbling et al 2011, Kim et al 2001). Volkens (2008: 108) summarizes this, stating that due "to the importance of political parties in representative democracies, methodological research on measuring policy positions of parties has been continually growing during the last 20 years."

According to these authors, like Benoit and Laver (2006), party positions matter; it is useless to have a serious discussion without knowing where a party stands on substantive matters. Party ideology is significant because of the importance of ideology itself and the party connection with democracy. Budge (1994: 446) states that "ideology provides politicians with a broad conceptual map of politics into which political events, current problems, electors' preferences and other parties' policies can be fitted." In other words, parties can decide what to think and how to act from the ideology they choose. Parties do not decide and act in a vacuum but it is largely influenced by their views (Ball et al 1995). Ideas matter in politics. Ideologies matter. This action then has an influence in the societies we find

ourselves in either moderately or extremely (Ball et al 1995). Importantly so, the decisions and actions taken influence the quality of democracy (Schwarzmantel 2008).

Also, party ideology offers an environment of choice for the electorate. When the "political parties take clear and consistent policy positions, voters are offered valuable information about specific candidates or cues on specific policy issues" (Dalton and Wattenberg, 2000: 6). Ideology is said to facilitate a healthy democracy (Schwarzmantel 2008). Klemmensen et al (2007) observes that studies of political competition often refer to positions of actors or parties. "It is therefore not surprising that there has been a surge in the literature on how to estimate policy positions" (Klemmensen et al, 2007: 746). Parties have positions whether that be explicit or implicit and it is necessary to figure out party ideology to know precisely what these positions are and where they fit on the left-right dimension or with contemporary ideologies such as liberalism, socialism, conservatism and nationalism.

This research proceeds from this perspective. Making a statement in the context of fifteen years of democracy and in the fourth democratic election, Petlane (2009: 183) states that "the 'left' and 'right' labels make little sense in terms of South African politics." This research project aims to make sense of the left and right in South Africa. What is the ideology of South African parties? This is the central question of this research. Sub-research questions include: is there a left-right dimension in South Africa? Are parties predominantly centre-left? What about the centre-right? Can we speak of right-wing parties? Even more, does South Africa have any extreme right parties? Are there extreme left parties? What is the nature of ideological conflicts inside parties? What is the state of parties in articulating their own ideological positions? Is South African party competition based on ideas and ideology? How can the left-right dimension help us to understand South African parties and politics? This research does not face value the left-right dimension in South Africa but attempts to investigate and examine it.

The scope of this research looks at thirteen parties that were represented in Parliament as at 2009. The project will systematically estimate or measure party ideology and from this concludes the most appropriate party positions. The project uses three key research instruments which are commonly used to estimate party positions. First, it looks at national election manifestos; second, it conducts an expert survey; and third, it holds interviews with

party leaders and representatives. It uses a combination of the quantitative and qualitative methods. When it comes to the literature on South African party politics generally and party ideology specifically, it is without any hesitation scarce. Issues pertaining to party ideology are mentioned within the literature but academics resort to simply giving a party a label such as centre-left or conservative without systematic evidence to support the validity of those labels. This will be further discussed in the *Literature Review* in Chapter 2. Essentially, this research project attempts to close this gap.

Chapter 3 on *Political Ideology* deals with what is ideology, the importance of ideology, the usefulness of the left-right dimension, and choosing right and left ideology. Chapter 4 on *Methodology* deals with choosing left-right variables; critically assess various strengths and weaknesses of the manifesto, expert survey and interview approach; and explains how I intend to analyze the data and my unique contribution in a methodological sense. Chapter 5 on *Data Presentation* essentially presents the results obtained from the three methods in the form of figures, tables and graphs. Chapter 6 on *Discussion of Results* essentially engages with the data from Chapter 5 to offer a qualitative discussion which includes the interview data. And Chapter 7 presents the main conclusions of this research.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 INTRODUCTION

This chapter examines the state of the literature on party ideology in South Africa. What has been written on South African party ideology? The following parties as represented in parliament as at 2009 will be discussed, namely the, African National Congress (ANC), Democratic Alliance (DA), Congress of the People (COPE), Inkatha Freedom Party (IFP), Freedom Front Plus (FFP), Independent Democrats (ID), United Democratic Movement (UDM), African Christian Democratic Party (ACDP), United Christian Democratic Party (UCDP), African People's Convention (APC), Azanian People's Organization (AZAPO), Minority Front (MF), and Pan Africanist Congress (PAC).

What has been said about right-wing parties? According to Naidu and Manqele (2006: 207, 218), the ACDP, UCDP, MF, FFP and UDM "could be regarded as both economically and socially conservative" – tending to be positioned on the "political right of the ideological spectrum" with only "slight variations in their policy positions." What has been said about the left-wing parties? Discussions have been made about the centre-left and the radical left. Hoeane (2006) and Petlane (2009) label the PAC, AZAPO and ID as representing the left, stating that these parties are "bound together by their common roots in radical, leftist, and black politics." Part of this includes a discussion on the 'extreme left'. Petlane describes the PAC as 'radical' and together with AZAPO as 'Africanist'.

Furthermore, in the discussion on parties, there is an uneasy distinction made between ideology and geographical base. Some parties are seen as culturally and geographically representing ethnic constituencies, such as the MF and the UCDP (Petlane 2009). Petlane makes a distinction between ethnically, ideologically and regionally or geographically based parties; of which the PAC and AZAPO fall under 'ideological' parties (leftist) whereas the MF and the UCDP are considered 'ethnic' and 'regional' parties. This assumes that other parties are void of an ideological base and this base is just reserved for parties who have it. Is it really the case that some South African parties are ideological and others ideologically 'absent'? Why is there a reservation to extend ideology to other parties? What exactly does ideology mean in this case? Is it reserved as a category for merely extreme leftist parties?

Besides issues of party ideology, it is useful to survey the general field of ideology in South Africa. First, it is common to talk of ideology in racial terms. This goes as far back as during the apartheid time. Afrikaner nationalism, the far right and black and African nationalism have been a common part of ideology in the domain of race (Biko 1978, Louw 1997, Marx 2002). Gerhart (1978: 116) discusses the 'orthodox nationalist' or 'black power schools'. Gerhart explains 'South Africa's ideological spectrum' through economic and social lines largely based upon race. Making particular mention of the ANC, Gerhart notes that the transition of the ANC from an all-African to a multiracial party brought subtle developments in its ideological orientation and pointed to the incompatibility between African liberals, communists and nationalists. In this case, nationalism has been an ideological feature in South African political ideology. In the assessment of contemporary parties, it is crucial to examine whether this ideology exists, especially in the FFP, MF, AZAPO and the PAC.

Second, it is also more common to talk of ideology in socio-economic terms. Scholars discuss issues such as neoliberal policies, left-talk but right-walk, and socialism and communism in South Africa (Marais 2001, Natrass 2003, Desai 2003, Turok 2012). Moreover, scholars tend to concentrate the discussion on this matter on a few majority parties in the country, such as the ruling ANC and the opposition, the DA. However the ANC has been most discussed. For example, Terreblanche (1999) discusses the transition from the Reconstruction Development Plan (RDP) to the Growth, Employment and Redistribution (GEAR) in an attempt to measure the 'old' and 'new' ideological position of the ANC. This is not inaccurate, literature tends to focus on dominant parties in any case, but this thesis will make a particular argument about the shortfall of this approach.

There has been a severe paucity of academic books and journal articles directly referring to party ideology in South Africa; there is no direct focus on parties, for example, small parties are ignored from the discussion and even more, when majority parties are included in the discussion, ideology is reserved to a specific domain that is the socio-economic domain. Though social and cultural issues – such as Afrikaner, African or black nationalism – have been referred too, this has been rather minimal. The best way to go around this challenge is to look at academic literature written directly on elections which provides a discussion on all parties who won parliamentary seats. After surveying the literature, the following discussion has been seen as referring to party ideology.

2.1 PARTY IDEOLOGY IN THE LITERATURE

2.1.1 ANC

The ANC is described as having a multi-faceted ideology which is nowhere near the extreme left. Memela (2008) states that "the ANC political mansion has many ideological rooms", meaning that it is a 'broad-church ideology'. Booysen (2012) states it in a different way that the ANC is 'ideologically hybrid'. In trying to argue for this Memela (2008: 2) states that "there are people and political ideologies from all the corners of the earth that can be found within the ANC, speaking to all people irrespective of race, creed, and religion or class background." This includes, according to Memela, pan-Africanists, liberals, capitalists, black consciousness adherents, socialists, communists, sell-outs, technocrats, elites and workers. One has to ask, are these groups even 'ideological' groups? What exactly constitutes a political ideology in reference to theoretically defined literature?

In the late pre-democratic period, Fatton (1984) gives an analysis of the ideology of the ANC, arguing that despite its socialist rhetoric the ANC is fundamentally a populist movement which transcends 'petty-bourgeois radicalism' by an 'all-class' common front rather than in the determined mobilization of the black proletariat and peasantry; and moreover, the ANC failed to develop a truly socialist revolutionary strategy. In this light, the ANC for Memela, is neither ultra-left nor ultra-right but leftist with minimal state intervention. For Booysen (2012), the ANC is not a far right party. There has however been more critical inspection between the ANC's rhetoric and actual practice. Bond (2013), in an unpublished article, questions whether 'talking left' corresponds with 'veering back to the left'. As Bond put it, the ANC seems to 'talk left' but 'walk right'. This can be interpreted as the ANC choosing to use communist language but actually adopts liberal, capitalist tendencies.

2.1.2 DA

Welsh (1994) observes the historical roots of the DA, the then Progressive Party, were "cautious liberals" and in 1979 accepted universal suffrage. In a Strategy Document of 1992 the then also called Democratic Party (DP) attacked the ANC and the National Party (NP) for not having a "deep-seated commitment to liberal democratic values or to market oriented economics" (Welsh, 1994: 110). In the first democratic election in 1994, the DP propagated "liberal democratic values among the new electorate…untainted by violence, corruption,

apartheid and socialism", and in so doing, exemplifying itself as a "centrist party" (Welsh, 1994: 111). Welsh further states that the rational of the DP in the 1994 elections was that the ANC would gain the vote of the 'far left' and the NP the vote of the 'far right' but the DP could take the political centre.

Scheidegger and Lodge (2005) see the DA as being a liberal party. Not too far from this, Booysen (2006) and Jolobe (2009) mention the DA as having a 'liberal' or 'centrist' constituency and as a party seeking to protect the public from 'power hunger'. Booysen (2006: 132-133) observes the DA as being "right of the ANC". Does the term 'liberal' denote 'right'? What does right-wing mean in contemporary politics? Jolobe (2009: 133) states that while "Leon's strategy and vision was to turn a white, minority, liberal political tradition into an electable, centre-right, multi-racial voting block", the post-2004 DA had to reinvent itself. But Booysen (2006: 143) observes the "incongruous ideological" position of the DA, which in order to grow in its support base had to target poor black voters; however, it advocated free market, though it made proposal for a basic income grant, it was contradictory. It is plainly said that the DA pretends to be a social-democratic party but displays a mixed bag of orientations and in the 2004 elections were conservative in its policies (Booysen 2006). Booysen (2006) argues the need for an effective opposition to come from the left not the centre-right to challenge the ANC. if a centre-right party does exist in South Africa, exactly what is their relevance? Even more, is there a centre-right party or parties in the socio-economic domain? The latter needs to be first established before the former is even examined.

2.1.3 COPE

COPE tried to be close to the ANC ideology. Booysen (2009: 96) describes the ideological direction of COPE as a "social democratic party". Booysen based this on COPE's speaking of a mixed economy within the confines of capitalism, the free market and co-operation with the private sector. "The ideological dividing lines in the ANC-COPE contest were blurred" (Booysen, 2009: 97). Booysen (2009) observes that COPE was formally positioned as right of the political spectrum from the ANC, however, later COPE stated that it is on 'ideological par' with the ANC, the only difference being that it intended to practice what it preached.

2.1.4 IFP

The IFP has been described as having prominence in Zulu affairs. Hamilton et al (1994: 74) states that the IFP has identification with monarchical leadership and the Zulu-speaking heritage; describing it as "the king's intervention in politics" in the region of KwaZulu Natal, whose history dates back to King Shaka. In 1994 the IFP made a request for an autonomous Zulu nation which was the call for KwaZulu Natal to secede from South Africa. The party has been described as 'Zulu nationalists' or 'Zulu traditionalists', exhibiting a claim to a 'Zulu Kingdom' (Hamilton et al, 1994: 75-76). The IFP in this sense is seen as a 'national cultural liberation movement' in which popular mobilisation was based upon a unified Zulu ethnicity; this was powerfully seen when the IFP initially limited membership to Zulus (Hamilton et al 1994). Zulu revivalism was seen when the IFP not only appealed to Zulu culture but appealed to the restoration of Zuluness altogether in an attempt to avert foreign cultures in South Africa (Hamilton et al 1994). In the same tone but in a contemporary light, Piper (2006) states that the IFP is seen as a predominantly Zulu nationalist party.

The IFP had its own 'traditional power structures' – traditional in the sense of loyalty to chiefly authority (Hamilton et al 1994). During the Convention for a Democratic South Africa (CODESA) in 1992, the IFP presented claims to traditional authority and the IFP leader, Chief Buthelezi, argued that a single model of governance should not represent the entire South African populace but each party should have their constituency (Hamilton et al 1994). In 1992 the IFP participated in the Concerned South Africans Group (COSAG) that was declared to be a 'right-wing' group and which included the Afrikaner Volksfront who predominantly asserted the right to self-determination of South Africans (Hamilton et al 1994). From a contemporary perspective, Scheidegger and Lodge (2005) show how 'traditional leadership' is central to the IFP. Scheidegger and Lodge describe the IFP as conservative, in the 2000s the IFP from the National Democratic Convention desired to build a 'philosophical conservative' approach around three pillars: family values and the fear of God, deepening democracy, and a market-based developmental state.

Piper (2006) observes the 2004 electoral performance of the IFP as linked to its ideological shift. "The 2004 election saw the IFP lose its thirty years of dominance in KwaZulu-Natal to the ANC" (Piper, 2006: 148). Piper tries to explain the outcome stating that the party

adopted a new strategy – it jettisoned militant Zulu nationalism of the 1980s and 1990s in favour of liberal democratic politics. Piper (2006: 150) observes that, aside from its Zulu nationalism, there were moments such as in the negotiations of 1990 and 1994 "when the party was in a buoyant mood and presented its inclusive, national, and conservative-liberal face." And in the post-1994 period the Zulu rhetoric disappeared from the IFP who presented itself as such. The party's support base is rural Zulu communities and it is less able to use traditional leadership and coercive tactics of the old to gain popular support, and current campaigns are ineffective because of the lack of leadership and policies geared to meet the demands of society – the "party is unable to develop leaders, policies, and performance" (Piper, 2006: 152).

Despite the IFP's conservative-liberal approach targeted to gain voters in the 2004 election, the party is still overwhelmingly traditionalist in its leadership, operating in a 'yes-man' political climate, and in this sense, the internal political culture of the party is not conducive to liberal-democracy, as Piper argues. Even more, Piper explains, those who favour the liberal democracy were suppressed by traditional politics within the party and subsequently left. Further noting that the challenge of party re-innovation is hampered by the figure of Buthelezi, Piper argues that traditional politics is of little debate within the party for leadership renewal towards liberal democracy. In this sense, Piper concludes that the post-apartheid IFP has not transformed but is trapped between militant Zulu nationalism and inclusive conservative-liberalism.

2.1.5 FFP

Johann van Rooyen (1994) discusses the FFP under the label of the 'White Right'. General Viljoen 'hastily' created the then Freedom Front (FF) to ensure right-wing participation in the 1994 election (van Rooyen 1994). The reason for this was the acceptance by Viljoen that the era of Afrikaner and white rule had passed forever, Viljoen then decided to compromise and negotiate. It was a demand for Afrikaner self-determination in the form of a *volkstaat* (a people's state). The FF formed out of the umbrella of the Afrikaner Volksfront (AVF) in 1993 which was a conservative movement that had twenty one right-wing groups with the goal of uniting and mobilising right-wing movements to pursue Afrikaner self-determination (van Rooyen 1994). The AVF had internal divisions between the moderates and the extremists,

however, in 1994 seventy three percent of the 'traditional hard Right core' supported the FF; in this sense "Viljoen…effectively gained control over right-wing politics" (van Rooyen, 1994: 104). With less than half of all Afrikaners supporting the *Volkstaat*, the idea has not always been accepted and van Rooyen (1994) states that this meant the demise of right-wing politics particularly centred around a *volkstaat*.

It has been observed that the FFP is on the right of the political spectrum in the sense of conservative ideology (Naidu and Manqele 2006). Heyn (2009: 174) describes it as being formed out of the "conservative white Afrikanner". Naidu and Manqele describe the FFP as the 'last bastion of Afrikanerdom'. The party aims to protect and advance the interests of Afrikaners, fighting for minority rights in a non-racial and multiparty state, however it is not merely fighting for political and cultural rights but the FFP promises to fight for an 'Afrikaner state' – that is the *volkstaat* (Naidu and Manqele 2006). In the 2004 election, the party rebranded itself as the FFP but during this time the party did not focus on a *volkstaat* but on advancing cultural rights of Afrikaners. In the 2009 elections, the *volkstaat* was not explicitly mentioned for the first time though this does not mean that the party abandoned the notion (Heyn 2009). In an effort to appeal to Afrikaners and other minority groups, Naidu and Manqele (2004: 222) state that the FFP lacks appeal amongst Afrikaners and "raises questions about Afrikaner nationalism" and the party's future. Is the FFP a far right party? If so, far right on what issues? Or is it now moderate right? What can further support this?

2.1.6 ID

Hoeane (2006) and Heyne (2009) observe the brevity of the ideological nature of the ID. The party defines itself as social democratic and to the centre-left (Heyne 2009). Hoeane discusses the ideological nature of the ID as being dedicated to represent workers and leftists. Commenting on the ID's success in the 2004 election, Hoeane states that it is due to the party carving a niche of support in the way it represented issues. Heyne states that the ID and other smaller parties feared being marginalised and ventured to expand their electoral base. This meant for the ID a move to the centre of South African politics, trying to become attractive to disillusioned voters. Heyne (2009) observes that the ID did not concentrate on policies that differentiate it from the ANC but sees itself as a social-democratic party like the ANC but the ID argues that the difference is its policy-making and

policy implementation and not primarily ideological differences, as a result vowing to be better and more effective than the ANC.

2.1.7 UDM

Naidu and Manqele (2006: 216) explain that "the UDM attracted disaffected voters from a variety of political background" promising to bring capable leadership on key socio-economic issues. In 1999, the dual leadership of Bantu Holomisa and Roelf Meyer enabled the party to project a multiracial image. By 2004 the "UDM appeared to have become an ethnically based party with appeal only in the Eastern Cape" but had to represent itself as a national party in the 2004 election year (Naidu and Manqele, 2006: 216). The 2004 electoral strategy discredited the ANC by convincing voters that the ANC abandoned them for neoliberal policies which would increase poverty, in this sense the UDM appealed to the economically marginalized and as a policy alternative, promised to increase public expenditure for basic services (Naidu and Manqele 2006). This is similar to the observation made by Scheidegger and Lodge (2005: 13) who state that in the 2004 election, "the UDM campaigned around a set of policies that represented a mild left alternative to the ANC's liberal market reformism." UDM officials stress the extent to which "the demands and needs of the people' shape policy making within the organization" (Scheidegger and Lodge, 2005: 22).

2.1.8 ACDP

The ACDP is described as a conservative party that is engaged in 'rebuilding South Africa's morality' (Naidu and Manqele 2006). The ACDP represents 'Bible believing Christians' and "those who have a high regard for moral value" (Naidu and Manqele 2006: 208). Scheidegger and Lodge (2005: 15) state that the ACDP represents "the Charismatic Pentecostal Christian right". The ACDP considers liberal democracy as a demise of morality and the party capitalizes on the state of rapid moral degeneration. The 1994, 1999 and 2004 election campaigns were relatively similar. However, Heyn (2009: 163) states that in the 2009 election, the ACDP opted for a more secular stance by attracting non-Christian supporters. The ACDP describes itself as a classical conservative centre-right party (Heyn 2009). The 2004 election was concerned with moral issues whereas in 2009 the concern was social issues of unemployment and poverty. The ACDP in 2009 used the term 'family values'

not ‘Christian values’ to campaign in order to broaden its support base. However Heyn (2009) notes that the ACDP did not depart from its centre-right position but is trying to reach other groups of voters. Heyn further states that the challenge is for the ACDP to transform itself from a right-wing conservative party to a Christian party focused on social and economic issues. Is the ACDP far right or centre-right? And on what issues particularly?

2.1.9 UCDP

The support for the UCDP comes mainly from the North West Province, from disgruntled civil servants in urban areas and former homeland chiefs in rural areas (Naidu and Manqele 2006). Its consistency is people who had relatively privileged positions in the apartheid-homelands administration. The UCDP capitalizes on the lack of service delivery by the ANC and the 1999 election campaign of the UCDP was based on promising service delivery and improved living standards for people in the North West – the slogan was ‘ready to deliver where others have failed’ (Petlane 2009, Naidu and Manqele 2006). Petlane (2009) discusses the program as based on a mix of Christian and traditional values. The campaign on such issues is consistent with other years, as these authors show. The UCDP does have a slight appeal to Christian and traditional values but however focuses more on social and economic issues; and furthermore, service delivery rather than ideology is more apparent in the UCDP (Petlane 2009). There is an uneasy understanding being made again with ideology. Is the UCDP absent of ideology when it focuses on service delivery?

2.1.10 APC

The APC has not been discussed at all. This is perhaps because it emerged recently and won seats in the 2009 election. There has not been academic literature pertaining to the APC.

2.1.11 AZAPO

Academics when discussing AZAPO tend to do this together with the PAC. According to Cooper (1994), AZAPO and the PAC “tended to stand more on principles and socialist rhetoric” and ignoring reconciliatory politics. AZAPO, just as the PAC, failed to participate in the 1994 election because it did not want to participate in a government that included parties that were associated with the apartheid system, particularly referring to the National Party (NP) (Hoeane 2006). Observing the poor performance of PAC and AZAPO’s refusal to participate in the 1994 election and also considering the contemporary electoral

performance of the party, perhaps the suggestion by Cooper (1994) is worth stating, that AZAPO and the PAC must consider the new realities after the Cold War if they want to increase public appeal and electoral success. Petlane (2009: 181-182) makes a claim that AZAPO has similar ideology and programmes as the ANC and the PAC – "sharing ideological ground" and "programmatic similarities".

Discussing, in a more direct fashion, the ideology of AZAPO, Hoeane (2006) states that AZAPO's socio-historical party origin comes from the banning of black consciousness organizations in South Africa. In this sense, the party sought to continue to uphold black consciousness 'ideology' and asserting the centrality of black people in South Africa – to which Hoeane describes as being largely similar to the orientations of the PAC. However, AZAPO was largely different because it defined 'black people without reference to skin color but as those who were politically opposed such as Coloreds and Indians, as Hoeane explains.

AZAPO "explicitly embraced radical Left ideas, arguing for a socialist South Africa" (Hoeane, 2006: 192). AZAPO in 2004 stressed the central role of government in controlling the economy and opposes privatization (Hoeane 2006). AZAPO sought to place African people at the centre or spotlight of politics, economic and cultural liberation, and defined the working class as the "most crucial component" of the liberation (Petlane 2009: 182). According to Petlane, the party emphasized issues such as the abolition of provincial government.

Academics have criticized AZAPO for failing to develop a coherent ideological position, similar to the PAC; and while the country moves to liberalization, AZAPO continues to advocate radial left positions making the party seem out of date and it has also failed to convince the black working class that its policies are possible – it continues to call for socialism, what Cooper would call the rhetoric (Hoeane 2006). Hoeane states that both the PAC and AZAPO are poor in support because of its 'rigid ideological positions' and rather than developing a socialist agenda that is in-tune with current realities, both AZAPO and the PAC are stuck in branding a socialism of the 1970s. Petlane (2009: 193) states that the general decline in the support for leftist parties shows the consolidation of 'centre-left' politics as represented by the ANC and COPE. Additionally, Hoeane (2006) notes that the premier socialist party, the ANC, has moved to the right and the PAC and AZAPO have not yet filled the gap existing for the political left.

2.1.12 MF

Reynolds (1994: 199) discusses the MF with reference to the election results, discussing the MF and the ACDP under 'the others', stating that Amichand Rajbansi "managed to poll enough Indian votes in Durban to get a spot in the regional legislature." Naidu and Manqele (2006: 213) describe the MF as 'keeping alive the Indian vote' – however, this discussion was focused on leadership charisma which enables organizational survival of the party. The observation by academics when discussing the MF is that it "solely concentrates on the Indian vote and is thus an ethnically based party", further stating that the 'core' of the MF is to safeguard Indian interests in the face of an African-led government, to advance social and economic interests by making sure that Indians receive a fair share of service delivery (Naidu and Manqele, 2006: 214). The party tends to have an overwhelmingly Indian support base but it portrays itself as representing all minorities. Naidu and Manqele (2006) states that it is not about tensions between Indians and other race groups, rather, the party aims to seek cooperation between races to build a lasting unity (Petlane 2009).

2.1.13 PAC

There is lack of a clear party position of the PAC since 1994 which was caused by leadership conflicts within the party (Cooper 1994). The party suffered "ideological inconsistency and marginalization" in 1960s to 1980s (Petlane, 2009: 183). This is perhaps because it espoused socialism. Hoeane (2006) describes the PAC as being more radical on the left than the ANC. Hoeane states that in the 2004 election campaign, the PAC advocated radical land redistribution and spoke of the party's key constituency being black voters and the working class. Petlane (2009: 186) states that "at the core, the PAC programmes of policy proposals did not differ significantly from that of the ANC" but focused on the black marginalized constituency like the ANC. However, according to Petlane, the PAC can be seen as both left and right, Petlane supports this by referring to the usage of the term 'African', its suspicion of non-racialism, and proposals to nationalize the economy. Petlane describes the party as espousing nationalist ideals. The PAC broke away from the ANC stating that the ANC deviated from the African nationalist principles of its origins in favor of non-racialism and was being influenced by white communists. Hoeane in this sense links the PAC ideology to black politics. According to Hoeane, the party for example emphasizes how the socio-economic condition of the black majority has not improved. Hoeane states that this is not

just interests external to the party but internal issues such as the candidate list of 2004 which was dominated by black candidates. Hoeane concludes that this is unsurprising given the party's 'Africanist view'.

Moreover, according to Hoeane (2006: 200), the "PAC's ideology has failed to evolve with changing conditions in postapartheid South Africa." Hoeane goes on to explicitly state that "[i]ideologically, the PAC remained mired in its apartheid-era mindset", showing a hostility towards the consensus politics of 1994, displaying mistrust of past actors, and the reconciliatory trajectory; and even up until 2009, instead of addressing the real needs of black voters, the PAC concludes that the condition has not changed since 1994. PAC made a claim in 1994 that whites must leave, Cooper (1994: 117) calls this a lapse into wild rhetoric. ANC suspended Zephaniah Mothopeng and Robert Sobukwe for an "Africanist tendency", who went on to become the founding fathers of PAC. There was a time when "nearly all whites" feared the PAC (Cooper, 1994: 118). Cooper (1994: 118) describes it is a "far-Left" organization. Is the PAC still an extreme left party? What about its ideology in relation to the political domain? Is it also far left?

2.2 CONCLUSION

Gathering from the literature review of ideology in South Africa and more specifically party ideology in South Africa, it is clear that there has been discussion on ideology and also an effort to classify South African parties according to ideology or the left-right dimension has been made. Two main conclusions can be derived from this. First, the discussion of ideology generally is concentrated in two domains: the social-cultural domain, which focuses in itself on a particular variable, race (discussing Afrikaner parties, Indian parties, African or black parties); and the socio-economic domain (centre, centre-left, centre-right and far right and far left parties). Second, the discussion on party ideology specifically, does not reveal neither a direct focus and subsequently nor a systematic investigation on party ideology. The rational of this research proceeds from an attempt to fill this gap. The research will focus not on a specific or a few parties but on all parties as represented in parliament at 2009. In order to provide an understanding of each party's ideology, it is important to avoid a narrow and one-sided approach which is to simply focus on the socio-economic domain. In

this sense, this research attempts to provide a broad and inclusive picture of party ideology by focusing on the political, socio-economic and social and cultural domain.

CHAPTER 3: POLITICAL IDEOLOGY

3.0 INTRODUCTION

This chapter seeks to define the terms that are used in this research. It will provide a definition of ideology, give an understanding of its significance and will discuss the left-right dimension in terms of the ideologies that constitute it.

3.1 WHAT IS IDEOLOGY?

Three approaches have been developed over the years in an attempt to define ideology. This is the scientific, pejorative and value-neutral approach. The scientific approach was understood as the initial definition of ideology. The term 'ideology' was originally formed in the eighteenth century, by French author Antoine Destutt de Tracy who tried in the 1790s and 1800s to find a 'systematic' study of the sources or origins of ideas (Gould and Truitt 1973). De Tracy's aim was not only to create a systematic science of ideas but also making the study 'distinct from prejudices', as an attempt to rid the science of ideas from all its supernatural and religious elements (Freeden, 2004: 1). De Tracy argued that religious ideas are misleading and superstitious and in this sense ideologies came to be associated with rationality and science (Ball et al 1995).

The pejorative approach is a 'negative' definition of ideology. In the nineteenth century Marx and Engels understood ideology as a 'critical concept'; it is often seen that they "are the originators of what became a widely accepted theory of ideology" (Gould and Truitt, 1973: 1). For Marx and Engels the 'ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas', this means that the class which is the ruling material force of society also rules the intellectual force (Gould and Truitt 1973). Marx's desire was to show the illusion of the times in which people see from the ideology that supports the ruling class; however, once people see differently then revolution becomes real (Ball et al 1995). In this sense, "ideologies are interrelated systems of false ideas, false consciousness" (Gould and Truitt, 1973: 1). According to Jost et al (2009), it is not only Marx and Engels who expressed this view but also social theorists such as Mannheim and Habermas. Mannheim (1936: 55), though offering a different approach to Marx, in one sense described ideology as a "more or less conscious disguise of the real nature of a situation." Habermas (1989) treated ideology as a "systematically distorted communication." It is an analysis of politics that refers to

social class and treats political ideologies as nothing more than an expression of the interests of a particular class (Heywood 2003).

The value-neutral approach understands ideology as a phenomenon worthy of study in its own right rather than merely as an "epiphenomenon" (Freeden, 2004: 3). It is closely linked to the scientific approach. In this way the concept of ideology came to mean first, 'beliefs' of the world and second, as something more than a defense of a specific interest or class (Ball et al 1995). This influenced part of the movement away from the purely critical approach to ideology. This non-pejorative, scientific or value-neutral conception denotes "the different families of cultural symbols and ideas human beings employ in perceiving, comprehending and evaluating social and political realities in general, often within a systemic framework" (Freeden, 2004: 1; Editorial 2001). In this sense, ideology came to be seen as a tool that "provides a coherent *perspective* through which to understand and act upon the social world" (Eccleshall, 1984: 8, my emphasis). Vincent (1992: 16) states that ideology denotes a political perspective, "a specific set of views which tries to legitimate political power", ideologies describe and prescribe. All ideologies share two common features: they present an *image* of society and also a *political programme* which essentially says something about how society actually operates and how it ideally should operate (Eccleshall, 1984: 8).

It is argued that ideology is worth studying a system of ideas in its own right. And moreover, the value-neutral approach is important because it is a broad enough to encompass what most people have in mind when they talk about ideologies (Ball et al 1995). This is the return to the original idea of the scientific study of ideology as 'value-free activity' as juxtaposed with the Marxist understanding of the 'truth-distortion dimension'. This research paper takes a value-neutral approach to studying ideology in South Africa. It focuses on four particular ideologies – liberalism, socialism-communism, conservatism and nationalism.

3.2 IMPORTANCE OF IDEOLOGY

It can be plainly stated that "political ideas matter", that "ideas matter in politics is beyond question" (Schwarzmantel, 2008: 3; Rueschemeyer, 2006: 227). It is difficult to understand political activity without understanding the ideas and visions that have caused people to act (Schwarzmantel 2008). This is precisely the point that this essay proceeds from. We simply cannot take ideas for granted. We cannot consider them as theoretical philosophy in books.

Ideas can have ‘pervasive consequences’ (Rueschemeyer, 2006: 248). Ideas can advance social change such as seen by the Enlightenment which played a role in the run-up to the French Revolution or help to maintain the status quo as in the doctrine of the divine right of kings to rule in post-medieval Europe (Rueschemeyer 2006). “Ideas enjoy varying degrees of autonomy in their development, and their impact on social stability and change can be minuscule but also extremely powerful” (Rueschemeyer, 2006: 249). This is more than ideas but ideology which can create, keep or destroy systems.

Ideology is not just a belief system, attitudes or views about society but also is directed towards action. Freeden (1996) links ideology to ‘thought-behavior’ relationship. The purpose is not to pursue ideas for action randomly but to organize society, so action is intended to arrange the way society should be organized (Schwarzmantel 2008). “Its systematic features are ‘maps of problematic social reality’ which enables purposive action and perform an integrative function, irrespective of whether those maps are accurate or not” (Freeden, 2004: 5). It can take up extreme forms but also moderate forms in which people in ordinary life engage in political activity. This is not reserved to leaders but masses of people who found political ideas an inspiration and a cause for action (Schwarzmantel 2008). There is “plenty of historical evidence that politics cannot be understood without comprehension of ideas or packages of political ideas that have mobilised people to political activity, at whatever level” (Schwarzmantel, 2008: 4).

Ideologies feature a major part in political life, particularly in ordinary affairs of government life. Especially in relation to what factors motivate a specific decision. Hamilton (1987) explains that ideology facilitates choice or decision. This is described as a key function of ideology (Editorial 2001). Political life, Schwarzmantel argues, cannot be impoverished by the weakness of political ideologies; a healthy democracy rests on competing ideologies. Ideologies and the relationship with democracy have been explored and it has been argued that ideology enables citizens of democratic societies to ‘debate the choices open to them’ and in that way help them ‘shape their future society’ (Schwarzmantel 2008: 183). The “confrontation between different ideologies is a necessary part of a healthy democracy” precisely because it involves debate and discussion between competing views of how society should be organized and to realize this in practice (Schwarzmantel, 2008: 13). “Without such confrontation between opposing ideologies, political life becomes stifled or

limited, confined to a merely technical, though not unimportant, discussion about how to manage the existing political order" (Schwarzmantel, 2008: 13). Of course, one has to work out what is the role of ideology, which is usually not something of a post-Wold War II type but rather the purpose is for the construction of a good life (Schwarzmantel 2008). In this sense ideology is important in the political process for decision-making and a healthy democracy.

Besides the internal dimension of ordinary political affairs, though significant, ideologies have had a greater impact throughout the world. Ideologies and ideological conflicts have persisted throughout modern history (Ball et al 2004). This goes as far back as medieval society (conservative ideology) versus the enlightenment (liberal ideology), to World War II (defeating fascism), the Cold War (liberalism versus communism), to contemporary society. For a big part of the twentieth century, three political ideologies dominated the world: fascism, liberalism and communism. In World War II, the communist regime of the Soviet Union joined forces with liberal democracies of the West to defeat the fascist alliance of Germany, Italy and Japan. After the triumph over fascism, communist and liberal allies soon became enemies in a Cold War that lasted for more than forty years. Ball et al (2014: 2) describes Lenin, Stalin, Hitler, Mussolini, Mao, and many others, as 'armed prophets' who "left the landscape of the twentieth century littered with many millions of corpses of those they regarded as inferior or dispensable." In writing in the time of the Cold War, Grimes and Horwitz (1959: 1) describes it as a 'world-wide ideological struggle' – "an age which has been increasingly dominated by the sharp clash of differing political perspectives." Isaiah Berlin in 1992 stated that these movements began with ideas in people's heads (Ball et al 2014).

"Now, with the collapse of communism and the disintegration of the Soviet Union, the terrifying but easy-to-understand clash of ideologies seem to be over" (Ball et al, 1995: 3). However Ball et al (1995:3) explains that instead of thinking that the 'communist menace' or the 'evil empire' has vanished and liberal democracy has won, in some ways the world of the Cold War seems to have been replaced by "a world more terrifying and certainly more mystifying": a world fought by nationalists and racists, cultural wars waged by white racists and black Afro-centrists, neo-Nazi skinheads and ethnic cleansing, religious conservatives, fundamentalists, and secular humanists, gay liberation and anti-gay groups, feminists and

anti-feminists, terrorism, and so on. According to Ball et al (2014) political ideologies remain significant and will not simply fade away and "leave people to lead quiet lives" in the twenty-first century. "We may still hope that it will prove less murderous, but so far it appears that the twenty-first century will be even more complicated politically than the twentieth was" (Ball et al, 2014: 2).

In a world that has always been complex and is getting more complex, it is important to make sense of the world. How do we assess the merits or judge between different points of view? One way is to look at the view of either side, but the other is to put them in context. Looking at different viewpoints in isolation does not give a full picture of the issue nor an accurate evaluation. To understand the complicated political ideas and movements, it is crucial to understand the contexts in which they have taken shape. For example, to "grasp the thinking of neo-Nazi skinheads…we must study the thinking of their heroes and ideological ancestors, the earlier Nazis from whom the neo- (or "new"-) Nazis take their bearings", and of course the same is true for any other ideology (Ball et al, 2014: 3). Basically "[e]very ideology and every political movement has its origins in the ideas of some earlier thinker or thinkers" (Ball et al, 2014: 3).

3.3 WHY THE LEFT-RIGHT DIMENSION?

The left-right dimension is considered important in analysing party ideology. Since the work of Duverger (1954), scholars have advanced beyond the 'simple typologies' of parties as communist, socialist, and so on, "while accepting the principle of a single left-right dimension" (Janda, 1993: 172). According to McDonald et al (2006: 2), the "left-right, or some similar single-dimension concept, is fundamentally important to empirical and normative democratic theory" and therefore "theorists, analysts, and commentators frequently rely on it to explain and evaluate the operation of democracies." The left-right dimension plays a central role in analysing democratic processes (Gabel and Huber 2000). It is used as a major explanation of "party competition, coalition-building and policy outcomes" (Jahn, 2011: 746). Scholars further use the left-right position of parties on topics such as macro-economic policy, voting behaviour, political representation, legislative institutional choice, and cabinet stability (Gabel and Huber 2000, McDonald et al 2006). The view is that "parties communicate along an identifiable single dimension, such as left-right,

so that voters and other decision makers can know the meaning of the policy bundles parties embody" (McDonald et al, 2006: 1). In other words, a party's ideological position on policy and other issues is best captured in the left-right dimension which in itself bundles different ideologies together, presenting it in a single dimension.

This thinking presupposes that there is a left-right cleavage in countries. Importantly, this research draws from the conclusion by Budge et al (1987) who, in performing a comparative analysis of party ideology, shows that there is a clear left-right cleavage and the left-right can be found in a modified form. Janda (1993: 173) drawing from this conclusion, states that "despite the possibility of the great complexity of parties' issue positions across nations, existing research suggests that the variation can be accounted for with only two factors, both of which have some "left-right" element."

3.4 WHICH IDEOLOGIES?

The left-right dimension is a single dimension which contains multiple ideologies within it. Socialism-communism and liberalism are the most common ideologies that are referred to when using the left-right distinction. The left has one dimension which is socialism-communism while the right is divided into conservatism and liberalism (Jahn 2011). In this sense, the left-right spectrum is not one dimension but contains at least two-dimensions, in other words it can be seen as being composed of three ideologies (Jahn 2011). Nationalism is not popular inside of the left-right dimension. However, it is a significant ideology. This research will consider it together with the aforementioned ideologies. The view that the left-right is composed of particular ideologies does not fully capture the divide within the ideologies. This is mainly because ideologies have advanced through time, they are not composed only of the single ideas that formed them initially but contain 'branches' or 'divides' within themselves. For example, though liberalism broadly makes up the spectrum, it is overarching between the right and the left. It is not just a left or right ideology but is contained on both sides. Liberalism divides on the main point of equality, which concerns what kind of equality, formal or socio-economic equality? And which also concerns the degree of state intervention, how much state involvement in political and economic affairs? The following section outlines and explains the ideologies and its branches that will be

considered in this project and I have tried to classify them in the category that best reflects the particular ideologies' historical development in terms of its division.

3.5 THE 'RIGHT' IDEOLOGIES

This research takes the 'right ideologies' to be associated with classical liberalism, libertarianism, conservatism and nationalism. However, nationalism can be placed on the left as well. The problem is where to place nationalism, on the left or on the right? Nationalism is understood as being on the left side of the spectrum while others see it as being on the right side of the spectrum. Unlike the branches of the other ideologies which are much easier to see as rightward, nationalism can be understood as right or left, it depends on what factors are taken into account to cause a right placement. Nationalism can be on the left because of its communitarian association, that is, as referring predominantly to the community. This chapter places nationalism on the right because of its association with conservatism and the need to preserve and affirm the communities' culture and language or essentially its group identity. In this sense, though nationalism is composed of the communitarian element, the conservative element of nationalism is more distinguishing and significant. In other words, the community is not just a community but the community wants to achieve particular goals, to conserve its customs, cultures and traditions.

'Centre' or liberal parties do not contain a deep distinction as with the left-right parties. It is more common to find left-right parties than simply centre parties. When referring to 'centre' parties, this research will consider it to be applicable to the political domain. Centre parties are those parties that support rational views in politics and also support liberal institutions rather than traditional institutions. On the latter, these parties tend to prioritize individual or civil liberties rather than community or traditional rights. This research will refer to this as 'individualism'.

3.4.1 Classical liberalism

Liberalism has divided into two parts over the years: classical and modern. Heywood (2003: 27) in commenting on the distinction between early liberals who wanted the government to interfere as little as possible, and modern liberals, that want the government to be responsible for delivering welfare services, states that:

> …historical developments since the nineteenth century have clearly influenced the nature and substance of liberal ideology. The character of liberalism changed as the 'rising middle classes' succeeded in establishing their economic and political dominance. The radical, even revolutionary edge of liberalism faded with each liberal success. Liberalism thus became increasingly conservative, standing less for change and reform, and more for the maintenance of existing – largely liberal – institutions. Liberal ideas, too, could not stand still. From the late nineteenth century onwards the progress of industrialization led liberals to question, and in some ways to revise, the ideas of early liberalism.

Classical liberalism focuses on the idea of limited government, maintenance of the rule of law, avoidance of arbitrary power, and the responsibility of individuals for their own fate (Ryan 2007). Liberalism divides when it comes to the extent of government intervention and the meaning of equality. This is most clearly seen when considering the 'welfare state'. Classical liberals are hostile to the welfare state because it violates the principle that each individual must look for their own welfare and moreover, it confers large discretionary powers to politicians and bureaucrats making others dependent on the state for their own prosperity – the welfare state employs an extensive bureaucracy in which its members are granted "discretionary powers and charged by laws to use those powers for the welfare of their clients" (Ryan, 2007: 365).

Classical liberals are associated with favourable references to private property, capital, investment, entrepreneurship and business. This research will term these as those parties who favour the 'market mechanism'. Classical liberals refer to equality in an 'equality of opportunity' sense, referring to formal equality, that is legal and foundational, which means the legal framework of society must regard each one as equal before the law, as having the right to vote, and essentially as having the natural right to human equality (Heywood 2007). This is interlinked with freedom or liberty, as each person being free insofar as he or she does not infringe on the equal liberty of another. This is the point of human rights which plays a major role for classical liberals. This is legal equality and political equality. On socio-economics this means that each one is equal and free insofar as he or she is not held back by arbitrary factors such as race or gender but are accorded equal opportunities as everybody else. This project will term the aspects on equality as 'liberal equality' and freedom as 'liberal freedom'.

Classical liberals also favour liberal democracy and its elements, particularly constitutionalism and elections. They recognize the essentialness of constitutionalism as forming the boundaries that condition the operations of the state and where elections play a role on allowing people to have a voice in politics by choosing a government of their choice (Plattner 2009). Another important liberal democratic element is parliamentary oversight that is the duty of parliament to oversee the organs of the state, to be a check on government power, to scrutinize and report any violation or abuse of power, and to check the performance of state organs (Plattner 2009). This is related to the role of opposition in politics. Another feature is minority views. Liberal democracy has been specific about this issue, arguing that the majority should not infringe on the rights of the minority but the minority should be accorded the opportunity and the rights to voice their opinions (Plattner 2009). This research refers to this as 'liberal democracy' as those parties who refer favourably to elections, constitutionalism, separation of powers, the judiciary and so on.

Closely related to constitutionalism, from the idea of the separation of powers between the executive, judiciary and the legislature, comes the idea of decentralized authority. This is one way in which a state pursues decentralization and another way is in the form of federalism which can be seen as existing for the purpose of decentralization, to curb authoritative tendencies or as existing to form a closer link between the people and the government, as a grassroots purpose (Holden 1988). In this research the term 'decentralization' will be used for party's who support and want power decentralized to provincial and local government. However, though associated with classical liberalism, decentralization falls under the 'left' because its opposite, centralization, falls under the 'right', favouring a more authoritative position. This makes one element of classical liberalism fall under the left. The opposite of which is 'centralization' will be used for party's who support the abolition of the provinces and argue for more authority to central government. In the social and cultural domain, classical liberals tend to be liberal multiculturalists, advocating for diversity and pluralism instead of special group rights. This project will refer to this as 'multiculturalism'. Classical liberals also tend to support individualism more than community issues.

These issues and elements are usually articulated in a moderate fashion by classical liberals, in this sense, they are considered moderate or centre-right parties on such issues. The stronger version of classical liberalism has come to be known as libertarianism.

3.4.2 Libertarianism

The justification of the state is a central issue for libertarianism. This is supported first by the libertarian idea of individualism. Individuals own their lives – they have the right to act as they choose unless their actions interfere with the liberty of others to act as they choose (Hosper 1974). Hosper (1974) provides a good example. According to libertarians, there should be no law against protecting a person from becoming intoxicated with alcohol and drugs or limiting fornication and sexual behaviour – as long as doing all this imposes no threat to others. This research terms this as 'civil liberties' such as those parties who advocate civil liberties in favour of the individual such as in abortion or homosexual rights.

Second is the issue of the individual versus the state. Libertarians view the state with 'great suspicion', assigning individuals 'strong rights to non-interference', arguing for a 'protected sphere' of personal rights (Wolff 1998). Libertarians of "all stripes clearly wish to give the state only a very narrow authority"; libertarianism 'strongly resists' the idea that the state should have a role in the regulation of the manner in which an individual chooses to live their own life (Wolff, 1998: 2). In other words, they do advocate for some form of authority but strictly a minimal government. Libertarians are clear that the right to freedom is a negative right, which is the right not to harm others and in contrast, positive rights is the right to help others (Narveson 1998). Besides the social side of individualism, libertarians are known as neoliberals in the economic sphere, espousing strong views on non-interference of government.

Libertarians reject the system of social welfare that one should be forced to help others, "not even to tell them the time of day if requested, and certainly not to give them a portion of one's weekly paycheck" (Hosper, 1974: 356). "The price of abandoning self-ownership is high – "astronomical" seems about right" (Narveson, 1998: 24-25). Acceptance of social welfare laws constitute a kind of cannibalism but unlike in the physical sense as those who live of the flesh of others, it is seen in a moral sense as 'moral cannibalism', understood as those who believe he has the right to live of the 'spirit' of others (Hosper 1974). Many

people claim that they have a right to a job, free medical care, free education, free food and clothing, the right to a decent home, and so on, but for the libertarian, these things do not 'grow on trees', people have to provide them, and it does not mean that the government or people should provide this (Hosper 1974). In other words, the government should have no role in assisting the needy because the economy will do this on its own. This is the idea that "a person must belong to himself, and thus be unavailable for forced redistribution of his efforts" (Narveson, 1998: 1). This can be called neoliberalism or the radical version of the classical liberal position on socio-economics.

However, this research uses the term 'market libertarianism' to assess parties' socio-economic positions. It will mean by this those parties who talk of the free market, that is who directly mention the term, anti-affirmative action or anti-social welfare. It is in contrast with the 'market mechanism' component of classical liberalism. Parties in this sense do not state the 'free market' or 'open market' but other terminology such as private sector and so on, exemplifying a much more moderate version of market promotion.

3.4.3 Conservatism

Conservatism stands for preserving tradition. It is a 'passionate affirmation' of existing institutions (Huntington 1957, Claassen 2011). Huntington says an 'essential part' of conservatism is its desire to preserve. Nichols (1997: 243) defines tradition as "established practices of thought and action that are not simply 'habits'…because they are consciously valued and handed over." Conservatism speaks of the value of tradition as a guiding mode of cultural practice (Nichols 1997). Simpsons (1987) talks of the 'central place of social conventions' in conservatism which honours the integrity of communities, their customs, institutions and values. In the South African context, this research will take this to mean traditional governance or chieftaincy. Conservatism is also linked to authority that is espousing an authoritative dimension especially in political affairs – this can be seen as either authority to enforce traditional morality issues or other conservative elements.

Conservatism has a moral aspect to it. It is known as the preservation of traditional morality. This is better captured by the term 'neoconservatism' which expresses deep reservations about economic individualism. Neoconservatism is a form of "cultural conservatism that is in fact ferociously predatory on liberal values" (Drolet, 2010: 91). They see the bourgeois

order as destroying the traditional symbols and practices of society. The 'basic interest' of the new conservatives lies in the field of social or cultural criticism (Chapman 1960). Steinfels (1979: 55) states that the current crisis is 'primarily a cultural crisis', arguing that the problem is "our convictions have gone slack, our morals loose, our manners corrupt." It is important to note that neoconservatism is a type of 'compromise' that accepts social modernity only under conditions that exclude an affirmation of cultural modernity (Habermas 1994). In other words, new conservatism accepts free market capitalism but, and importantly so, rejects the demoralizing effects of capitalist society. They want to preserve traditional gender and sexual roles, and family values, arguing for a more authoritarian form of democracy, rather than extending liberty as proposed by the libertarians whose obsession lies in individual civil liberties (Ansell 2001). This research will take this to mean conservatism primarily in the sense of traditional morality, it is those parties that espouse family values, traditional morality and religious faith. The project terms this 'morality' and 'religion in politics'.

The conservative ideology is also linked to the socio-economic domain, for instance those parties that want to conserve the free market order against the threat of the welfare state (Giddens 1994). Though this is better captured under the label of libertarianism, 'conservative parties' are more common than the label 'libertarian parties' in the economic context. The project will use the term 'market libertarianism' and 'market mechanism' as explained above.

3.4.4 Nationalism

This comes from the idea of the 'nation'. It is important to distinguish a nation from a state, the nation often "consists of an ethnic or cultural community" while the state "is a political entity with a high degree of sovereignty" (Miscevic 2010: 1). On the most basic level, the nation is a cultural community, a "collections of people bound together by shared values and traditions, in particular, a common language, religion, and history, and usually occupying the same geographical area" (Heywood, 2003: 160). Two types of nationalism have been distinguished – ethnic and civic. According to the civic view, a nation is any group of people who give voluntary consent to forming a common political organization, loyalties of this group would be 'civic' as opposed to 'ethnic'; on the other hand, there is a nation

which comes together in a non-voluntary way in virtue of a common origin, language, tradition and culture; what determines one's membership in a community is one's ethnic-cultural background (Miscevic 2010). Nationalism, though having a state or country component, it is commonly associated with ethnic or cultural nationalism, in other words, groups in a country. Nationalism is predominantly about 'group identity' which this research will consider.

Ethnic and civic nationalism is best understood by its distinguishing factors. Heywood (2003) succinctly outlines and summarizes these. Civic nationalism considers the nation as: a political entity, it is inclusive and universal, it considers other nations as equal, and it is based on rationality, citizenship, civic loyalty and cultural diversity (liberal multiculturalism). However, ethno-cultural nationalism considers the nation (as in groups within a state) as a cultural or historical nation, it is exclusive and particularist, it considers other nations as unique, and it is based on emotion/mysticism, descent, ethnic allegiance and cultural unity. These types of nationalisms bring with it important questions about group identity. "All forms of nationalism address the issue of identity" (Heywood, 2003: 167). In this sense, if a party is appealing to a group, especially a racial or cultural group, such as the white group, the African group, the black group, or the Zulu group, it is showing nationalist sentiments.

Linked to nationalism is the issue of self-determination, this is the idea of advocating for either territorial separatism or some other form of recognition (Benner 1997). The self-determination element of nationalism raises questions on whether self-determination is always expressed as full statehood or something less for recognition (Miscevic 2010). Nationalism is not always associated with separatism or secession. This has led some scholars to adopt a variety of approaches to deal with many 'nations' existing in one territory or those groups who want recognition. First is liberal multiculturalism, which is the recognition that each culture deserves equal treatment to express its distinctiveness, it accepts diversity and pluralism, giving primacy to the individual to choose a cultural community. Liberal multiculturalists cannot be considered as nationalists. Second is communitarianism which emphasizes on communities and group rights, it is the accommodation of cultures, that is, it does have a liberal multicultural aspect to it but this plays a small part. Special recognition and rights of groups play a larger part. Communitarians when focusing on group identity can be considered as nationalists. These

nationalists, in its moderate form, first, advocate for special rights such as for cultural customs and linguistics heritages to be protected; and second, for the psychological emancipation or upliftment of a particular group, promoting the appreciation of the cultural identity of a group, especially if the group has been seen as inferior. These are elements of conservatism that expresses the desire to preserve tradition and affirm tradition or group identity generally. The extreme form of this cultural nationalism is the promotion of territorial separatism.

Nationalism at first glance seems like a unifying phenomenon yet world history proves it can also be destructive; nationalism does not only provide a sense of belonging to a group but separates groups from each other, clearly defining the 'other' as different. Nationalism was declared the political shame of the century and gained popular attention especially in 1990s (Calhoun 1993, Benner 1997, Miscevic 2010). The 1980s and 1990s was marred by ethnic violence and made real how everyday solidarities can become destructive such is seen by ethnic cleansing in Serbia and Rwanda, nationalist clashes in former Yugoslavia, and former Soviet republics (Benner 1997, Calhoun 1993, Miscevic 2010, Yack 2001, Herr 2006). Nationalism in the nineteenth and twentieth century has been the "preferred vehicle…for the expression of tremendous reservoirs of violent emotion" (Kaiser 1994: 148). From the twentieth century experience, scholars have concluded that such national awakenings can bring with it inhuman, cruel, violent expulsion and cleansing of non-nationals (Miscevic 2010).

Scholars have begun to argue that nationalism can be limited in its harms and cultivated for its 'strengths'. These scholars argue that liberalism and nationalism need not be wholly opposed ideas. 'Liberal nationalist' attempt to reconcile the ideals of liberalism with the facts of national affiliation (Dzur 2002, Yack 2001, Benner 1997, Herr 2006,). The perspective does not totally do away with cultural nationalism. The argument is that cultural bonds, can hold society together, and are important but it needs to depend on something deeper. Put in another way, particularism is worthwhile however to a certain degree; if particularism is taken as the fundamental value, it can be defended even if it violates principles of liberal democracy and values of liberty, equality, justice and reason (Benner 1997). Nationalism should be anchored in liberal elements to constrain its negative tendencies.

3.5 THE 'LEFT' IDEOLOGIES

3.5.1 Socialism and communism

Socialism is seen as a first step to attain communism and is the mobilization in the consciousness of people. In its earliest form, socialism tended to have a fundamentalist, utopian and revolutionary character (Heywood 2007). Its goal was to abolish capitalism and replace it with a different society usually constructed on the principle of common ownership. Revolutionary socialism desires absolute equality. "The most influential representative of this brand of socialism was Karl Marx, whose ideas provided the foundations for twentieth century communism" (Heywood, 2007: 53).

There is an important difference within communism itself about retaining the capitalist system. "Marx's goal was communism, a society of a radically new and different kind. In the dialectical language some Marxists still prefer, communism is the 'negation' of capitalism" (Levine, 2004: 84). Communists tend to favour public ownership and bureaucratic control of virtually all enterprise and the abolition of the capitalist system (Levine 2004). They can be considered as the far left. For communists, private property should not be allowed rather, property should be owned by the state and must be shared within the community. This egalitarian stance of communism goes on to advocate for the redistribution of wealth in society in an extreme fashion, to take from the rich and give to the poor in an attempt to equalize society from an income perspective (Heywood 2003). In this sense, they oppose market mechanism and market libertarianism in favour of a classless society, radical redistribution of wealth, state ownership of business and industry, nationalization, state economic planning in the market, and common ownership. This research captures this in the variable 'market libertarianism oppose' when analysing party manifestos (see Appendix G).

The revolutionary brand was not the only one around. From the late nineteenth century, a 'reformist' socialist tradition emerged "that reflected the gradual integration of the working classes into capitalist society through an improvement in working conditions and wages and the growth of trade unions and socialist political parties" (Heywood, 2007: 53). Reformist socialism (also known as the welfare state, modern liberals, social democracy) accepts inequality in society but pursues moderate egalitarian policies to lessen gross inequality (Ryan 2007). The welfare state is the main way for reformist socialism to exercise their

ideas, which is a 'social containment of capitalism' (Habermas, 1994: 63). Part of this compromise with capitalism is the acceptance of private property, especially as a means to generate human development and wealth. They envision a society in which not all but the major means of production are either publicly owned or in partnership with the private sector, in this way making an accommodation with capitalism (Levine 2004). In this sense, they are in favour of a 'mixed economy', both government intervention and capitalist wealth-creation, and a 'welfare state' – terms that this research will use.

In the social-cultural domain, national solidarity and community can be seen as components of socialist ideology. Heywood (2007) explains that socialism has a community element. This is in contrast to individualism of the classical liberals and the libertarianism that are seen by socialists as 'selfish'. Socialists discuss the 'cooperative' element of human nature and in this sense highlight unity, togetherness and solidarity. For socialists, people are better in community, when they focus on what they have in common rather than what they have apart. This research takes this to refer to 'national solidarity'.

In the political environment, socialists have come to argue for something more than liberal democracy because they seek to expand participation of people through things like people's forums. This can be known as the 'participatory democracy' component of socialism. In a participatory democracy, "there is a real sense in which individuals can feel that the government's decisions are their decisions, and should therefore be accepted", in this sense, engaging citizens in the decision making process (Holden, 1988: 133). Participatory democracy differs from the liberal democracy because it is a question of how much participation or the extent of popular control on public affairs (Pennock 1979). Liberal democracy is a system of rule by elected officers who represent on behalf of the peoples interest and the public's power of decisions is limited to electing representatives who are charged with the responsibility for making final decisions on behalf of the people; whereas participatory democracy is a system in which citizens are directly involved in decision making and the public has power over final decisions of important matters on the political agenda (Weale 2007). This research will consider this component as 'participatory democracy' and distinguishes it from 'liberal democracy'.

By the twentieth century, the socialist movement was divided in these two rival camps: revolutionary and reformist socialism. Lenin and the Bolsheviks are examples of revolutionary socialism, who called themselves communists. Reformist socialists practiced constitutional politics and embraced what came to be called social democracy. Social democracy has come to be seen as indistinguishable from modern liberalism (Heywood 2007).

3.5.2 Modern liberalism

This section must be understood in tandem with reformist socialist as discussed above. Modern liberalism links equality and liberty to socio-economic issues which goes beyond formal and legal equality offered by classical liberals and which also goes beyond 'negative liberty' and rather offer a 'positive liberty'. This research will refer to this as 'socialist freedom' and 'socialist equality'.

Modern liberals are not extremists in the sense of communism because they do not put any restriction on the absolute liberty of owners to dispose of their property as they wish, in other words, modern liberals do not have confiscatory ambitions (Ryan 2007). But in other ways, modern liberals, unlike classical liberals, believe that the government is responsible for delivering welfare services such as health, housing, education, and pensions, and also regulating the economy (Heywood 2003). Modern liberals favour a mixed economy, seeing the role for both the state and the market. In the socio-economic area, modern liberals argue that it is the proper task of the government to secure 'expanded' freedoms for individuals by ensuring that they are not 'enslaved' by poverty and unemployment, they argue for liberation from "anxiety, poverty and the cramped circumstances of working-class existence" (Ryan, 2007: 365). In this sense, they advocate for a moderate redistribution of wealth from the rich to the poor, which can be seen in the welfare state. This project terms this 'redistribution of wealth'.

Modern liberals want to go beyond equality of opportunity to talk of equality of outcome. As explained by Heywood (2007) and many others, modern liberals see equality of opportunity as amounting to the right to be unequal or the freedom to starve whereas for example legal equality grants a person the right to eat but not the capacity to eat. The response to this from classical liberals will be that each man has an equal starting place and

has the responsibility then in an equal society to make a life for himself. This equal society not only has equal opportunities for all but is marked by the principle of merit and hard work. On the other hand, modern liberals say it is the responsibility not only of the person but when the person is incapable, due perhaps to unequal historical conditions, the state has a responsibility to contribute to his or her progress and self-development by social welfare. This paper will take this to mean affirmative action and social welfare in the context of South Africa which are mechanisms from a modern liberal perspective to help the poor, and more specifically, from a communitarian perspective, to help those who were previously disadvantaged by providing empowerment through programmes like affirmative action.

3.6 CONCLUSION

Ideologies have developed over the years and it is important to consider the historical development of it when placing an ideology as either left or right. The left-right dimension can be better understood by looking at the branches of ideologies. This research will take the following to be either on the left or the right: classical liberalism (right), modern liberalism (left) and libertarianism (right) to fall under the ideology of liberalism; reformist socialism (left) and revolutionary socialism (left) will fall under what can be called 'socialism-communism'; and conservatism and nationalism will fall under the right.

CHAPTER 4: METHODOLOGY

4.0 INTRODUCTION

The main purpose of this research is to investigate and establish grounds for a left-right dimension in South Africa by using a combination of three approaches: manifesto analysis, expert survey, and interviews. It will employ both a qualitative (interview) and quantitative (expert survey and manifesto analysis) methodology. Each approach will be explained in this section, along with its strengths and limitations, and its reliability and validity will be considered. All three approaches have a common goal, that this, they assist in examining and measuring the prevalence of the left-right dimension by using variables and statements. It essentially considers that by "summarizing the observable manifestations of left–right criteria, one looks for patterns in the data and asks if there could be an underlying dimension which may be classified as left–right" (Jahn, 2014: 297). This Chapter also engages in selecting left-right variables and domains that will be used in this research. The domain and variable selection is based on deductive and inductive approaches.

4.1 CHOOSING LEFT-RIGHT VARIABLES

Before conducting research on left-right positions, it is crucial to choose variables that will enable one to determine such a dimension, and even more, how you choose it determines the validity of the approach. The left-right dimension is broadly made up of ideologies but these ideologies contain variables that make up the ideology in the first place. Classifying a party as left-wing is based on, for example, the party's support for state intervention in the economy; or classifying a party as right-wing is based on its support for the free market order. Within these examples, there are two ideologies, liberalism and socialism, inside of them is a dimension, the socio-economic dimension, and there is the variable of state regulation or free market. Each variable links to a particular ideology and moreover, sometimes that ideology can be both on the left and right depending on the kind of variable considered. The variables can be understood as issues. According to Pennings et al (2006: 206),

> Issues are societal problems that need to be solved, although not necessarily by means of government policy. They play an important role in the competition between parties. Parties seek to present themselves to the voters by means of specific issues that enable voters to identify themselves with these parties.

Can all issues be captured by the left-right dimension? It is most common to use the left-right dimension to refer to economic issues and to use the liberal-conservative or the libertarian-authoritarian dimension to refer to social and cultural issues (Evans et al 1996, Chapel Hill Expert survey 2006). This is because both dimensions measure "distinct dimensions of political values", for example, the left-right better captures equality and government regulation issues whereas the liberal-conservative dimension better captures issues relating to personal freedom (Evans et al, 1995: 97). In this sense the left-right is limited because it is unable to adequately capture social and cultural issues and therefore another dimension is more appropriate.

This however does not mean that issues cannot be placed within the left-right but it means that it fits uneasily within the dimension. In other words, the left-right dimension is not invalid but insufficient. Yet it is also highly useful. Despite the limitation of the left-right dimension, it is necessary to attempt to construct a single-dimension (Jahn 2011). The principal strength of the left-right dimension is that instead of having different ideologies per domain, such as the democratic-authoritarian dimension for the political, the liberal-socialist dimension for the economic, and the liberal-conservative or libertarian-authoritarian dimension for the social and cultural, it is possible to have a single dimension that captures everything and makes it easier to understand.

Positioning parties can be domain-specific and issue-specific (Gabel and Huber 2000, Budge et al 1987). According to the Chapel Hill expert survey (2006), it is possible for parties to be classified on their stance on economic, political and social issues – this research considers these categories to refer to 'domains'. In an earlier study, von Boyme (1985) looked at party positions on economic issues and on cultural issues. Within each domain there are further sub-categories which this research will refer to as the 'intra-domain'. Recent studies such as the Comparative Manifesto Project (CMP), Benoit and Laver (2006), and Budge et al (1987) take political issues to include freedom, democracy, religion in politics, constitutionalism, decentralization, and government efficiency; economic issues include government intervention, taxation and public spending, free enterprise, and ownership of the economy; and social issues include traditional morality, multiculturalism, group rights and nationalism. Social welfare is also included, however, as shown by Budge et al (1987), it is placed under a

separate domain, 'Welfare and the Quality of Life'. This research will include it under the socio-economic domain, which is used by Keman (2007).

Thus far this Chapter has outlined the left-right dimension and its association with ideologies, domains and issues. It has also outlined what others have stated to be variables within the domains of the left-right dimension. What these studies are attempting to do by working with categories and sub-categories is to establish an index or criteria. But simply using what other studies have used can be problematic unless we attempt a critical assessment.

"Despite the importance of the Left-Right dimension in comparative politics, establishing an index that captures this dimension in both a theoretically and empirically sound manner remains an ongoing challenge for political scientists" (Jahn, 2011: 745). In the words of Gabel and Huber (2000: 96), it is indeed "very difficult to develop and defend arguments about the inclusion, exclusion, and relative importance of specific issues." The reason for this is precisely because the left-right dimension comes from Western European countries. It "is the core currency of political exchange" for Western political societies and it is argued that the variables under the dimension may not be applicable to all contexts because of the uniqueness of other contexts (McDonald et al, 2006: 2; Huber and Inglehart 1995, Mair and Mudde 1998). According to Benoit and Laver (2006: 202), the left-right semantic has a specific meaning for everybody. This suggests that "correlating left-right positions with other policy issues in order to specify what is left and right shows that left and right mean something very different in the countries under investigation" (Jahn, 2014: 297). In this sense the left-right dimension is limited temporarily and geographically (Gunther and Diamond 2003).

Also, if one just uses variables found in the national study, that is, taking a country-specific approach, the left-right spectrum may not be comparable to different contexts (Gabel and Huber 2000). In a contrary light, Castles and Mair (1984: 83) state the importance of judging party ideology according to "general standards rather than purely national considerations." This enables the research to be comparative. There are two competing approaches here, the inductive (country-specific) and the deductive (exporting from elsewhere). Elo and Kyngas (2008: 107) state that inductive content analysis "is used in cases where there are no

previous studies dealing with the phenomenon or when it is fragmented" and the deductive approach "is useful if the general aim was to test a previous theory in a different situation or to compare categories at different time periods." Jahn (2011) reviews attempts to construct measures for the left-right dimension and concludes that they are mainly inductive.

In the CMP, the way in which the Right-Left Index (RILE) is identified is criticized by Gabel and Huber (2000) and also by Franzmann and Kaiser (2006). Gabel and Huber develop the 'vanilla approach' which starts out by saying that it is difficult to make claims about what issues refer to the left and right, the main advantage of the vanilla approach is that it understands that the semantics of the left-right change over time and are dependent on country-specific conditions. Franzmann and Kaiser develop the party-oriented approach, which essentially is the idea that parties determine the left-right dimension themselves. In other words, left issues will generally be emphasized by left-wing parties and vice versa. For Jahn (2011), by identifying a dominant ideological dimension from the party itself, it is extremely useful when considering special national scores. But Jahn argues that those who note the inconsistencies of the RILE and try to develop alternative approaches, though these advance our knowledge, its main drawback is that it uses inductive inference; it does not refer to the theoretical meaning of the left and right. For Jahn it is unclear whether the inductive approach is even related to the left-right from an ideological or theoretical viewpoint.

The left-right should meet the criteria of generalizability and specificity. Jahn (2011) considers that the left-right as theoretical concepts must be accounted for in the empirical study, it is also time-country specific, different statements have different meaning, and the left-right varies over time and across countries; and as a result Jahn argues for a deductive and inductive approach. For Jahn (2011: 746), the deductive approach is the need to use "ideological roots that lie at the core of this political distinction." The index combines political theory and empirical research, "which starts out from a clearly defined theoretical perspective in order to identify political parties' Left and Right positions" (Jahn, 2011: 746). In order to identify left-right indices that are stable over time and context, Jahn identifies a left-right core (LR_core) which is a predefined left and right index. According to Jahn (2011: 750) the strength of this "guarantees comparability and generalizability." Jahn also accommodates for country-specific issues which is regarded as the left-right plus

(LR_plus). So the left-right dimension includes the LR_core and LR_plus. In order to derive core theoretical variables of the left-right, Jahn, who takes the variables from the RILE, includes and excludes certain variables as shown in Table 4.1.

Left **Right**

Socialism (Left)	Liberal (Right)	Conservative (Right)
• Nationalization • Controlled economy • Economic planning • Market regulation	• Welfare state limitation • Free Enterprise • Economic orthodoxy	• Traditional morality • Social harmony • National way of life

Table 4.1 Core left-right statements derived by Jahn (2011: 753)

This research finds the work of Jahn (2011) very useful because it considers specificity and generalizability, it will also employ the approach of the LR_core. However, the research does not use all the variables as outlined by Jahn to constitute the LR_core, mainly because it is limiting. For example, conservatism includes variables that Jahn does not include, and also the variables that are included such as social harmony and the national way of life, may not be considered by some as core componential features of conservatism. Also, this research considers the welfare state as part of the core left-right especially with the demise of communism most democracies have come to accept the need for a welfare state (Schwarzmantel 2008, Giddens 1994). Political ideology should not be narrowed so much that it becomes first, rigid and may not be country-applicable, and second, unable to meet the core componential features of a particular ideology, something political theorists are concerned about, such as Freeden (1996).

This research uses a combination of the deductive and inductive methods. It will consider variables constituting the left-right dimension from, firstly, the CMP, Budge et al (1987), Laver and Budge (1993), Evans et al (1996), the Chapel Hill expert survey (2006), and Jahn (2011). Secondly, from the literature review on political ideology, it will consider variables most commonly used by political theorists when talking of liberalism, socialism, conservatism and nationalism. Thirdly, it adds certain variables that are unique to the South African context. This includes affirmative action and traditional governance. Table 4.2 shows

the variables employed in the research project. (*Difficult to locate* means that the variables cannot easily be placed as opposites.)

POLITICAL DOMAIN		SOCIO-ECONOMIC DOMAIN		SOCIAL & CULTURAL DOMAIN	
LEFT	**RIGHT**	**LEFT**	**RIGHT**	**LEFT**	**RIGHT**
Participatory democracy (people participation, peoples' forums, consultations, national conferences)	**Liberal democracy** (constitutionalism, elections, human rights, separation of powers, parliamentary oversight)	**Market (opposed)**	**Market (support)** (capital, private sector, entrepreneurship, business, investment)	**National solidarity** (togetherness, unity)	**Individualism**
Equality (socialist) (equality of outcome: social condition, history, context)	**Equality (liberal)** (equality of opportunity: formal equality, legal, equality, political equality)	**Market libertarianism (oppose)** (state economic planning, state ownership of business, nationalization)	**Market libertarianism (support)** (free enterprise, free market, economic orthodoxy and efficiency, privatization, competition, incentives)	*Difficult to locate*	**Multiculturalism** (diversity, pluralism, liberal multiculturalism)
Freedom (socialist) (positive liberty: consider outcomes, context, history, social conditions)	**Freedom (liberal)** (negative liberty: consider opportunity, each one is free and not held back arbitrary distinctions)	**Private property (oppose)**	**Private property (support)**	*Difficult to locate*	**Group identity** (group or minority rights, language rights, self-determination) and nationalist sentiments
Decentralisation	**Centralisation**	**Mixed economy** (private-public partnership, business-government partnership)	**Market libertarianism**	**Civil liberties** (extending liberty, individual rights, human rights)	**Morality** (traditional morality: opposes abortion and homosexual marriages)
Difficult to locate	**Traditional governance**	**Social welfare (support)**	**Social welfare (oppose)**		
Difficult to locate	**Religion in politics** (Christian democracy, religious values)	**Redistribution of wealth (support)**	**Redistribution of wealth (oppose)**		
		Affirmative action (support)	**Affirmative action (opposed)**		

Table 4.2 Variables used for left-right dimension per domain

4.2 MANIFESTO APPROACH

One of the most popular approaches to estimate a party's left-right position is through election manifestos, primarily national election manifestos (Gabel and Huber 2000). This comes from the broader method in the social sciences which is content analysis. The manifesto approach was first carried out in the 1990s, by the Comparative Manifesto Project (CMP) (Laver and Budge 1992). Party manifestos, though not primarily written to inform citizens about the left-right dimension, can be "used to deduce a party's underlying ideological position" (Jahn, 2011: 746). The idea is that parties use election manifestos as a kind of informational tool through which they communicate their policies to the public (Jahn 2011). Manifestos provide an accurate picture of the party's position at a particular time without requiring prior information about the party's policies and documents (Budge et al 2001).

The CMP method looks at sentences within the manifesto that appears to reflect either a left or right position. This is illustrated by Budge et al (2001) and Klingemann et al (2006). The CMP approach uses 'quasi-sentences' which is a set of words containing one and only one political idea. For example, the party statement 'we will protect social welfare' is considered a quasi-sentence. Moreover, sentences are coded under appropriate variables, for instance, the above quasi-sentence is considered under the variable 'welfare state'. This variable refers to favourable mention of social welfare by the party. Another example is a party statement such as 'we will increase the private sector's share of the economy', is coded under the variable 'free enterprise'. This variable refers to favourable mention of capitalism and free market over state control. This is the CMP approach to coding manifestos statements.

There are various strengths and weakness associated with the manifesto analysis approach. First, the strength of analysing manifestos is that they contain 'clearly' articulate views by the party (Budge et al 2001). Second, manifestos are able to show what the party stands for without prior reference to its policy documents. Policy documents also focus on narrow or single issues whereas manifestos focus on a broad range of issues. Third, Scott (1990) mentions the need for credibility of a text. There is a high degree of reliability of this content approach, precisely because manifestos are thought out by the party themselves and is in

this sense a party document. Fourth, from a quantitative perspective, by using numerical measures in analysing manifestos, it easily and clearly shows the frequency of issues. Smith (1975: 218) and Scott (2006) states that qualitative analysis deals with patterns of form while quantitative deals with duration and frequency which is the frequency of the appearance of particular elements in the text. The number of times that particular issues are used suggests the significance that the party attributes to it.

However, the quantitative method is criticized for emphasizing the "procedures of analysis" rather than the "character of the data available" (Sellitz et al, 1959: 336). Sellitiz argues that all communication that is not in the form of numbers must be considered or else meaning may be lost if it is reduced to numeric form. This is a critical weakness to the manifesto approach in terms of numeric analysis as conducted by the CMP. In considering this, this research uses a combination, as suggested by Smith (1975). The main strength of the qualitative approach is that it describes issues in a much more in-depth fashion and focuses on meaning (Prasad 2008, Kalof et al 2008). In so doing, this research does not look only at the numerical value which is intended to establish frequency and in turn say something about the significance of the element, but uses an interview approach.

When analysing the manifestos, a quantitative limitation was found in another form. The score from the manifestos only captures whether the party is left or right; it gives the amount of favourable references to an issue were mentioned. However, the numerical score is unable to say whether a party is moderate or extreme (McDonald et al 2007). For instance, the high negative score or high positive score does not mean the party is extreme in its ideology but simply means that the party emphasizes that element to a large extent. Only a qualitative study of the manifestos can say something about moderate and extremes, to a smaller extent, this research uses a qualitative approach – it checks whether the statements were radical or non-radical. The gap is also filled by the expert survey and the interview data which is able to capture moderate and extremes.

In addition, the manifesto coding system of the CMP and other researchers who employ this method do not specifically elaborate on the domain issues. For instance, some of the CMP work offers left-right scores but this is an overall score that averages all the number of statements and hence clusters and merges all domains together. This research considers the

domain component of the left-right dimension as critical and offers a contribution in this regard. The domain score is vital because it shows a parties position on that domain, for instance the political domain. A party can receive an overall left score but may be right in the political domain. If researchers on party positions fail to state this, then it gives a misrepresentation of the exact party's left-right position, in other words, the party is not wholly or totally leftward. Also, if one wants to track how a party's ideology evolved or changed overtime, the overall score can be useful but looking at the domains can be more useful. This research provides a 'domain emphasis' which is also a unique contribution that is neglected in the party positions methodology.

Moreover, the intra-domain emphasis and variables are neglected in the research on party positions. For instance, a party receiving a rightward score in the political domain obviously comes from certain variables that were higher than others to give the party such a rightward score for its political orientation. For instance, high mentions of the intra-political domain of liberal democracy or liberal equality gives us more concentrate theoretical and ideological understanding of why the party is rightward in its political orientation as opposed to leftward politically-oriented parties that emphasize perhaps participatory democracy and socialist equality. This research makes the argument that intra-domain variables gives explanatory power to parties left-right positions. These variables or intra-domain variables are not explicitly states and not well discussed but theorists who rather focus more on the overall position of parties.

When using a large time period it is important to consider that this can be limiting. If the left-right score is calculated based on clustering all years together, it fails to provide a fair and accurate representation of the party's ideology primarily because each party has been evolving (Keman 2007); and it fails to give a contemporary perspective, for instance, simply using 1994 and 1999 manifestos does not tell us what the party is contemporarily. Parties evolve or remain consistent through time. What they were in 2009 may or may not be what they were in 1994. By using a yearly approach, it can measure party ideology change and it moreover, eliminates the time-factor deviation in the results. This research uses the 2009 manifestos, especially for the domain emphasis, to give a contemporary picture and to

compare it to the survey and the interview. The yearly score will be used to check the consistency of party ideology.

A limitation that was encountered during the stage of data collection was that some party manifestos especially those of 1994 were difficult to locate. For the research scope of 13 parties, 40 party manifestos needed to be studied during the period of four elections between 1994 and 2009, which is the time-period of this research project. Besides referring to the parties' official websites and trying to obtain electronic copies of the manifesto, not all were available. Different channels were consulted to obtain the manifestos. First was the party itself, by sending a formal letter via email to the relevant person and through checking with them via multiple call-backs. Second, I located historical archives such as the University of the Witwatersrand Historical Archives and research institutes such as the Electoral Institute for Sustainable Democracy in Africa (EISA), through which some manifestos were obtained. Table 4.3 provides a list of manifestos obtained and not obtained (non-existent means either that the party did not exist at all or the party existed but did not gain parliamentary seats in that year). 83 percent of the manifestos were obtained, and for the year of 2009 all manifestos were obtained.

POLITICAL PARTY	MANIFESTO PER ELECTION YEAR			
	1994	1999	2004	2009
ANC	✓	✓	✓	✓
DA	✓	✓	✓	✓
COPE	Non-existent	Non-existent	Non-existent	✓
IFP	Not obtained	✓	✓	✓
FFP	Not obtained	✓	Not obtained	✓
ID	Non-existent	Non-existent	✓	✓
UDM	Non-existent	✓	✓	✓
ACDP	✓	Not obtained	✓	✓
UCDP	Non-existent	Not obtained	Not obtained	✓
APC	Non-existent	Non-existent	Non-existent	✓
AZAPO	Non-existent	✓	✓	✓
MF	Non-existent	Not obtained	✓	✓
PAC	✓	✓	✓	✓

Table 4.3 List of Manifestos obtained: Manifesto Analysis

The manifesto analysis used in this research was done quantitatively, similar to the CMP research. The process in which this method was used in this research is as follows. Firstly, statements were categorised according to the variables, and secondly, statements were classified according to their respective domain: political, socio-economic and social-cultural. Thirdly, the number of favourable references to or the frequency of each variable was calculated, that is, the Left count and the Right count. This was a process of simply counting and adding up the left statements and the right statements in each domain. Fourth, for the final score per domain and for the overall ideological score, the equation proposed by Budge (2013) as $\frac{(R-L)}{(R+L)}$ was used were 'R' is 'Right' and 'L' is 'Left'. This research terms this as the 'Ideological Index'. See Appendix G for the raw data.

When the ideological index reveals a *negative* score, it means that the party is on the *left side* while a *positive* index means it is on the *right*. The research uses a scale from -1.00 to +1.00. The result generated from the manifesto analysis or the ideological index was put in a range as shown below. It is important to note that a score of either -1.00 or +1.00 does not mean that the party emphasizes many elements in the domain nor does it mean that the party is extreme but it can be in most cases that the party only emphasized one element. The following shows the scale used in the ideological index:

-0.50 to -1.00	Emphasizes left elements to a large extent
-0.01 to -0.49	Emphasizes left elements to a slight extent
0.00	Emphasizes left and right elements to the same extent
0.01 to 0.49	Emphasizes right elements to a slight extent
0.50 to 1.00	Emphasizes right elements to a large extent

Table 4.4 Scale used for the Ideological Index: Manifesto Analysis

4.3 EXPERT SURVEY APPROACH

Prior to the manifesto approach, party measures relied on expert judgements (Kim and Fording 1998). The most common way to acquire expert judgements is through an expert survey. "The term *survey* is used to denote a standard list of questions that will be posed to a great number of individuals" (Pennings et al, 2006: 59). The expert survey, specifically on party ideology or other issues related to the party, can be found in the study of Benoit and Laver (2006), Laver and Hunt (1992), and Warwick (2006). Castles and Mair (1984) published the first expert survey on party positions, followed by Laver and Hunt (1992) and also Huber and Inglehart (1995). These surveys are widely used to measure party positions. Essentially, the expert survey is based on elite judgements by individual scholars (Budge 2000).

The expert survey is advantageous because it is an "easy, economical and authoritative way to identify party preferences" (Budge, 2000: 103). Also because it is presupposed that scholars can give 'mature' judgements because of their 'expertise' (Budge 2000). The expert survey is also advantageous because it provides a contemporary perspective of party positions. "The expert scales…do not measure the positioning of parties at many points in time (mostly only at one)" (Pennings et al, 2006: 201). In this sense, experts base their judgements in a contemporary environment, in other words, unless it is a question which is asked, they will not place a party based on its ideology in 1994 or 1999.

Budge (2000) states that many have come to face-value expert judgements without being critical of it. The limitation of the survey is that it is infrequently administered and have different formats across countries, making its comparability limited (Gabel and Huber 2000). This limitation is considered in this research, as explained in the section of *Choosing left-right variables*. More importantly, experts may be biased in the judgements based on their party affiliations or party liking, and also what information they base their judgement on is unclear (Budge 2000). To fill this gap, this research uses the median method and the interquartile range to prevent outliers in the results such as extreme deviations. This research has also supplied the standard deviation and the mean for the expert survey data for those who would like to compare variability of results. See Appendix H for the raw data.

The experts had to position the parties for each question on a scale of 0 to 10. This research uses centre and moderate in an interchangeable manner. The following scale will be used:

9 to 10	Extreme right or far right
8	Close to the extreme right
5 to 7	Centre-right or moderate right
5	Centre or liberal
5 to 3	Centre-left or moderate left
2	Close to the extreme left
0 to 1	Extreme left or far left

Table 4.5 Eleven-point Scale used for the Expert Survey

Analysis of the scores was done by using the median as the averaging method. The two most commonly used methods for averaging are the mean and the median but the median was considered most appropriate for this method as it excludes outliers which can severely skew the results. In addition, the reliability of the results were evaluated using the interquartile range which is the difference between the upper quartile and the lower quartile values. In Chapter 5, in the *Expert Survey* section, the results are presented in a graph in which the dot represents the median score for each party, the line indicates the interquartile range, and the arrows show the upper quartile and the lower quartile respectively (representing the deviation of the expert responses). The lower the interquartile range, the more precise the result. The following range was employed in assessing the reliability of the median value with the following interquartile range presented below (the expert survey responses for all questions were lower than 4.5, indicating a reliable result):

0 to 2	Highly reliably
3 to 4	Reliable
>5	Unreliable

Table 4.6 Interquartile reliability range: Expert Survey

The expert survey in this research was restricted to 10 questions due to the limitation of the free version of the online survey provider namely Survey Monkey. But this has an added benefit primarily because the time taken for an expert to complete the survey would be less and the response rate could possibly be higher. The survey is included in Appendix F. Initially the questions on taxation versus public spending and gender equality were asked both in the survey and the interview, however as the research progressed, I discovered that the variables were numerous and I had to leave out these two issues. Though it is presented in Chapter 5, it is not discussed in the research.

Experts in the field of social sciences were identified and amounted to 420. To increase the population size for a higher response rate, the disciplines which were selected were broad, encompassing the political science, sociology, history, development studies and public policy. The survey was sent via email with an invitation, the survey link, the participant information sheet and the consent form attached, see Appendix B and D. The survey was fair in terms of the South African demographics by considering experts from universities across the Provinces as represented in Table 4.4.

INSTITUTION	NUMBER OF EXPERTS INVITED
University of Witwatersrand	29
St. Augustine College	4
University of Pretoria	66
University of South Africa	35
University of Johannesburg	42
Monash South Africa	15
Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University	18
Rhodes University	26
University of Cape Town	51
North West University	22
University of Stellenbosch	32
University of Venda	10
University of the Western Cape	26
University of Kwazulu-Natal	29
Limpopo University	26
Free State University	23
Tshwana University of Technology	4
Walter Sisulu University	9
University of Fort Hare	8

Table 4.7 Number of experts invited per institution: Expert Survey

Some of the emails were undelivered either due to the change of or incorrect email addresses. The final population amounted to 420 and considering this population, the response rate was 11.2% which is higher than the normally acceptable rate of 10 %.

4.4 INTERVIEW APPROACH

Interviews are seen as a good method in the social sciences for collecting data for qualitative analysis. Though this is not among the popular methods for assessing party ideology, this research sees it as significant in getting a first-hand understanding of party ideology and also because it is useful to check the consistency in a party's ideology (when compared with other methods). Davies (2006: 157) states that an interview is a "method of data collection, information or opinion gathering that specifically involves asking a series of questions". Rugg et al (2007: 135) defines an interview as 'a conversation with a purpose'. Interviews can be "conducted on a face-to-face basis…In some contexts and for some purposes interviews may be conducted by telephone or by way of electronic communication…Interviews of this nature are popular for reasons of cost-effectiveness and for the speed of data collection" (Davies, 2006: 157). This research uses a combination of face-to-face and telephone interviews, the latter forming the majority of interviews.

Non-random selection will be used for the purposes of this project. The leaders of each political party were ideally considered, however most of them were not available, and I was referred to party representatives. I interviewed one person per party. Moreover, I requested for the representative to be a long-standing or established party member, who would in this sense be able to give a reliable understanding of party ideology. Table 4.4 shows the person interviewed for each party, and the Bibliography under the *Interviews* section contains a list of the positions of those interviewed. Almost all parties were interviewed except the IFP and AZAPO – initially agreements were made to go ahead with the interview but in the last instance the members became unavailable. To compensate for this, qualitative information from the manifestos will be used. Participants were invited via email, with the participant information sheet attached and the consent form, see Appendix A and C.

One limitation of an interview approach is that especially for elite interviewing, the interview may overemphasize particular variables, this is especially so for open-ended or in-depth interviews (Legard et al 2003). This research takes a semi-structured approach, asking a series of general questions which covered all the three domains and which were common to all parties, refer to Appendix E. The interview also asked questions specific to the parties'.

On the point of reliability and validity, the interview is considered reliable because of the representative's position as a long-standing and well-informed member. Also, the commonality of questions based on the domains make it possible to achieve inter-party comparability with the manifesto data and the expert survey.

POLITICAL PARTY	PERSON INTERVIEWED
ANC	Ben Turok
DA	James Selfe
COPE	Farouk Cassim
IFP	Unavailable
FFP	Piet Uys
ID	Lance Greyling
UDM	Nqabayomzi Kwankwa
ACDP	Kenneth Meshoe
UCDP	Isaac Sipho Mfundisi
APC	Themba Godi
AZAPO	Unavailable
MF	Shameen Thakur-Rajbansi
PAC	Bennett Joko

Table 4.8: Person interviewed per party: Interview

4.5 CONCLUSION

This research engaged in convergent validity, which refers to "the comparison of a measure against one or more measures that are also measures of the same concept" (McDonald, 2005: 944). In other words, it took the ideological index from the manifesto analysis, the ideological position from the expert survey and the interview responses and compared them amongst each other in order to come up with convergent conclusions. Each method is useful – the manifesto result provides an answer as to whether the party is left or right, the expert survey provides an understanding of whether a party is left or right and moreover, moderate or extreme, and the interview analysis provides a means of establishing evolution and consistency. These three methods provide a combined approach which in itself gives an in-depth understanding to party ideology.

CHAPTER 5: PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

5.0 INTRODUCTION

This chapter constitutes an important part of this thesis. It aims to graphically illustrate the results collected from the two quantitative methodologies, namely, the manifesto analysis and the expert survey. From the party manifesto data, the following will be presented:

- The overall ideological index of parties from 1994 to 2009,
- The ideological index of parties for the political, socio-economic, and social-cultural domain from 1994 to 2009,
- Ideological index for each party in the respective years,
- Domain emphasis of parties from 1994 to 2009, and
- Number of statements for the political, socio-economic, and social-cultural intra-domain of parties from 1994 to 2009.

From the expert survey data, this chapter will present the following:


- Overall party ideology,
- Overall party position on politics and government,
- Positions on socio-economic issues such as state economic planning versus free enterprise, state ownership versus private ownership, and redistribution of wealth and affirmative action,
- Overall social-cultural ideological position, and
- Position on gay and lesbian rights.

The qualitative analysis of the interview will not be presented here but in Chapter 6. These graphs enable main conclusions to be drawn for each party and party ideology generally, which will be discussed in Chapter 6 and Chapter 7.

5.1 MANIFESTO ANALYSIS

5.1.1 Overall ideological indices of Parties in 1994, 1999, 2004 and 2009

The overall ideological indices from 1994 to 2009 are represented in Figure 5.1 for the parties existing at that time or for those parties for which the manifestos were available. These graphs provide an immediate understanding of each party's ideological position for each year but must be considered in tandem with the domain emphasis graphs.



	1994	1999	2004	2009
APC	0	0	0	0,58
AZAPO	0	0,04	0,08	0,26
MF	0	0	0,5	0
PAC	0,54	0,33	0,08	0,43
UCDP	0	0	0	0,28
ACDP	0,13	0	0,81	0,69
FFP	0	1	0	0,89
UDM	0	0,64	0,78	0,62
ID	0	0	0,43	0,22
IFP	0	0,29	0,41	0,4
COPE	0	0	0	0,18
DA	0,54	0,86	0,52	0,3
ANC	0,13	0	-0,08	-0,25


Figure 5.1 Overall Ideological Index of Parties from 1994 to 2009: Manifesto Analysis

5.1.2 Ideological indices of Parties per domain in 1994, 1999, 2004 and 2009

Though Figure 5.1 provides an immediate representation of the parties overall ideological positions, the Figures 5.2 to 5.4 below show the indices of the parties per domain for each year and Figures 5.5 to 5.17 shows the domains for each party per year also enables us to understand why the parties received the above scores. Essentially, it allows us to see what where the contributing domains to the overall ideological index as presented above. For example, the ANC was the only party positioned to the Left in Figure 5.1. However, the domains give a more accurate representation and we find more Left-Right party positions. Figures 5.5 to 5.17 is usual as it enables one to focus on a specific party and its Left-Right position.


5.1.3 Intra-domain analysis of parties per year in 1994, 1999, 2004 and 2009

This section also looks at each party's intra-domain emphasis, for the years obtained. Figures 5.18 to 5.5.20 clearly show the number of statements per variable for each party in the respective years. It presents the frequency at which each factor or variable was favourably referred to in the manifestos. These 'number of statements' were what made the manifesto ideological score possible, as stated in the methodology. It is useful to look at these statements in isolation because it allows us to see which variable within the political domain for example allowed the party to be positioned on the right. For instance, a party that is placed on the Right in the political domain does not say something about the intra-political issues, that is, what allowed a right placement. Also, looking closely at the intra-domain issues allows us to more precisely place a party in a particular ideology – for example, more intra-socio-economic domain statements on the free market, private property, no state intervention, no affirmative action measures, shows that the party is inclined to liberalism.




	1994				1999							2004									2009											
	PAC	DA	ANC	ACDP	AZAPO	FFP	PAC	DA	UDM	IFP	ANC	AZAPO	MF	ACDP	UDM	ID	DA	ANC	PAC	IFP	PAC	MF	ACDP	FFP	IFP	AZAPO	APC	UDM	ID	UCDP	COPE	DA	ANC
Political	0,62	0,46	0,36	0,26	1	1	0,92	0,86	0,69	0,6	0,3	1	1	0,87	0,78	0,75	0,45	0,38	0,27	0,14	1	1	0,86	0,77	0,64	0,64	0,59	0,57	0,5	0,47	0,44	0,42	0,21

Figure 5.2 Ideological Index of Parties: Political Domain from 1994 to 2009: Manifesto Analysis




	1994				1999							2004									2009													
	ACDP	DA	PAC	ANC	FFP	IFP	DA	UDM	AZAPO	PAC	ANC	IFP	ACDP	UDM	DA	ID	MF	AZAPO	PAC	ANC	FFP	UDM	APC	MF	ANC	PAC	COPE	AZAPO	ID	DA	IFP	ACDP	UCDP
Socio-economic	1	0,71	-0,59	-0,1	1	1	0,77	0,7	-0,83	-0,5	-0,07	1	0,82	0,78	0,5	0,25	-1	-0,6	-0,6	-0,33	1	1	-1	-1	-0,69	-0,56	-0,47	-0,38	-0,26	-0,2	-0,2	-0,11	-0,04

Figure 5.3 Ideological Index of Parties: Socio-Economic Domain from 1994 to 2009: Manifesto Analysis




	1994				1999							2004									2009											
	PAC	DA	ACDP	ANC	AZAPO	FFP	DA	PAC	UDM	ANC	COPE	AZAPO	PAC	DA	ACDP	MF	UDM	ANC	ID	IFP	ACDP	PAC	MF	IFP	APC	DA	UDM	UCDP	IFP	ID	AZAPO	ANC	COPE
Social-cultural	0,9	0,71	-1	-0,33	1	1	1	0,67	0,14	-0,54	-0,14	1	1	0,82	0,76	0,52	0	-0,78	-0,33	-0,33	1	1	1	0,91	0,75	0,69	0,6	0,45	0,45	0,31	0	-0,58	-0,5

Figure 5.4 Ideological Index of Parties: Social-Cultural Domain from 1994 to 2009: Manifesto Analysis




	1994	1999	2004	2009
SOCIAL-CULTURAL	-0,33	-0,54	-0,78	-0,58
SOCIO-ECONOMIC	-0,1	-0,07	-0,33	-0,69
POLITICAL	0,36	0,3	0,38	0,21

Figure 5.5 Ideological Index of the ANC per Domain from 1994 to 2009: Manifesto Analysis




	1994	1999	2004	2009
SOCIAL-CULTURAL	0,71	1	0,82	0,69
SOCIO-ECONOMIC	0,71	0,77	0,5	-0,2
POLITICAL	0,46	0,86	0,45	0,42

Figure 5.6 Ideological Index of the DA per Domain from 1994 to 2009: Manifesto Analysis




	1994	1999	2004	2009
SOCIAL-CULTURAL	0,9	0,67	1	1
SOCIO-ECONOMIC	-0,59	-0,5	-0,6	-0,56
POLITICAL	0,62	0,92	0,27	1

Figure 5.7 Ideological Index of the PAC per Domain from 1994 to 2009: Manifesto Analysis




	1999	2004	2009
SOCIAL-CULTURAL	-0,14	-0,33	-0,58
SOCIO-ECONOMIC	1	1	-0,2
POLITICAL	0,6	0,14	0,64

Figure 5.8 Ideological Index of the IFP per Domain from 1999 to 2009: Manifesto Analysis




	2004	2009
SOCIAL-CULTURAL	-0,33	-0,58
SOCIO-ECONOMIC	0,25	-0,26
POLITICAL	0,75	0,5

Figure 5.9 Ideological Index of the ID per Domain from 2004 and 2009: Manifesto Analysis




	1999	2004	2009
SOCIAL-CULTURAL	0,14	0	0,6
SOCIO-ECONOMIC	0,7	0,78	1
POLITICAL	0,69	0,78	0,57

Figure 5.10 Ideological Index of the UDM per Domain from 1999 to 2009: Manifesto Analysis




	1999	2009
SOCIAL-CULTURAL	1	0,91
SOCIO-ECONOMIC	1	1
POLITICAL	1	0,77

Figure 5.11 Ideological Index of the FFP per Domain for 1999 and 2009: Manifesto Analysis




	1994	2004	2009
SOCIAL-CULTURAL	-1	0,76	1
SOCIO-ECONOMIC	1	0,82	-0,11
POLITICAL	0,26	0,87	0,86

Figure 5.12 Ideological Index of the ACDP per Domain from 1994, 2004 and 2009: Manifesto Analysis




	2004	2009
SOCIAL-CULTURAL	0,52	1
SOCIO-ECONOMIC	-1	-1
POLITICAL	1	1

Figure 5.13 Ideological Index of the MF per Domain for 2004 and 2009: Manifesto Analysis




	1999	2004	2009
SOCIAL-CULTURAL	1	1	0
SOCIO-ECONOMIC	-0,83	-0,6	-0,38
POLITICAL	1	1	0,64

Figure 5.14 Ideological Index of AZAPO per Domain for 1999 to 2009: Manifesto Analysis




	2009
SOCIAL-CULTURAL	0,45
SOCIO-ECONOMIC	-0,04
POLITICAL	0,47

Figure 5.15 Ideological Index of the UCDP per Domain for 2009: Manifesto Analysis




	2009
SOCIAL-CULTURAL	-0,5
SOCIO-ECONOMIC	-0,47
POLITICAL	0,44

Figure 5.16 Ideological Index of COPE per Domain for 2009: Manifesto Analysis




	2009
SOCIAL-CULTURAL	0,75
SOCIO-ECONOMIC	-1
POLITICAL	0,59

Figure 5.17 Ideological Index of the APC per Domain for 2009: Manifesto Analysis




	ANC				DA				PAC				IFP			UDM			ACDP			AZAPO			ID		FFP		MF		UCDP	COPE	APC
	1994	1999	2004	2009	1994	1999	2004	2009	1994	1999	2004	2009	1999	2004	2009	1999	2004	2009	1994	2004	2009	1999	2004	2009	2004	2009	1999	2009	2004	2009	2009	2009	2009
Political	56	57	48	48	82	42	44	38	42	25	11	17	5	7	33	51	46	42	19	30	14	4	9	28	24	56	1	26	5	1	30	68	29
Socio-economic	31	45	36	32	21	26	36	20	29	20	25	18	2	7	15	20	9	6	5	11	9	12	15	16	16	38	4	21	2	9	23	19	1
Social-cultural	12	26	18	24	14	19	11	13	80	6	16	14	7	3	22	7	0,00	5	6	34	16	7	2	2	6	26	8	44	21	8	11	8	8

Figure 5.18 Domain Emphasis of Parties from 1994 to 2009: Manifesto Analysis




	1994				1999							2004									2009											
	DA	ANC	PAC	ACDP	ANC	UDM	DA	PAC	IFP	AZAPO	FFP	ANC	UDM	DA	ACDP	ID	PAC	AZAPO	IFP	MF	COPE	ID	ANC	UDM	DA	UCDP	APC	AZAPO	IFP	FFP	PAC	ACDP	MF
Religion	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	8	0	3	0
Traditional governance	0	2	0	0	10	3	0	7	0	3	0	2	3	4	0	0	0	3	1	0	7	0	1	0	0	7	10	2	4	0	6	0	0
Centralization	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	5	0	0
Decentralization	18	2	1	4	13	5	3	0	1	0	0	5	2	10	2	2	1	0	3	0	9	8	1	2	10	8	0	0	4	3	0	1	0
Freedom (socialist)	0	0	1	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Freedom (liberal)	12	8	4	0	9	5	9	5	0	0	0	6	5	1	3	0	1	1	0	1	5	3	5	0	1	0	0	3	0	8	0	2	1
Equality (socialist)	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Equality (liberal)	6	9	3	1	8	6	5	2	0	0	0	9	2	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	6	2	10	4	1	5	5	3	6	1	3	0	0
Liberal democracy	42	19	27	1	10	29	25	8	4	0	1	16	31	27	7	20	5	3	2	3	31	37	13	29	25	6	8	11	8	4	3	8	0
Participatory democracy	4	16	5	3	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	2	2	0	1	3	0	0	0	7	4	14	5	0	0	6	5	2	0	0	0	0

Figure 5.19 Number of Statements for the political domain of Parties from 1994 to 2009: Manifesto Analysis



	1994				1999							2004									2009										
	ANC	PAC	DA	ACDP	ANC	DA	UDM	PAC	AZAPO	FFP	IFP	ANC	DA	PAC	ID	AZAPO	ACDP	UDM	IFP	MF	ID	ANC	UCDP	FFP	DA	COPE	PAC	AZAPO	IFP	ACDP	MF	UDM	APC
Affirmative action (oppose)	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Affirmative action	6	10	0	0	6	0	1	2	1	0	0	6	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	10	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
Redistribution of wealth	2	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	1	0	0	1	6	1	0	0	0	0	0
Social welfare	8	0	1	0	11	2	2	8	4	0	0	10	9	10	6	5	1	1	0	1	15	9	9	0	9	4	3	6	9	4	7	0	0
Mixed economy	1	1	2	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	2	0	3	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Private property (oppose)	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	1
Private property	2	0	4	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	3	0	2	6	3	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0
Market (libertarian - oppose)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	7	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0
Market (libertarian)	0	0	10	3	0	10	0	0	0	3	1	0	3	0	0	0	6	0	3	0	0	0	4	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0
Market	12	6	4	2	18	3	14	5	1	1	1	12	11	5	10	3	3	6	4	0	11	5	5	1	3	5	4	5	3	1	0	6	0

Figure 5.20 Number of Statements for the socio-economic domain of Parties from 1994 to 2009: Manifesto Analysis



	1994				1999							2004									2009										
	PAC	DA	ANC	ACDP	ANC	DA	FFP	UDM	IFP	AZAPO	PAC	ACDP	MF	ANC	PAC	DA	ID	IFP	AZAPO	UDM	FFP	ID	ANC	IFP	ACDP	PAC	DA	UCDP	COPE	APC	MF	UDM	AZAPO
Morality	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	3	0	0	29	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	2	11	16	0	0	5	0	0	0	2	0
Group identity	76	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	7	5	0	12	0	16	0	0	0	2	0	31	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	6	8	0	0
Individualism	0	12	0	0	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Multiculturalism	0	0	4	0	2	0	0	4	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	8	2	1	0	0	5	4	3	5	0	0	9	3	2	1	0	2	1
National solidarity	4	2	8	6	20	0	0	3	4	0	1	4	5	16	0	1	4	2	0	0	2	9	19	6	0	0	2	3	6	1	0	1	1

Figure 5.21 Number of Statements for the social-cultural domain of Parties from 1994 to 2009: Manifesto Analysis

5.2 EXPERT SURVEY

Experts responded to the survey by positioning the parties to the Left-right based on the following questions (See Appendix F):

5.2.1 Overall party ideology

When asked to position the parties on their general ideological orientation, this is where experts placed the parties:




Figure 5.22 Overall ideology of Parties: Expert Survey

Key:

0: Extreme left

10: Extreme right

5.2.2 Overall ideology on politics and government

When asked to position the parties on their general ideological orientation on politics and government, this is where experts placed the parties:




Figure 5.23 Overall positions of Parties on politics and government: Expert Survey

Key:

0: Democratic

10: Authoritarian

5.2.3 Party positions on socio-economic issues

When asked to position the parties on their socio-economic issues, five aspects were chosen, namely, the party view on taxation and public spending, economic planning versus market mechanisms, ownership and the means of production, redistribution of wealth from the rich to the poor, and affirmative action measures to improve opportunities for historically disadvantaged groups.

These are where experts positioned the parties:




Figure 5.24 Positions of Parties on taxation and public spending: Expert Survey

Key:

0: Strongly in favour of increasing public spending and taxes

10: Strongly in favour of reducing public services and taxes




Figure 5.25 Positions of Parties on economic planning versus market: Expert Survey

Key:

0: Strongly promotes state economic planning

10: Strongly opposes state economic planning




Figure 5.26 Positions of Parties on ownership and the means of production: Expert Survey

Key:

0: Strongly promotes maximum public ownership of business and industry

10: Strongly opposes all public ownership of business and industry




Figure 5.27 Positions of Parties on redistribution of wealth from the rich to the poor: Expert Survey

Key:

0: Strongly promotes redistribution of wealth

10: Strongly opposes redistribution of wealth




Figure 5.28 Positions of Parties on affirmative action measures: Expert Survey

Key:

0: Strongly in favour of affirmative action

10: Strongly opposed to affirmative action

5.2.4 Party positions on social and cultural issues

When asked to position the parties on their views on social and cultural issues, an overall position on social and cultural ideology was asked, and also two direct issues, that is, the party's view on gender equality and gay and lesbian rights. These are where experts positioned the parties:




Figure 5.29 Overall social and cultural ideology of Parties: Expert Survey

Key:

0: Liberal

10: Conservative




Figure 5.30 Positions of Parties on gender equality: Expert Survey

Key:

0: Strongly in favour of gender equality

10: Strongly opposed to gender equality




Figure 5.31 Positions of Parties on gay and lesbian rights: Expert Survey

Key:

0: Strongly in favour of gay and lesbian rights

10: Strongly opposed to gay and lesbian rights

5.2.5 Knowledge Gap: Frequency of 'Don't Know'

The percentage of experts who answered 'Don't Know' can say something about the lack of knowledge on specific parties and their ideologies. The graph below shows that the most questions regarding the APC were unanswered whereas all questions for the FFP were answered, and most questions for the ANC and the DA.




Figure 5.32 Percentage of 'Don't Know' answers to the question on overall party ideology: Expert Survey

CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

6.0 INTRODUCTION

This chapter focuses on discussing the results presented in Chapter 5. It will combine it with the results from the qualitative method of the interviews with the party representatives and leaders. Each political party will be discussed and attention will be given based on the political, socio-economic, and social-cultural domain. The discussion will involve engaging all three methods, the manifesto, expert survey and the interviews, to come up with an overall understanding of each party's ideology.

6.1 ANC

The manifestos for all years from 1994 to 2009 were able to be obtained for the ANC. For 1994 (0.13), 1999 (0.00), 2004 (-0.08) and 2009 (-0.25) the party seems to be inconsistent in its overall ideological position, emphasizing right elements to a slight extent in 1994, to emphasizing both left-right elements to the same degree in 1999, and to emphasizing left elements in 2004 and 2009 to a slight extent, as illustrated in Figure 5.1. Also, the ANC was the only party to be positioned on the left for its overall ideology in 2004 and 2009. This is due to the left score from the socio-economic and social-cultural domain, as shown in Figure 5.3, 5.4 and 5.5. The ANC tends to emphasize the political domain more than the other domains, followed by the socio-economic domain, as shown in Figure 5.18. The expert survey placed the party as centre-left for its overall ideological position, as shown in Figure 5.22. The expert responses pertaining to the ANC are reliable particularly because the interquartile range yielded a value of less than 3.5, meaning that there was little variation among experts in the results. From Figure 5.32, it can be deduced that the ANC is a well-known party by intellectuals. After the discussion with Ben Turok, the ANC seems to be a centre-left party.

It can be said that, for the overall ideology, the ANC seems centre-left but this does not tell us why exactly or for what reason is the party given such a label. In this sense, the domains can provide a comprehensive and accurate presentation of the ANC's ideological position. Does the centre-left apply to the political domain? Does centre-left suggest that the party

has no right elements? What is the party's position on social-cultural issues? A left view entails a liberal position, is the party centre-left on social-cultural issues?

Political domain

The ideological index for 1994 (0.36), 1999 (0.30), 2004 (0.38) and 2009 (0.21) placed the party as a consistently right party, emphasizing right more than left political elements to a slight extent, as shown in Figure 5.2. This is due to the party's mentions of liberal democracy, liberal equality, liberal freedom and traditional governance, as illustrated in Figure 5.19. The party mentioned participatory democracy, socialist equality and socialist freedom and other left elements such as decentralization but this was outweighed by the former right elements. According to the expert survey, the ANC is a centre-right party, this is shown in Figure 5.31. From the interview with Turok, the party can be seen as centre-right because of its support for right elements such as liberal democracy, more than left elements such as participatory democracy, and traditional governance.

On constitutionalism, Turok stated that "[i]t's very important…we all accept that we're a constitutional democracy, that the constitutional court has a major role…" On traditional governance, Turok explained that "we recognize traditional leaders and indeed there has been proposals for a legislation". The consistency in the results from the index, expert survey and the interview, show that the ANC can be positioned as centre-right on political matters, and for the reasons as outlined in the manifestos and in the interview.

Socio-economic domain

The ideological index for 1994 (-0.10), 1999 (-0.07), 2004 (-0.33) and 2009 (-0.69) positioned the party as consistently to the left, emphasizing left more than right socio-economic elements to a slight or to a large extent, as shown in Figure 5.3. Though the party mentions its support for the market and private property, these right elements were outweighed by its left emphases such as a mixed economy, social welfare, redistribution of wealth and affirmative action, as shown in as shown in Figure 5.20. The expert survey positioned the party as centre-left on state economic planning, state ownership of business, and redistribution of wealth, but extreme left on affirmative action, this is shown in Figure 5.25,

5.26, 5.27 and 5.28. From the interview, the party seems to take a centre-left or moderate left position.

Turok explains this stating that the position of the ANC is "economic emancipation of the previously disadvantaged people". He related the party's position to that of a socialist equality stance, explaining that egalitarianism "is largely at a formal level, at a legal level, but not at an economic level" and this is "one of the mission of the ANC". Turok went on to explain that the previous system of apartheid structured inequality and in order to overcome that races face an obstacle "primarily because the economy is so unequally divided". He also made it clear that the goal of the ANC is non-racialism but "[y]ou cannot create a non-racial society in a country where there are such huge inequalities and such huge disadvantage and even discrimination against people of colour, especially Africans."

On left elements particularly, Turok explained the ANC's support for social welfare, redistribution and affirmative action. Turok stated that social welfare is "[e]xtremely important, that's why our social grants increase every budget", and he further stated that "it is seen as the major instrument of poverty alleviation which it is". On redistribution, Turok stated that "[i]n principle it [the ANC] does believe in redistribution" and the social security system is one main mechanism. On affirmative action, Turok said that it is "[e]xtremely important because the institutions of power still exercise discrimination and there's a sort of time lag especially in business and companies". Turok also mentioned that the party supports a mixed economy, "the ANC does talk left and actually operate in the mixed economy environment". However he highlighted that the ANC is not a far left party, the "ANC is not a socialist movement", it has not developed its initial socialist agenda. In this sense the party can be seen as a centre-left party on socio-economic issues.

Social and cultural domain

The ideological index for 1994 (-0.33), 1999 (-0.54), 2004 (-0.78) and 2009 (-0.58) placed the party as consistently to the left, emphasizing left more than right social-cultural elements to a slight or to a large extent, as shown in Figure 5.4. This left position is due to its emphasis on national solidarity that outweighed its mentions of the right element of liberal multiculturalism, this can be seen in Figure 5.21. According to the expert survey, the ANC seems to be a centre-left party on its social-cultural ideology generally and close to the

extreme left or highly liberal on its view on gay and lesbian rights, as illustrated in Figure 5.29 and 5.31. From the interview, the party seems to take a centre-left or liberal view on social and cultural issues particularly on abortion and homosexuality. Turok stated that the legislation is clear pertaining to those issues, meaning that the party is in favour of abortion and homosexual rights. The ANC can be seen as a far left or libertarian party on social-cultural issues.

Conclusion

The ANC can be seen as a centre-right party on political issues, favouring liberal democratic elements more than left elements of participatory democracy, and traditional governance. On socio-economic issues, the party is positioned as centre-left, favouring social welfare, redistribution and affirmative action. The party can be seen as not just a liberal but libertarian or far left party on social-cultural issues, especially on abortion and gay and lesbian rights.

6.2 DA

The manifestos from 1994 to 2009 were able to be obtained for the DA. From Figure 5.1 it can be seen that for 1994 (0.54), 1999 (0.86), 2004 (0.52) and 2009 (0.30), the party has been consistently to the right on its overall ideology. This right score was influenced by the right variables that were predominated in the political, socio-economic and social-cultural domain through the years, as shown in Figure 5.1 and 5.6. The DA tends to emphasize the political domain more than the other domains, while the socio-economic domain is given more attention than the social-cultural domain, as shown in Figure 5.18. The expert survey placed the party as centre-right, this is shown in Figure 5.22. The expert responses pertaining to the DA are reliable primarily because the interquartile range is less than 3.5. From Figure 5.32, it can be deduced that the DA is a well-known party amongst intellectuals. After the discussion with James Selfe, the party seems to be centre-left. The right, centre-right and centre-left positions are inconsistent with regard to the party's overall ideological position, this problem can be clarified by looking at the domain emphasis and examining whether each domain carries a particular dimension. Does the centre-right apply to the party's position on socio-economic issues? Or does the centre-left capture this? Is the party centre-right on political matters? What about social and cultural matters?

Political domain

According to the ideological index, for 1994 (0.46), 1999 (0.86), 2004 (0.45) and 2009 (0.42), the DA seems to take a consistent right position, emphasizing right elements to a slight or to a large extent, as shown in Figure 5.2 and 5.6. These right elements included liberal democracy, liberal equality, and liberal freedom, whereas a left element of decentralization was also mentioned, as shown in Figure 5.19. Traditional governance was mentioned only once that is in the 2004 manifesto, as Figure 5.19 shows. The expert survey result placed the party as centre-left for its overall political ideology, as shown in Figure 5.23. From the interview with James Selfe, the DA seems to be neither left nor right but centre or liberal, especially with its emphasis on liberal democratic elements, as shown below.

Selfe explained the party's commitment to constitutional democracy, stating that "the South African constitution is a covenant that was developed in closing down the conflict in South Africa in the early 1990s and we are very proud of the constitution". But moreover he added that they "want to strengthen" its institutions and "make them as independent as possible". On the point of elections, the DA believes "very deeply" in "free and fair elections and although we do not govern in all or very many part of South Africa, we deeply respect democratic outcomes where the outcomes are the result of the free and fair process", as Selfe highlighted. When it comes to majoritarian rule, Selfe explained that the DA believes that the majority have the right to govern and also the "minority have a right to have their views respected".

On the issue of traditional governance in South Africa and the DA's position on it, Selfe argued that the DA has reservations on the institution. It does say that it has a place in South Africa but it must be in respect to the constitution and democracy, even more the party argues that individual rights are more important than communal rights. According to Selfe (2014), "individual rights must trump communal rights", the inability of this was described as "one of our big problems with the Traditional Courts Bill". In this sense the DA does not desire to preserve traditional cultural institutions, the party is more inclined to favour individual civil liberties being extended to all South Africans. This makes the party a centre or liberal party on politics and government.

Socio-economic domain

The ideological index clearly shows that the DA for 1994 (0.71), 1999 (0.77), 2004 (0.50) and 2009 (-0.20) has been inconsistent in its ideology on socio-economic issues, emphasizing right elements to a large extent from 1994 to 2004, and emphasizing left elements to a slight extent in 2009, as illustrated by Figure 5.3. What caused the DA to be right on socio-economic matters? The party's mentions of the market, market libertarianism and private property caused a right result, as shown in Figure 5.20. The expert survey placed the party as centre-right, showing the DA as favouring free enterprise, private ownership, being dis-inclined to redistribution of wealth and affirmative action, as shown in Figure 5.25 to 5.28. From the interview, Selfe presented the DA as taking a centre-left position.

This included his emphasis on social welfare and affirmative action while also accepting the market mechanism and private property. On right issues, Selfe explained that "by and large we believe in private ownership of land and property because with it goes the freedom to be able to use those resources to become productive, efficient and wealthy and to create jobs." In this sense, the party supports the private ownership of land, Selfe also stated that "as much land should be in private hands as possible". Economic efficiency was also stated in the case that the government tends to be "on the whole inefficient". In this sense, state ownership is not a position of the DA. But the party's market commitment cannot be looked at in isolation. Stating something about the DA's general economic stance, Selfe spoke of the DA's position on the free market and economic intervention,

> Our commitment to a free market is not an untrammelled one. Because if one simply said that you were going to have a free market as from tomorrow then people who became wealthy as a result of the systematic asset stripping that characterized apartheid would simply get richer and richer and they may very well be a even bigger disparity of wealth and opportunity which correlated with racial lines. That is not what we want.

Selfe stated the DA supports left issues but "within the parameters of the market, allowing the market to be as free as possible", in other words, the party is expressing its rightward commitment but at the same time its leftward support. On the party's position on particular left issues, Selfe argued that social welfare is important to the party, "[w]e do believe in a social safety net for peoples who are indigent or peoples who through circumstances

beyond their control are not able to look after themselves." He further added that "if that wasn't there then a lot of people would starve, literally. So it has been a very important way of keeping people living in dignity." When asked about affirmative action Selfe stated that the DA's starting point is equality of opportunity but the party understands that there is a need for "corrective measures". Selfe stated that affirmative action is "[a]bsolutely…important",

> …our principle starting point is…equality of opportunity but we recognize that some people have been systematically denied opportunities, not because of anything other than their race. And so in order to overcome that legacy, you have got to take corrective action…

On speaking about corrective measures and economic intervention, Selfe explained that,

> …if you cut yourself you need some band aid. We cut ourselves for 40 years of apartheid, or however long it was, and centuries of colonialism, now we need a bandage while that wound heals and that bandage is a series of policy interventions that are designed to support us while the wounds heal and while we can get back to normal. The free market economy is still the most efficient way of creating cheap goods and services and creating employment but we can't close our eyes to the legacy that we've inherited and we need to take some policy measures that are designed to overcome that.

The DA can be seen as being a party to the centre-left on socio-economic issues.

Social and cultural domain

From the ideological index, the party has been for 1994 (0.71), 1999 (1.00), 2004 (0.82) and 2009 (0.69) to the right, emphasizing right more than left social-cultural issues, as Figure 5.4 and 5.6 shows. This has been due to individualism which was in its height in the manifestos of 1994 and 1999 and dramatically decreased in 2004 and 2009, leaving the right emphasis in these latter two years being due to liberal multiculturalism and to a lesser extent to individualism, as shown in Figure 5.21. According to the expert survey, the DA seems to be a left party on its social-cultural ideology generally and close to the extreme left or highly liberal on its view on gay and lesbian rights, as illustrated in Figure 5.29 and 5.31.

It can be said that the DA has decreased on its emphases on individualism but this does not mean that it has negated the issue, rather the party supports it in other forms, such as through its support for homosexuality. Selfe stated that the party is "absolutely commitment to equality…between people of different sexual orientation...", adding that the

party “has no policy on it other than its commitment to the constitutional right to equality”. Though the party has no official party stance on the issue, but it emphasizes on civil liberties and the constitution, it can be said that the party in another light does not take a conservative stance but rather is more inclined to favour a liberal stance in an extreme fashion. On the issue of abortion, Selfe argued that there was a party position on that, the party believes that all it does is to “create choices for women to terminate their pregnancy”. The DA can be seen as a far left or libertarian party on social-cultural issues, especially because of its pro-abortion and pro-homosexuality position.

Conclusion

The DA, on political matters, favours the protection of liberal democracy and does not favour traditional governance, making the party a centre or liberal party. On socio-economic issues, the DA can be seen as a centre-left party because of its support for social welfare and affirmative action. The DA is a centre-left or liberal party on social-cultural issues, favouring individual liberty instead of traditional morality.

6.3 COPE

COPE gained seats only in the 2009 election, in this case the 2009 manifesto will be used for the ideological index. According to Figure 5.1 and 5.16, the party scored 0.18 for its overall ideological position, indicating that it emphasizes right elements to a slight extent. This was due to the right variables coming from the political domain that outweighed the left variables even though emphasized in the socio-economic and the social-cultural domain, as demonstrated in Figure 5.16. Gathering from the 2009 manifesto, COPE tends to emphasize the political domain much more than the other domains, while the socio-economic domain is given more attention than the social-cultural domain, as shown in Figure 5.18. This means that the political domain contributes largely to the overall ideological index. The expert survey placed the party as centre or liberal, as shown in Figure 5.22. The expert responses relating to COPE are highly reliable particularly because the interquartile range is less than 2. From Figure 5.32, it can be deduced that COPE is a moderately known party by intellectuals. After the interview discussion with Farouk Cassim, the party seems to be centre-left. There is an inconsistency with the results for the overall ideology, ranging from centre, centre-left to right. The overall ideology does not tell us something about the

domain that shows a leftness or rightness. The domain can give an accurate presentation of exactly why COPE is right or left.

Political domain

Based on the manifesto analysis, the ideological index for COPE on the political domain is -0.44, as shown in Figure 5.2, this suggests that the party emphasizes right more than left elements to a slight extent. This rightward result was due the following elements: liberal democracy, liberal equality, liberal freedom and traditional governance, as illustrated in Figure 5.19. Though the party made references to participatory democracy and socialist equality, and other left elements such as decentralization, the former right elements surpassed these left elements. The expert survey placed the party as centre or liberal on politics and government, as shown in Figure 5.23. But from the interview, COPE seems centre-right. Cassim spoke favourably of constitutionalism and elections but also spoke of the party's support for traditional leaders. For Cassim the "starting off point is the constitution and democracy" which "must be the cornerstone", he also mentioned that the party regards the constitution as "supreme". Cassim stated that COPE supports traditional governance. Cassim argued that "[t]raditional governance is a good thing". In this sense COPE seems to take a centre-right position.

Socio-economic domain

The ideological index for COPE on the socio-economic domain is -0.47, as shown in Figure 5.3, this suggests that the party emphasizes more left elements than right elements to a slight extent. From Figure 5.20 it can be seen that the party makes mentions of a mixed economy, social welfare, redistribution and affirmative action, though the party also mentions the right element of the market order, the former left elements outweigh this. The expert survey positioned the party as centre on ownership and redistribution and centre-left on planning and affirmative action, as shown in Figure 5.25 to 5.28. From the interview, the party takes a clear centre-left stance on these issues. Cassim spoke of the party's support for redistribution, social welfare and affirmative action, though mentioning right elements of private property and an anti-nationalization stance.

On right elements, Cassim argued that the party supports private ownership, which is regarded as the "basis of people's wealth", explaining that a "person who is able to invest in the property and is able to build in that property is saving for his future", and argued that "[w]e need to be able to ensure that this constitutional provision is guaranteed." The party is against state ownership and is more inclined to support private ownership, talking on nationalization, Cassim stated that countries that formerly practiced nationalization have reversed it because they realize the need for the management, efficiency and investment that business and industry require. For Cassim, nationalization he argued,

> …is a non-starter, it will not generate economic growth and people who would invest would run away…Why would anyone want to put money in a project that will be taken over, there will be nothing for them. To talk of nationalization is to talk of larger queues of unemployed…Government's job is not running the economy. Government's job is creating the framework. Government's job is to make sure there is proper laws and order and regulations and that administration runs effectively and efficiently.

On left elements, Cassim spoke of the redistribution of wealth which is considered key to the party, for Cassim, "[t]here has to be a redistribution of wealth…The rich in South Africa are getting richer. The poor are getting poorer. There has to be a redistribution of wealth." He linked it to creating a sustained economy, that is, if wealth is redistributed it can enable more people to stimulate economic growth. On social welfare, Cassim explained that a "social safety net is very very important", linking this to the need for "redistributive justice", and stated that "[t]here is no argument about the need to ensure that those who are the most vulnerable in society have a social safety net, to get a basic minimum." And on affirmative action, Cassim argued that it is "very important" to the party, viewing it as necessary to "correct the ravages of the past", in the view that "black indigenous South Africans were most seriously disadvantaged by apartheid laws, so there has to be empowerment" primarily to uplift people.

In this sense, COPE takes a centre-left or moderate left position.

Social and cultural domain

The ideological index for COPE on the social and cultural domain is -0.50, as shown in Figure 5.4 and 5.16, indicating that the party supports left elements to an almost large extent. This is supported by the elements of national solidarity that outweighed liberal multiculturalism,

as shown in Figure 5.21. From the expert survey, COPE is seen as centre or liberal for its general social-cultural ideology and centre-left or moderately liberal for its views on gay and lesbian rights, as Figure 5.37 and 5.39 highlight. From the interview, the party seems to be a far left or highly liberal particularly because of its views on abortion and homosexuality. On the party's position on abortion, Cassim stated that the "constitution permits people to make choices", the constitution is clear, "if you don't agree on the termination of pregnancy, you don't have too", but we "will defend that right". On the party's position on gay and lesbian rights, Cassim further stated that "[e]quality is for everyone, gays can enter into relationships…There can be no alternative but to adhere to the constitution." Cassim stated that "COPE begins by giving the individual those rights in the constitution". In this sense, the results show a far left take which is a highly liberal take on social and cultural issues.

Conclusion

On political matters, the party takes a centre-right position, it supports more liberal elements than left elements, and it supports traditional authority. The party takes a centre-left view on socio-economic issues, accepting the role of the state to create a conducive environment for investment but also its role in social welfare, redistribution and affirmative action. COPE supports abortion and homosexual rights, it is a far left or highly liberal party on social-cultural issues.

6.4 IFP

The 1994 manifesto for the IFP was unable to be obtained, the ideological index was based on the 1999, 2004 and 2009 manifesto. The overall ideological index of the IFP for 1999 was 0.29, 0.41 for 2004 and 0.40 for 2009, as shown in Figure 5.1 and 5.8. These results indicate that the party is consistently on the right, emphasizing slight right elements more than left elements. This was due to the political domain in 1999, the socio-economic domain in 2004, and the political and social-cultural domain in 2009, as illustrated in Figure 5.8. From the manifestos, the IFP tends to emphasize the domains inconsistently, the political domain tends to be given more attention but in some cases the socio-economic and social-cultural domain are also given attention, as shown in Figure 5.18. The expert survey positioned the party as centre-right or moderate right in its overall ideology, as shown in Figure 5.22. Also,

the interquartile range for this survey question yielded a value of less than 4, which indicates a reliable result. For all survey responses for the IFP, the interquartile range is less than 4.5, making the responses reliable. From Figure 5.32, it can be deduced that IFP is a moderately known party amongst intellectuals. An interview with the party was not possible, as stated in the methodology. The two methods and an additional qualitative analysis of the manifestos will be done to fill this gap. What makes the IFP right? And does the IFP mention any left element?

Political domain

The IFP in 1999 (0.60), 2004 (0.14) and 2009 (0.64) has been on the right, as shown in Figure 5.2 and 5.8, emphasizing more right than left elements ranging from a slight to a large extent. The expert survey placed the party as moderate right on politics and government, as shown in Figure 5.31. There is a correlation between the two results, and in this sense the IFP can be seen as a moderate right party on politics and government. Exactly what right elements were emphasized by the IFP? On a closer examination from Figure 5.19, the party emphasizes liberal democratic elements, liberal equality and traditional governance. While left elements such as decentralization was also referred to.

The party throughout the manifestos has made mentions to liberal democracy more than the left, participatory democracy. In the 1999 manifesto, the party made numerous references to elections as being the ability to change a government if that government is unable to provide for the people, this was an emphasis on the power of voting and elections especially in the face of a citizenry marked by dissatisfaction. In 2004, the party spoke of the need for a democratic alternative to “prevent the consolidation of a one-party state”. By 2009, the IFP used terms such as preventing the ‘abuse of power’, the need to not conflate the state and the party and the importance of an independent judiciary. In 2009, the IFP mentioned transparency, accountability and the autonomy of civil society to be left alone. In 2009, the IFP said that it stands “for a constitutional state in which individual rights are protected against intrusive government”.

The IFP has consistently mentioned decentralization in the manifestos. In the manifesto of 1999, the IFP discussed the need to “strengthen the ability and capacity of provincial and local government” for the main aim of delivering better to the people and in “reducing the

scope, size and resources of the central government". The manifesto of 2009 saw the party stating that decentralized institutions such as municipalities and provinces "are key role players in addressing poverty". In the 2004 manifesto, the party put forward its case in this way,

> The IFP will continue to champion federalism and decentralization of power between the three spheres of government: national, provincial and local. The country is simply too large and diverse to be governed effectively from the centre. Moreover, the present concentration of power is an autocratic threat, which puts democracy at risk.

The IFP has also mentioned traditional governance and traditional leaders consistently in the manifestos. The need to protect cultural diversity was linked in the 2004 manifesto as applying to traditional leaders. In 2009 the party linked traditional leaders to the issues of communal development in the rural areas. The IFP can be seen as a centre-right party in politics for these reasons.

Socio-economic domain

The IFP in 1999 (1.00), 2004 (1.00) and 2009 (-0.20) has been inconsistent in its position on socio-economic issues according to the ideological index, as shown in Figure 5.3. In 1999 and 2004 it emphasized more right than left elements to a large extent whereas in 2009 it emphasized more left than right elements to a slight extent. The expert survey result showed that the party is centre-right on planning and ownership, centre on redistribution of wealth, and centre-left on affirmative action, as shown in Figure 5.25 to 5.28. Whenever the party was the right, it spoke of the market and the market in a libertarian sense, and private property but in 2009 the party mentioned social welfare, this can be derived from the manifesto analysis which is illustrated in Figure 5.20.

In the 1999 manifesto the party stated the need to "stimulate entrepreneurship" and business. This was repeated in 2004 when the party spoke of business ownership at a small level which is essential to social development. In 2009, the IFP stated the need to provide business, especially small business, "easier access to capital". This shows the party's support for certain market mechanisms, but there were also support for a libertarian market but in a non-radical fashion. The party stated in 1999 the need to "privatise government assets" particularly for the purposes of using the "proceeds in part to create new jobs". In 2004, the manifesto stated that,

> We will speed up the privatization of all the parastatals, including public utilities, and the outsourcing of selected government functions to create more efficient business and government services, and to provide resources to reduce the debt drain on our economy. Privatised assets will not be maintained as monopolies but returned to free market competition to avoid that, for instance, we continue to pay more in South Africa than in other countries for telecommunications.

But the IFP is not a right-wing party without any left-leaning. In the 2009 manifesto, the party spoke of social grants and the need for its improvements in the system of administration and proposed the idea of a basic income grant. This left-leaning nature of the IFP can be captured by its overall economic position, in the 2009 manifesto, the party stated that,

> The IFP does not advocate unbridled, laissez faire capitalism associated with a minimalist state. We recognise the imperatives driving our need to be a developmental state, but this does not imply an over-interventionist state whose actions unnecessarily limit the growth potential of our economy. Thus, though we need to recognize an important role for the state, we believe more emphasis must be placed on the role of the private sector in generating growth and jobs. And we need to ensure that the negative consequences of high growth can be dealt with through other types of state intervention so that whatever we do to promote growth and jobs, we also protect our more vulnerable citizens and provide a safety net for the poor.

The IFP can be seen as a centre-left party that supports the market, private ownership, free enterprise but that also makes room for social welfare and affirmative action. It is a moderate left party on socio-economic issues.

Social and cultural domain

In 1999 (-0.14), 2004 (-0.33) and 2009 (0.45), the IFP has been inconsistent in its ideological position on social-cultural issues according to the ideological index, as shown in Figure 5.4 and 5.8. This suggests that the party has made slight left emphases in 1999 and 2004 whereas in 2009 the party mentioned right elements. From the expert survey, the party was positioned as moderate right on its social-cultural issues generally and also on its position to gay and lesbian rights, as seen in Figure 5.29 and 5.31. From Figure 5.21, the party mentions national solidarity, liberal multiculturalism and morality issues. This can be examined by closely looking at the manifesto statements. The party from these results can be seen as a moderate right or conservative party on social-cultural issues.

The IFP has spoken of national solidarity in 1999, 2004 and 2009. According to the 1999 manifesto, the party stated that "we need to come together to confront the numerous challenges facing us as we build a better country", and it "is time for all South Africans of good will to join hands together". In the 2004 manifesto this was stated as "let's make a difference–together". In the 2009 manifesto the party used the term 'solidarity'. Multiculturalism was referred to in 2004 and 2009. This is in the sense of liberal multiculturalism. In the manifesto of 2004, the party stated the importance of the "promotion and protection of cultural diversity". In 2009 the party used the term 'unity in diversity', it showed that society is plural in nature, diversity must be accepted, but at the same time, equality must be understood as important in this context, according to the IFP,

> We embrace our differences and reject the notion that we are all the same. We are equal under the law, of course, but South Africa is nonetheless made up of many different cultures, groups, races, religions, communities and peoples. None of these is more important than any other…We are inclusive, we promote multiculturalism…

Morality has also been an issue for the party. The emphasis was seen in the 1999 and 2009 manifesto. In 1999 this was related to parent involvement in their children's schooling. In 2009 it referred to the issue of young girls aborting without "their parents even knowing their children are pregnant" and the law that permits abortions for 12 year-olds without consent "must be abolished", and the issue of children "who don't respect their parents or elders". In this sense the IFP spoke of the need for Ubuntu in schools, and also to "promote the family and values that affirm and strengthen the family." On an overall issue, the IFP stated that,

> The IFP vision of a moral society is at odds with mush that is prevalent in South Africa today…The IFP however, with its commitment to Ubuntu/botho, its healthy balance of liberal, conservative and social values and its determination to change South Africa for the better, is able to chart the way forward and lead this campaign for moral regeneration.

Conclusion

On political issues, the IFP is a centre-right party that supports liberal democracy and traditional governance. On socio-economic issues, the party is a centre-left party that advocates for market mechanisms, free enterprise and economic efficiency but also

supports social welfare and affirmative action. And it is a centre-right or moderate right party on social-cultural issues, especially abortion.

6.5 ID

From the ideological index, the party received an overall score of 0.43 for 2004 and 0.22 for 2009, as shown in Figure 5.1, indicating that the party consistently supports right elements more than left elements to a slight extent. The political and the socio-economic domain contributed to the right index in 2004, the contribution was also largely due to the political and the social-cultural domain, though playing a smaller part in 2009, as shown in Figure 5.9. The ID, tends to emphasize the political domain more than the other domains, while the socio-economic domain is given more attention than the social-cultural domain, as shown in Figure 5.18. The expert survey placed the party as centre for its overall ideology, as shown in Figure 5.22. Also, the interquartile range for the expert survey responses pertaining to the ID yielded a value of less than 3.5 which indicates a reliable result. From Figure 5.32, it can be deduced that the ID is a moderately known party among intellectuals. From the interview with Lance Greyling, the party seems to be centre-left. The results from these three sources are inconsistent, ranging from the right, centre to centre-left. However, when looking at each domain, there is a consistency in the results. For the ideological index, political variables contributed to the right score, but does this mean that the ID is only right and not left?

Political domain

According to the ideological index for the ID on the political domain, for 2004 the score was 0.75 and 0.50 for 2009, as shown in Figure 5.2 and 5.9, this indicates that the party has been consistently to the right on political matters, emphasizing more right than left elements to a large extent. From Figure 5.19, it can be seen that the party discusses liberal democracy, liberal equality, and liberal freedom, however, left variables such as participatory democracy, socialist equality and other left variables such as decentralization are mentioned but the right variables outweigh these. The expert survey placed the party as centre or liberal on their views on politics and government, as shown in Figure 5.23. From the interview, the party seems to be centre or liberal.

Greyling explained the party's position on liberal democratic elements. On constitutionalism, he stated that "[w]e would take the constitution as our starting point", and on elections and association, he stated that, "[w]e would…argue for the basic tenants to be put in place to ensure free and fair elections. That would include a free press. That would include an active citizenry and an active civil society." When asked about the party's position on traditional governance, Greyling argued that the party has deep reservations on the issue, and would like to see it being under the authority of the constitution, arguing that "[w]e don't believe in unfettered rights for traditional authorities because we do believe that every South Africa is entitled to the kind of constitutional provisions and constitutional rights."

From these results, it can be said that the ID is centre or liberal on political issues, supporting liberal democratic elements and being reserved about traditional governance, in favour of the constitution as the supreme law of the land.

Socio-economic domain

Based manifesto analysis, the ideological index for the ID on the socio-economic domain for 2004 amounted to 0.25, while it was -0.26 for 2009, as shown in Figure 5.3 and 5.9. This indicates that the party emphasized right elements in 2004 more than left elements to a slight extent but in 2009 the ID emphasized left elements more than right elements to a slight extent. According to Figure 5.20, the party mentioned more statements on the market, though mentioning social welfare, this was outweighed by the former; and in 2009, the party spoke of a mixed economy, social welfare, redistribution and affirmative action, though mentioning the market and private property. The expert survey placed the party as centre on state economic planning, state ownership, redistribution, and affirmative action, as shown in Figure 5.25 to 5.28. However, from the interview the party is not centre but rather centre-left, correlating with the index result for 2009.

Greyling made it clear that the party supports the free market order but at the same time, also supporting government intervention. Greyling argued against the liberal view of non-intervention,

> The liberal viewpoint or the strictly formalistic liberal viewpoint argues that there should never be any kind of intervention, you leave it up to market forces, you make sure that

> everyone has the same opportunities, and then things will equalize. I don't think that is strictly true and I certainly don't think that is true in a context of an historical inequality.

The party supports a mixed economic system, where there is a "role for both the state and for the market", Greyling went on to add that there is a "need for the market mechanism in order to…generate the wealth and value within the economy" but "you also need the state to play a role in terms of regulating the outcome", Greyling further explained that "if the market mechanism is just left to its own devices that is one of the side effects that needs to be addressed is in terms of the increase in inequality." In this sense, for the ID, free market is necessary but must be regulated particularly because of poverty and inequality.

On more specific left elements, such as the redistribution of wealth, Greyling argued that the progressive tax system is necessary in which the wealth is redistributed to the social security system. And on social welfare, he explained that the ID takes the view that the "state has a role to play in ensuring the kind of basic social security net", because "everyone needs to be given the basics in life", making sure that "no one has to live in complete poverty". On the party's position on affirmative action, Greyling argued that this is crucial, though the party intends to move beyond race, there needs to be current measures in place to deal with inequality,

> Unfortunately though given our divided past, given the history of apartheid and the kind of systematic exclusion of certain racial groups, we have now certain in-built inequality which I think is structural as well and which is generational…if we simply say that we now have a system that doesn't institutionalize racial laws like apartheid did and now we have equality of opportunity all things will then come equal, I don't buy that. I think that we need to have active intervention by the state to deal with the kind of structural inequalities that apartheid has built into our society and where that legacy still lives on…Unfortunately in South Africa at the moment it [race] is still a major determinant. It is still a major indicator for poverty in South Africa where…the vast majority of those who are living in poverty are in fact black. That is the situation that we sit with today as a result of apartheid. So we would say these [affirmative action] measures need to be in place as long as that is true of the situation.

In this sense the ID takes a centre-left or moderate left position on socio-economic issues, supporting the view of a role for the market and for the state.

Social and cultural domain

Based on the manifesto analysis, the ideological index for the ID on the social and cultural domain for 2004 was -0.33 and 0.31 for 2009, as shown in Figure 5.4 and 5.9, indicating that the party emphasized left elements to a slight extent in 2004 while emphasizing right elements to a slight extent in 2009. When the ID was on the left, it was due to its emphasis on national solidarity that outweighed the right emphasis of liberal multiculturalism. In 2009, the right position of the party is due two elements, liberal multiculturalism and morality. This can be seen in Figure 5.21. The expert survey placed the party as centre or liberal for its overall ideology and moderate left or liberal for its views on gay and lesbian rights, as shown in Figure 5.29 and 5.31. From the interview, the party seems to be far left or highly liberal on social and cultural issues. Greyling argued that the party supports abortion and homosexuality, and linked it to the constitution, human rights, and civil liberties, stating that the ID,

> …would largely conform and agree with the liberal ideology. We would take a progressive stance on all of those particular issues….That's why we would be for women's rights and free choice…That's why we would also support the rights of homosexuals and their right into marriage. I suppose the best way for it would be civil liberties and certainly we would take a strong stance on that and in terms of protecting that…All those particular issues, we would certainly stand up for because we see that as a central pillar of a democratic society in which all rights are protected.

Conclusion

From these results, it can be said that the ID is centre or liberal on political issues, supporting liberal democratic elements and being reserved about traditional governance, in favour of the constitution as supreme. On socio-economic issues, the party takes a centre-left position, accepting the market mechanism but arguing for state intervention for the purposes of empowering those in poverty and those previously disadvantaged by apartheid. On social and cultural issues, the ID takes a highly liberal stance, supporting abortion and homosexual marriage, making the party far left.

6.6 UDM

The manifestos for all years were obtained for the UDM. From the overall ideological index, the UDM scored 0.64 in 1999, 0.78 in 2004 and 0.62 in 2009, as seen in Figure 5.1. This

indicates that the party emphasizes right elements more than left elements to a large extent. The political, socio-economic, and social-cultural domain (except in 2004) contributed to this rightward score, as Figure 5.10 shows. Examining the manifestos, the party emphasizes the political domain much more than the other domains, while the socio-economic domain is given more attention than the social-cultural domain, as shown in Figure 5.18. The expert survey positioned the party as centre for its overall ideology, as shown in Figure 5.22. The interquartile range for this survey question produced a value of 2, which indicates a highly reliable result; moreover, the value was less than 3 for all responses pertaining to the UDM, indicating a reliable result for the expert responses. From Figure 5.32, it can be deduced that the UDM is a moderately known party by intellectuals. From the interview with Nqabayomzi Kwankwa, the UDM is seen as centre-left. The inconsistency in these results for the overall ideology–from centre, centre-left to right–can be clarified by looking at domain emphasis.

Political domain

For 1999 (0.69), 2004 (0.78) and 2009 (0.57) the UDM has maintained a right-leaning position, emphasizing to a large extent right elements more than left elements in the political domain, as shown in Figure 5.2 and 5.10. This included mentions of liberal democracy, liberal equality, liberal freedom and traditional governance, this is illustrated in Figure 5.19. The party highlighted left elements in the manifestos, including participatory democracy, socialist freedom, and other left elements such as decentralization but this was outweighed by its right emphases. The expert survey positioned the party as centre or liberal on its views on politics and government, as seen in Figure 5.23. From the interview, the party seems to take a centre-right position. Kwankwa spoke favourably about constitutionalism and elections. According to Kwankwa,

> …elections are important because they give people an opportunity to evaluate your performance as a government. They also give us an opportunity as opposition parties to compete and to outline what programmes we would implement if we were to be voted into power…[and] to get the government that has been leading to account at a horizontal level…the culture of constitutionalism, having a constitutional democracy, is critical especially…where you find…personalities that…think that running the country revolves around them instead of…what the constitution of the country dictates.

On the issue of traditional governance, Kwankwa made reference to the institution has playing a key role in cooperating with actors or government. But more than that Kwankwa spoke of the need for a complementary approach. This means that though individual rights "are very important" and are "protected in the constitution", the UDM is a "party whose values are influenced by the African way of doing things...it is more about the community and how those individual rights make us work better or function better". On the recognition of culture, Kwankwa spoke of the 'different nations' that live in South Africa,

> We have 11 official languages, and all those languages is a reflection of the knowledge systems and the values of the various communities, the different nations that live in our country. And the traditional systems and the traditional leaders, in particular, are the custodians of those values, and the principles and the knowledge systems, they have a better understanding of how their societies functions…

The UDM can be seen as a centre-right party in political matters.

Socio-economic domain

In 1999 (0.70), 2004 (0.78) and 2009 (1.00), the ideological index suggests that the party is right, emphasizing to a large degree right elements, as seen in Figure 5.3. Exactly what was emphasized? The party has mentioned the market order and private property. In 1999 and 2004, the party mentioned its support for social welfare and affirmative action, respectively, this can be seen in Figure 5.20. The latter left emphases were outweighed by the former right mentions. From the expert survey, the UDM can be seen as centre on planning and ownership but centre-left on redistribution of wealth and affirmative action, this can be seen in Figure 5.25 to 5.28. From the interview, the party seems to be centre-left, though mentioning right elements.

On right elements, Kwankwa spoke favourably about the market order in a libertarian sense, according to him, privatization is beneficial and efficient. Speaking about the market, Kwankwa stated that it is important to "build capacity within the economy, to try and make sure companies that are within your country are able to compete with others". Kwankwa essentially speaks of the rationale behind the market that is competition and economic growth. Elaborating on private ownership not just of property but also industry, Kwankwa stated that it leads to people becoming "more effective and competitive", how the economy and business grows "is determined by how effective and efficient your private sector is". He

also stated that the government "poorly manages" state enterprises that are under, this is because "there is no profit motive and no incentive for people to try to outmanoeuvre competition". Kwankwa linked the private sector has being essential to creating jobs.

On left elements, Kwankwa spoke of the need for economic intervention, social welfare, affirmative action and redistribution. Kwankwa stated that intervention is necessary and it has its limits,

> ...we always emphasize the intervention of the government in the economy to try an uplift the lives of those who were previously disadvantaged but to always come and try to balance the or rather to try to address the weaknesses that you would normally find in the capitalist system or the market economy…you intervene where it is necessary but in instances where the markets are performing well, there is no need to intervene…

In this sense, Kwankwa paints a picture of a government whose role is composed of a socialist side, that is intervention, and a liberal side, that is providing a framework for the market. Beside the government not intervening where the private sector is doing well, the government has a duty to play in the economy that is different from intervention, but must "play a more supportive role". Onto more left elements, according to Kwankwa, redistribution is very important to "redress past imbalances", and also, it is not possible to "advocate interventionist policies if you do not understand that the money for those policies have to come from tax." In this sense the UDM links redistribution to the South African progressive tax system that contributes to the social security net. Kwankwa also spoke positively about the need for social welfare and affirmative action. On social welfare, Kwankwa stated that it is "significant" as a "policy of intervention", further pointing out that millions of South Africans live "in abject poverty, so if you introduce welfare systems to show that you support them". Kwankwa argued that the current South African welfare system is "sufficient to try and provide support system to the poor and the previously marginalized." On affirmative action Kwankwa argued that,

> …some of the communities may actually need more empowerment than others, so we prioritize those who were previously disadvantaged…It is very important. We cannot deny the fact that we come from a political divisive past that denied opportunities, such as education, even opportunities to gain exposure in certain professions. You will definitely need…in order to try and level the playing field…to have policies that will encourage the private sector and the public sector to employ previously disadvantaged companies.

The UDM can be seen as taking a moderate left or centre-left position on socio-economic issues, though supporting right elements such as anti-nationalization, private property, and economic efficiency, the party also supports left elements, particularly social welfare, redistribution and affirmative action.

Social and cultural domain

For 1999 the party received a score of 0.14 and 0.60 in 2009, as shown in Figure 5.4 and 5.10. But in 2004, there was no score because of the absence of socio-cultural issues whereas the results of 1999 and 2009 suggest that the party emphasizes right elements more than left elements to a slight or to a large extent. This included mentions of liberal multiculturalism and morality, as illustrated in Figure 5.21. From the expert survey, the party is seen as centre-right or moderately conservative on its overall social and cultural ideology, and centre-left or liberal on its views on gay and lesbian rights, this is illustrated in Figure 5.29 and 5.31. From the interview, when asked about the UDM's position on abortion and homosexuality, Kwankwa stated that the party does not have a policy position on abortion and there is "no reservation, none whatsoever" on homosexual rights because "their rights are now protected in the constitution, especially gay and lesbian marriages." From these results, it seems that the UDM supports a moderate left or liberal position on this issue. In this sense, the party does not seem to be conservative.

Conclusion

The UDM is seen as a centre-right party on political issues, supporting liberal democracy, liberal equality and traditional governance. The party can be seen as a centre-left or moderate left party on socio-economic issues particularly because of its support for redistribution, social welfare and affirmative action. On social and cultural issues, the UDM is positioned as centre-left or liberal particularly on its views on gay and lesbian rights.

6.7 FFP

The manifesto for 1994 and 2004 was unable to be obtained, the ideological index is based on the 1999 and 2009 manifesto. The overall ideological index for the FFP in 1999 was 1.00 and 0.89 in 2009, as illustrated in Figure 5.1. This suggests that the FFP emphasizes largely

right elements more then left elements. The contributing factor to this rightward score comes from the political, socio-economic and the social-cultural domain for both years, as displayed in Figure 5.11. Gathering from the manifestos, the party tends to emphasize the social and cultural domain more than the other domains, while the political domain is given more attention than the socio-economic domain, as shown in Figure 5.18. For the expert survey, the FFP is a centre-right or moderate party, as seen in Figure 5.22. The interquartile range for this expert survey question amounted to a value of 2, which indicates a highly reliable result. But the result for each response is reliable as the interquartile range is less than 4. From Figure 5.32, it can be deduced that the FFP is very well-known by intellectuals. From the interview with Piet Uys, the FFP seems to be a centre-right party. But is the right dimension contained in all the domains? Is the ideology of the FFP absent of any left elements?

Political domain

In 1999 the ideological index was 1.00, indicating large right emphases in the manifesto. In 2009 the ideological index was 0.77, indicating again large right emphases, as seen in Figure 5.2 and 5.11. In the 1999 manifesto, the FFP was on the right because of its mention of liberal democracy, whereas in 2009, the right position was due to liberal equality, liberal freedom and religion in politics, though mentioning the left element of decentralization. This can be seen in Figure 5.19. According to the expert survey, the party is moderate right on politics and government, as seen in Figure 5.23. From the interview, the party seems centre-right. Uys stated that "the right to vote" together with elections and constitutionalism are important factors. When asked on equality, Uys gave a liberal position as opposed to a socialist one, stating that,

> …those are questions of the past, it doesn't bother us anymore. We carry on, we sit in all the municipalities where we sit on an equal base together with the ANC and the PAC and COPE and everybody, we are on the same committees, we're in the same meetings. To us, it is not a problem anymore.

On traditional governance, Uys states that if the people

> …want to do it there way, let them do it. We won't do it. We don't have a system of traditional leadership. But if the people want it, let them have it. It's their privilege, it's their culture.

The FFP from these results seems to have a right position on politics but this is a moderate view. On religion, Uys stated that all religions are equal and that the FFP believes in Christianity since the party's beginning. He added that the FFP is not a religious fundamentalist party, arguing that killing people with different religious beliefs is not even in any religion because most religions promote the principle of love your neighbour, "it doesn't say kill your neighbour if he is not on your side of the religion." The FFP can be seen as a centre-right party on political matters.

Socio-economic domain

Based on the manifesto analysis, the ideological index for the FFP on the socio-economic domain for 1999 and 2009 is 1.00, as shown in Figure 5.3 and 5.11, indicating that the party emphasizes right elements to a large extent. According to Figure 5.20, the party expressed its support for the market and market libertarianism, private property and anti-affirmative action. The expert survey placed the party has moderate right on some issues and extreme right on other issues, this can be seen in Figure 5.25 to 5.28. According to this, the FFP supports free enterprise and private ownership in a moderate right fashion but strongly opposes redistribution and affirmative action, in an extreme right fashion. From the interview, the party seems extreme right. Centre-right and market libertarian variables are mentioned in the interview, such as anti-communism, anti-nationalization and private property but the party moves to the far right when it opposes affirmative action and redistribution, suggesting a free market, equal opportunity context. It is important to note that centre-left elements were seen in the interview, such as the party's acceptance of social welfare but this is outweighed by their right emphases.

On left elements, when asked about social welfare, Uys stated that "we acknowledge the necessity of social grants." He further linked it to the poor Afrikaner people who make their situation known to the FFP about their lack of income, and also linked it as an important means of poverty alleviation. Uys expressed the party's satisfaction with the disability grant, stating that,

> It is the first time in our history that this disability grant is given to such a wide spectrum of people. Everybody who qualifies regularly gets their payment which is a very good thing. It was never done before. So without that many people would just simply die because of lack of food or lack of medical assistance.

On right elements, Uys stated the party's support for private ownership and further stated an anti-nationalization stance. On the latter, according to Uys, "we're against it, it's not capitalist and it doesn't work." Uys expressed the party's non-attraction to communism, arguing that "communism has a very bad track record. Wherever they took over, they destroyed the country economically…we believe in the free market system."

On redistribution, Uys argued that the party is not of the view that redistribution of wealth is necessary, stating that the "poor must be helped but not at the cost of the others. They must be a better formula found for that. We are completely against the redistribution of wealth." On affirmative action Uys stated that the party is firmly against it,

> …affirmative action was and is an attempt to eradicate the injustices of the past. But our point of view is that it cannot last forever…we think it should have been done already, we must now stop this…Because the children that were born after 1994, after the democracy…are now punished and they don't deserve it…that is discrimination, a reverse discrimination, that starts all over again. That is what we want to stop. People must from now on have equal opportunity and not a better opportunity and plus points when you black or whatever colour but not white. We must give equal opportunities to everybody.

The FFP does seem to have an extreme right view, especially with its opposition to affirmative action and redistribution. The party supports centre-left elements such as social welfare and also centre-right or market libertarian elements such as private property and ownership and free enterprise. But the far right elements outweigh both centre-left and centre-right emphasis.

Social and cultural domain

The FFP for 1999 (1.00) and 2009 (0.91), according to the ideological index, shows a right-leaning position on social and cultural issues, emphasizing right more than left issues to a large extent in this domain – as shown in Figure 5.4 and 5.11. From Figure 5.21, it is illustrated that the FFP in 1999 and 2009 discusses group identity, but in 2009, the party also focused on liberal multiculturalism and morality. The expert survey positioned the party as extreme right for its overall social-cultural ideology and moderate right for its views on gay and lesbian rights, as seen in Figure 5.29 and 5.31. From the interview, the party seems to take a centre-right stance.

When asked about the party's views on moral issues, Uys mentioned the Biblical commitment of the party on these issues. On the issue of abortion, Uys stated that "we believe that the Bible says thou shall not kill. Our official approach is that abortion may only be allowed when its medically necessary, for the safety of the mother…[but]…abortions at will…we're against it officially."

Another right dimension of the FFP is its nationalist stance, Uys expressed the party's promotion of group rights, minority rights and self-determination. Though the party emphasizes other right elements like liberal multiculturalism, in the sense that there "is a variety of culture of South Africa that is unique", but the support for group rights outweighs this, Uys further states that "we request that we will be able to be allowed to exercise and live in our culture…we want our own place in the sun. We want to govern ourselves…" On self-determination, Uys explained that the basic reason for the party's existence is because of the promotion of minority rights, which are internationally recognized rights, by the United Nations and also by the South African constitution. Uys also stated that the party is not just representing Afrikaner interest but other minorities. Elaborating on self-determination, Uys argued that there is an urgent need to preserve cultural institutions and reinforce language rights, especially in a modern world which is causing the dilution of culture,

> What practically happens is that we are slowing losing the things that we created for ourselves, like schools that have only Afrikaans speaking schools…we put in English speaking children in the schools…then…the whole school eventually change into a English school which means we have lost the school. The same you can say that the universities. You know we established a lot of these universities in South Africa, for the Zulus, and for the Tswana's, everybody has got its own university, but what is now happening is that all the universities, including the Afrikaans universities, Pretoria, Bloemfontein, Potchefstroom, are changing into English universities. So without noticing we are losing these things and we are losing the right to govern those institutes. We are losing them as time goes by.

The Afrikaner nationalism of the FFP is not radical, in the sense that the party accepts liberal multiculturalism and equality of all, the party can be seen as a moderate right or nationalist party insofar as it advocates the protection of culture, especially in the form of linguistic heritages. The party is also not extreme right because the territorial separatist agenda of creating an independent Afrikaner state is unpopular, as Uys argued.

Conclusion

The FFP is a centre-right party in the political domain. The party supports liberal democratic elements, such as constitutionalism and elections, but also accepts traditional governance and religion in politics. On socio-economic issues, the party is on the far right of the spectrum particularly because of its anti-redistributive and anti-affirmative action stance, that outweigh its other market libertarian elements such as free enterprise. The FFP is a moderate right party on social-cultural issues, it supports liberal multiculturalism and promotes group identity, particularly minority rights, however, the party is not extreme right in this regard because of its stance on equality, liberal multiculturalism, and the unpopularity of territorial separatism.

6.8 ACDP

The manifestos for 1994, 2004 and 2009 were used but the 1999 manifesto for the ACDP was unable to be obtained. In 1994, the ACDP scored 0.13, 0.81 for 2004 and 0.69 for 2009, this is shown in Figure 5.1. This suggests that the party emphasizes right more than left elements, ranging from a slight to a large extent. The rightward score was due to the political and the socio-economic domain in 1994, this also contributed to the 2004 score but together with the social-cultural domain, and in 2009 it was mostly due to the political and the social-cultural domain, as displayed by Figure 5.12. Using the manifestos, the party tends to place emphasis on the political domain followed by the social and cultural domain and the socio-economic domain is given the least attention, as shown in Figure 5.18. From the expert survey, the overall ideology of the ACDP is 7, as Figure 5.22 illustrates, this implies that the party is moderate right or moderately conservative. The interquartile range for the expert survey responses on the ACDP yielded a value of less than 3.5, which indicates a reliable result. From Figure 5.32, it can be deduced that the ACDP is a moderately known party among intellectuals. According to the interview with Kenneth Meshoe, the ACDP seems to be a far right party. In all these results, it shows that the ACDP is positioned to the right of the political spectrum. But exactly what makes the party rightward? And does this mean that it emphasizes no left elements at all? Which domain is being referred to?

Political domain

From the manifesto analysis, the ideological index of the ACDP was predominantly right. For 1994 the index was 0.26, demonstrating slight right elements, for 2004, the index was 0.87, suggesting largely right elements, and in 2009, it was 0.86, suggesting again, largely right elements, as illustrated in Figure 5.2 and 5.12. The right elements that were emphasized included liberal democratic elements, liberal equality, liberal freedom and religion, while the left element of federalism was also mentioned, as shown in Figure 5.19. According to the expert survey, the party is centre or liberal on politics and government, as shown in Figure 5.23. In this sense, the party is neither authoritarian nor democratic but liberal. This result is different from the ideological index and the interview. From the interview, the party seems to be centre-right on political issues, emphasizing issues that include elections, constitutionalism, religious input in politics and traditional governance, also, the left element of federalism was also highlighted.

When asked about the importance of constitutionalism and elections, Meshoe stated that "constitutionalism is paramount", and linked elections to a mechanism of ensuring accountability and rotation of government, Meshoe stated that, without elections, a "government in power may become arrogant" and when this happens the "government becomes uncaring", he went on to further state that the government "must know that if I don't perform…I am going to be replaced." On the point of federalism, Meshoe stated that the "ACDP believes that centralization limits the efficiency of government", the ACDP argues that there is a need to strengthen provincial and local government. This shows its liberal democratic elements.

The ACDP believes in religious involvement in politics, Meshoe stated that the ACDP is a "Christian party whose policies are guided by the principles of the Word of God." He argued that it is not possible, according to him, to separate religious beliefs from political beliefs, one cannot behave in one way at church and in another way when making policy, according to Meshoe, "it is a very important thing for people to be who they are, whether in school, church, politics or wherever." From the point of view of Meshoe, religious opinions are not intrusive, he stated that "[i]f opinions can be intrusive then it would be unfair to say only religious opinions are intrusive", because philosophical opinions too, according to him, can

also be intrusive. But Meshoe made it clear that the ACDP is not a religious fundamentalist party that seeks to sow conflict and to not tolerate those of differing beliefs. When asked about traditional governance, Meshoe stated that it "contributed a lot of positive things in our country. We have seen areas or villages that were ruled by traditional leaders being better." He also stated that "the ACDP is in favour of that model and we wish this model can run side by side with our councillors." The party can be seen as a centre-right party on political issues.

Socio-economic domain

From the manifesto result, as shown in Figure 5.2 and 5.12, in 1994, the index was 1.00, suggesting large right elements being emphasized, in 2004 it was 0.82, suggesting again large right elements, but in 2009 it was -0.11, suggesting the party's emphasis on left more than right issues. In 1994 and 2004, the right emphasis from the manifestos were market, market in a libertarian sense, and private property, as shown in Figure 5.20, but in 2009, the emphasis was on left elements that included social welfare and a mixed economy. The expert survey reveals that the party is centre-right, favouring market mechanisms instead of state economic planning, favouring private ownership instead of state ownership, and favouring redistribution, but the expert survey positioned the party on the centre for its views on affirmative action, this can be seen in Figure 5.25 to 5.28. In the manifestos, the party has not mentioned redistribution and affirmative action. In this sense, there is an inconsistency between the ideological index of right and left and the expert survey of centre-right. From the interview, the party seems to be of a centre-left position, mainly because it has mentioned its support for social welfare and affirmative action, as well as economic intervention where necessary.

Meshoe mentioned centre-right and market libertarian elements such as anti-communism, growth more than redistribution, anti-nationalization and private property, but also mentioned centre-left elements such as affirmative action, social welfare and economic intervention. Without the left emphasis the ACDP would be positioned as a right party. From the interview, Meshoe argued for private property, he stated that when people know that the property does not belong to them, they lose their sense of responsibility for

maintaining the property, in this he stated that common ownership is a massive disinvestment for individual and societal development,

> …if you look at people using what that does not belong to them…they are not as appreciative and careful as they are when they are using their personal assets or goods. We see in communism an uncaring attitude. Communism does not encourage a culture of caring because nothing belongs to me only, we all have to share what I have, even if we don't contribute equally. Even those that could contribute more, if they know I have to share this with somebody who does not contribute it, they are not motivated to do better than what they are doing. So that is why the ACDP does not believe in communism.

Linked to this, the ACDP does not agree with nationalization. "We believe that private enterprise must be encouraged because there is better productivity when people work for themselves then when they work for somebody else" (Meshoe 2014). When asked about the importance of redistribution, Meshoe stated that it is more critical to focus on growth rather than redistribution first,

> The ACDP believes that it is more important to increase wealth than to redistribute what you have…The fact is if we redistribute what we have only, what are we going to have after the redistribution?...That's why the emphasis for the ACDP is not in redistribution but in creation of more wealth.

However the party supports social welfare and affirmative action. When it comes to social welfare, Meshoe argued that the ACDP is more than a traditional conservative party, but stated that "we are also not focusing on moral issues only but bread and butter issues…We are talking about social welfare and many other things." On social welfare and more particularly on economic intervention, Meshoe stated that the government has a responsibility to help in situations where it is necessary, however he made it clear that this is not an wholesale intervention,

> The issue of inequality and poverty obviously these things are a challenge to any government and they have to be…government should not just intervene in everything and government should not run the lives of individuals…But when government sees that there is a need in the family they must intervene. When they see there is a need in the community, they must intervene, without wanting to run their lives.

It seems that the party is centre-left on socio-economic issues.

Social and cultural domain

From the manifesto result, it can be seen that for 1994 the score was -1.00 suggesting largely left elements, but for 2004 it was 0.76 suggesting largely right elements and for 2009 it was 1.00 suggesting again largely right elements – as shown in Figure 5.4 and 5.12. In 1994, the left emphasis was on national solidarity and togetherness, but in 2004 and 2009, the right emphasis was based on traditional morality and family values, as seen in Figure 5.21. Whereas in 1994 the left outweighed the right emphasis, in 2004 and 2009, right elements were dominant. From the expert survey, the ACDP received a score of 9 for its overall ideology on social and cultural issues, and a score of 10 for its views on gay and lesbian rights. This suggests that the party is extreme right or highly conservative on such issues. This is clearly shown in Figure 5.29 and 5.31. Taking from the interview, the party seems strongly right or opposed to liberal values.

The ACDP sees it fit to be a voice in society and in parliament to make a clear distinction between right and wrong and even further states the weakness of the liberal viewpoint on morality, according to Meshoe,

> …people who are liberal they did not want people to talk about what is right and what is wrong. We are told that children should not be taught what is right what is wrong…When you look at many of today's children, many of them are disrespectful, many of them are lazy, many of them are unhelpful to their families. Now because they are told you cannot be told what to do, just do what you want when you want. This is definitely wrong thinking…Imagine living in a country or in a world where nobody says this is right and this is wrong. Now to show the hypocrisy of the liberals they will not agree as in South Africa to say those people who want to drive on the right must have the freedom to drive on the right. They won't agree to that because they know what the consequences would be. There must be somebody who says drive on the left, if you drive on the right, there is going to consequences…Because of extreme immorality that is taking place in our country as a result of the liberals who said you cannot tell people what is right and what is wrong.

The ACDP's view on abortion and especially that of the young population of teenagers, is the Biblical protection of the right to life,

> The ACDP believes that every human being has the right to life, including the life of an unborn baby. Unborn children also have the right to life and government does not have the right to take the life of the unborn…We believe that teenagers should be taught about decency, about uprightness in morals, they should be taught about…what is right

> and what is wrong. If teenagers are just allowed to commit formication and when they are pregnant, commit abortions, this is helping them create a better future for them, our children must be encouraged to focus on their studies, to focus on building their future…The ACDP believes that we want to have responsible adults and to have responsible adults, young people, teenagers, must be taught what is right and what is wrong.

Related to this, on homosexual issues, the ACDP takes a clear stance on this issue, Meshoe argued that "the ACDP believes that when God created a man and a women. He said a man to marry a women and not a women to marry another women, or a man to marry another man." In this sense, the ACPD can be seen as a strongly or extremely right party on social and cultural issues.

Conclusion

The ACDP can be seen as a centre-right or moderate right party on political issues, which supports liberal democracy, religion in politics and traditional governance. The party is of an ant-communist stance and anti-nationalization, favouring free enterprise and economic efficiency but at the same time, the party supports economic intervention where necessary for the purposes of uplifting families. The party supports social welfare and affirmative action. This makes the ACDP centre-left on socio-economic issues. The ACPD is a far right or highly conservative party on social-cultural issues, it advocates for the need of traditional morals in a society that is being destroyed by liberal values, it is of an anti-abortion and anti-homosexual stance.

6.9 UCDP

The 1999 and 2004 manifesto was unable to be obtained. In this case, the 2009 manifesto was only studied. According to the manifesto data, the ideological index for the UCDP is 0.28, as shown in Figure 5.1, which means that the manifesto contained slight right elements more than left elements. The contributing factor to this overall right score was the political and the social-cultural domain, as shown by Figure 5.15. From the 2009 manifesto, the UCDP tends to emphasize the political domain while the social-cultural domain is given the least attention, as shown in Figure 5.18. Another data result was the expert survey, which rated the UCDP in its overall ideology as a moderate right party, as shown in Figure 5.22. The expert result for each question on the UCDP is reliable because the interquartile

range yielded a value of less than 3. From Figure 5.32 it can be deduced that UCDP is not so well-known by intellectuals. This however does not invalidate those experts who responded to the questions. From the interview with Isaac Mfundisi, it seems that the UCDP is a far right party. What does the UCDP talk of to be placed on the right? And is the 'right' dimension contained in all domains? Does the UCDP also speak of left elements?

Political domain

Based on the 2009 manifesto analysis, the ideological index for UCDP on the political domain is 0.47, as shown in Figure 5.2 and 5.15, suggesting that the party articulates right elements more than left elements to a slight extent. According to Figure 5.19, the UCDP manifesto contained favourable references to liberal democratic elements and liberal equality, and also mentioned the left element of decentralization. According to the interview, centre or liberal elements were seen. The expert survey revealed that the party is centre, as shown in Figure 5.23. Mfundisi discussed the UCDP's commitment to elections and constitutionalism. Mfundisi stated that elections "are very important. Just imagine wearing a socks without ever washing them?" There is a requirement for representatives to receive a 'new mandate'. On constitutionalism, Mfundisi observed that the constitution is crucial, arguing that "a constitution is there to guide and give direction as to how things should go." A liberal element or left element is decentralization. According to Mfundisi, the party believes in a 'federalist approach', precisely because "people wherever they are should be able to determine issues that affect them…the intention is that no single institution like central government can control all four corners of this country."

But Mfundisi also emphasized certain right elements, namely, traditional governance and religion in politics. According to Mfundisi, the UCDP recognizes traditional leaders and argues that just as royalty in England is maintained so too should chieftaincy in South Africa be maintained, "[t]he right thing to do, retain the institution, let it go on. Let everybody retain their origins." Even more, Mfundisi stated that it is possible for the leaders to know their limitations and boundaries in accordance with the law. When asked about the role of religion in politics, Mfundisi explained that the UCDP stands for a Christian democracy and that there "is a need for religion" and there "is just no way it can be seen as a hindrance for the running of the country." However Mfundisi made it clear that the party is not

fundamentalist in their religious beliefs. In this sense, the UCDP can be seen as a centre-right party on political issues.

Socio-economic domain

Based on the 2009 manifesto analysis, the ideological index for UCDP on the socio-economic domain is -0.04, as shown in Figure 5.3 and 5.15. This means that the UCDP highlights left elements more than right elements to a slight extent. According to the intra-domain emphasis, the UCDP mentioned its support for right elements such as the market in a libertarian sense, but also the market generally, and private property; whereas left elements were also stated, namely, a mixed economy, redistribution and social welfare, as shown in Figure 5.20. But the left emphasis outweighed the right emphasis. According to the expert survey, the party is centre on ownership of the economy, redistribution of wealth and affirmative action but centre-right on the market as opposed to state economic planning, as seen in Figure 5.25 to 5.28. However, from the interview, the UCDP is neither centre-right nor centre but centre-left, mainly because the party stated its support for the free market and it is against state ownership, but also showed its support for redistribution of wealth, social welfare and affirmative action.

From the interview, Mfundisi stated that "our party is a party that encourages free market economy. Those who work hard should get rich through the sweat of their brow." On whether ownership of the economy and business should be in the hands of the state or private capital, Mfundisi argued that the party is against state ownership, pointing to nationalisation, he stated that, "[w]e have always come up to say, nationalisation is not an ideal solution because now in that way taking us to some sort of communism…So we are very…careful not to commit ourselves to that." On redistribution, Mfundisi stated that though the party accepts a free market system, redistribution of wealth is necessary, "everybody has to work, earn much and grow as rich as they possibly can. But people can't be living in plenty when my neighbour is starving…" Mfundisi calls this a 'humanitarian spirit' which has to be "inculcated in the people". When it comes to social welfare Mfundisi pointed out that the UCDP seeks to ensure that the weak and the destitute are not abandoned but taken care of, he further stated that the UCDP "is a party that emphasizes alleviation of poverty and the maintenance of a basic level of societal

protection…encouraging a welfare state…" On affirmative action, Mfundisi made it clear that the party supports it, that they "feel it is necessary". The UCDP can be seen as a centre-left party on socio-economic issues.

Social and cultural domain

The ideological index for UCDP on the social and cultural domain amounted to 0.45, suggesting that the UCDP supports right more than left social and cultural issues to a slight extent – as shown in Figure 5.4 and 5.15. This included mentions of traditional morality, as seen in Figure 5.21. According to the expert survey, the UCDP is positioned close to the extreme right on social and cultural issues generally and on homosexual rights specifically, as illustrated in Figure 5.29 and 5.31. According to the interview, the UCDP has a strong right stance on social and cultural issues. To Mfundisi, the party pursues a "conservative form of course and it will also focus on the health of the community regarding the moral and cultural issues in society." When asked about the party's view of abortion and homosexual issues, Mfundisi stated that,

> Abortion, just like same sex marriage, we don't take into account. They just have no place in our thinking…there is no platform, no food, no legs to stand on…so to us it is unnatural for a women to get married to another women and the same thing will go for a man.

Moreover, Mfundisi explained that family values need to be conserved, "family values are very very important and have to be taken into account. And that is why we have kept on saying we will always try to ensure that moral issues are raised." The UCDP takes a far right or highly conservative stance on social and cultural issues.

Conclusion

The UCDP is a centre-right or moderate right party in political matters, it supports liberal democratic elements, religion in politics and traditional governance. The party encourages the free market and is against nationalization, but also supports redistribution of wealth, social welfare and affirmative action. In this regard, the UCDP is centre-left or moderate left on socio-economic issues. The UCDP takes a far right or highly conservative stance on social-cultural issues, advocating traditional moral values in society.

6.10 APC

The APC is a recent party which won seats in the 2009 elections. In this case the 2009 manifesto will be used. Based on the manifesto analysis, the overall ideological index of APC is 0.58, as shown in Figure 5.1. This indicates that the APC emphasizes right more than left elements to a large extent. This was largely due to the political and the social-cultural domain, as shown in Figure 5.17. According to the 2009 manifesto, the APC tends to emphasize the political domain more than the other domains, while the socio-economic domain is given the least attention compared to all other parties, as shown in Figure 5.18. The expert survey score for the overall ideology of APC is 3, as shown in Figure 5.22, which implies that the party is positioned as moderate left. The interquartile range for this survey question yielded a value of 4, which indicates a reliable result. In fact, for all expert survey responses concerning the APC, the interquartile range was less than 4. From Figure 5.32, it can be deduced that the APC is a poorly known party amongst intellectuals. But this does not negate the reliability of those experts who actually responded to the questions. Also, from the interview with Themba Godi, the party seems to be a far left party. What does the right mean from the index? Is the party moderate left or far left?

Political Domain

Based on the 2009 manifesto analysis, the ideological index for APC on the political domain is 0.59, as shown in Figure 5.2 and 5.17, which indicates that the APC emphasizes right more than left political issues to a large extent. Liberal democratic elements, liberal equality and traditional governance were the right variables mentioned in the manifesto, as seen in Figure 5.19. The party does mention left variables such as participatory democracy but this is outweighed by right elements. This is contrary to the expert survey score which placed the party as 5 which means centre of the political spectrum or liberal, as shown in Figure 5.23. But according to the interview, the APC seems moderately left on political issues, emphasizing the ‘mass-lines’, but also emphasizing traditional governance.

On mass-lines, Godi equated it to popular democracy, “the mass-lines means that the line of the party must come from the people, meaning that what we do and what our programmes are, must be informed by the needs of the people not by what we as leaders think.” The APC has been the only party in 2009 to discuss the most about traditional governance in the

manifesto, as seen in Figure 5.19. When asked about the significance of traditional governance, Godi stated that, there is a need to move beyond the 'colonial argument' and understand that traditional governance gives people values,

> …there are millions of people who live under that institution and everyday settle their disputes and issues through that system…it is there, it exists and there are people who believe in it...But you know it has to be understood in the context of colonialism where every system and every approach that belonged to the natives were just non-existent, it was wrong, it is inferior, and if it has to exist, it must be perfect, if not, any little shortcomings is a justification and a confirmation that it is wrong. Whereas if there's anything wrong or there are lapses in any Western-based system, it is normal, it is human…it's like these things is just so bad and so pagan don't even bring it to the legal realm…So I am saying, it is a colonial argument.

The APC can be seen to get its moderate right or centre element because of its acceptance of constitutionalism which is the "parameters" of the state, parliamentary oversight, and elections, as stated by Godi. According to Godi, "elections are important in that they allow the people the right to decide on who their representatives are…you see now a lot of socialist parties coming to power through the ballot…" On constitutionalism, Godi stated that "...constitutionalism to the extent that a constitution sets the legal parameters within which the laws of the country must operate, yes we support that, so that you have certainty, there are ground rules…" On parliamentary oversight, Godi linked it to the separation of powers, "you don't have a good government because there is a good individual but you should have a good government, a good state because, you have the legal framework that guarantees that irrespective of who the individual is." From the interview, the mass-lines makes the party left but traditional governance makes the party right, so the APC is left-right on political issues, but the party's emphasis on liberal elements together with the mass-lines makes the party centre-left, to incorporate traditional governance, we can say that the APC is centre-left with conservative elements.

Socio-economic domain

Based on the 2009 manifesto analysis, the ideological index for APC on the socio-economic domain is -1.00, which suggests that the APC manifesto contained left elements more than right elements to a large extent, as shown in Figure 5.3 and 5.17. This was the opposition to private property, as illustrated in Figure 5.20. From the expert survey, redistribution,

ownership and planning were given a moderate left position while affirmative action was close to the extreme, as shown in Figure 5.25 to 5.28. There is a clear left position just as in the ideological index, a further consistency can be seen with the interview response, but the only difference is that the APC is not moderate but extreme left on socio-economic issues. On the economy generally Godi pointed out that "we would not support a lassiez faire situation."

On state economic planning and the central economy Godi stated that, as socialists the APC would "expect the state to play a very critical and central role in the economy, therefore being able to accumulate resources that will service the people." Even more Godi explained that "we don't believe that authoritarianism is inherent in a system of state planned economy." Godi connected planning to nationalization which is a situation where the state plays a central role in the economy, so that "as a country and as a people we don't suffer the humiliation of being dependent on the exigencies of private capital." Godi does not see the logic in waiting for private capital because it simply does not invest and does not create jobs. On ownership, Godi argued that common ownership is what the APC supports, "we would want as much as possible common ownership", Godi further pointed out the APC's position on property,

> …land will not be a commodity, it will be in the hands of the state and the people. You can lease land, you can use it but you cannot alienate it…you can't sell it, so if we sell it to you, it becomes yours so it is no longer in the hands of the state.

On redistribution, Godi stated that, "I think if we have revolutionary socialists in charge, the resources we have in this country will be enough to lift out of poverty so many of our people." Further stating that whatever is produced in society must be "consumed in the most equitable way" or put in another way, "the wealth of the country will be in the hands and will be shared, as equitable as possible with everyone", this is described as the ultimate objective in the socialist system according to Godi. When asked about the importance of social welfare, Godi stated that there is a need for a social safety net to "alleviate the absolute poverty that so many people live under". On affirmative action, Godi stated that there has to be a means to "correct the imbalances of the past by very very deliberate action because the socio-economic relations that we have today were not a natural

development but a process of deliberate engineering". In this sense, the APC is an extreme left party, not moderate left or close to the extreme left on socio-economic issues.

Social and cultural domain

The ideological index for the APC on the social and cultural domain is 0.75, as shown in Figure 5.4 and 5.17, this indicates that the APC articulates right more than left social-cultural issues to a large extent. This element was specifically group identity, as seen in Figure 5.21. According to the expert survey, the APC is moderately right or moderately conservative on social-cultural issues, as shown in Figure 5.29 and 31. From the interview this right element can be seen in African nationalism which is a kind of group identity or self-determination. Though Godi spoke favourably about liberal equality especially among races, the right element of group issues outweighed this. According to Godi, Africanism forms the identity of people and causes an appreciation for that identity, and it is the ability to determine the direction of the country. Africanism is psychological, it is focused on the "indigenous majority". It is about how one see's himself or herself, and it is about projecting the African personality. Africanism is about accepting one's culture as an African, it is however more than a culture but that culture can provide guidance to people, especially young people, Godi pointed out that traditional songs for example can have meaning that "teach and shape a person's thinking" which is "a source of education". Godi stated that freedom is were African ways of life become part of the very fabric of society, moreover, if this does not happen, then a colonial situation is perpetuated,

> Self-determination goes way way way beyond just one person, one vote. It talks to the ability of the majority to feel they are part of this country, they have a say, and their voice matters. You can't have Africans being 80% of the population and yet the cultural landscape and the moral trajectory of the country does not reflect that or is not informed by that. Or actually their sense of right and wrong means little or means nothing. Otherwise you perpetuate a colonial setting where the views, the thinking and feeling of the majority…when we are free, we are not only free to vote but we are free to be who we are and appreciate who we are. That's where your Africanism comes in. The African people must feel who they are is not a mistake. What they believe in is not wrong, it can just be different from somebody else, it is not wrong. And be able to determine the direction of their country..

The nationalism advocated by the APC is not territorial separatism but it is of a psychological nature, an identity formation of the African character. The other right element which is

traditional morality, particularly on homosexuality, according to the expert survey the APC is moderate right on this issues, but according to the interview, the party does not have a position on this issue. In this sense the APC is a moderate right or nationalist party on social and cultural issues.

Conclusion

The APC is a centre-right party on political issues, it favours liberal democratic elements such as constitutionalism and parliamentary oversight but it also supports traditional governance. The party is far left on socio-economic issues, declaring itself as socialists, favouring state economic planning, common ownership and nationalization. On the social-cultural domain, the party is moderate right in the sense of nationalism, favouring African nationalism.

6.11 AZAPO

The manifestos for all years were obtained. The overall ideological index for AZAPO in 1999 was 0.04, 0.08 for 2004 and 0.26 for 2009, as shown in Figure 5.1. The index suggests that the party consistently emphasizes right elements to a slight extent more than left elements. The political and the social-cultural domain were the contributing factors to this rightward score as shown in Figure 5.14. AZAPO emphasizes the political domain and the socio-economic domain to similar extents, as seen in Figure 5.18. The expert survey score for the overall ideology was 2, as shown in Figure 5.22, this implies that the party is close to the extreme left. The interquartile range for this expert survey question yielded a value of 3, which indicates a reliable result. For all responses pertaining to AZAPO, the interquartile range was less than 4.5, indicating its reliability. AZAPO seems to be a fairly known party among academics, according to Figure 5.32. There is an inconsistency in the index and the expert survey. An interview with AZAPO was not possible, as explained in the methodology. The two methods and an additional qualitative analysis of the manifestos will be done to fill this gap. What exactly makes AZAPO right? Is the party close to the extreme left or far left? Which domain can this be seen in?

Political Domain

AZAPO in 1999 (1.00), 2004 (1.00) and 2009 (0.64) has been consistently to the right, emphasizing to a large degree right more than left political elements, as shown in Figure 5.2 and 5.14. The expert survey positioned AZAPO as a moderate right party, as shown in Figure 5.23. There is a correlation between these two results, both positioning AZAPO as a right party and moreover a moderate right party on political issues. The intra-domain emphasis gives an understanding of exactly what right elements were mentioned, as shown in Figure 5.19. Since 1999 to 2009, there has been a consistent reference to centralization and traditional governance, but in 2004 and 2009, references were made to other right elements, namely, liberal democracy, liberal equality and liberal freedom. Moreover in 2009 there were mentions of participatory democracy but this was outweighed by liberal democratic mentions, placing the party to the right on political issues.

Liberal equality and liberal freedom have been mentioned in the manifestos. In 2009, the manifesto stated that democracy "affords all of us freedom of speech, association, equality before the law and the right to be ruled by those we elect freely." Constitutionalism has also been mentioned. In 1999, the party stated that as part of its policy positions it believes in a democratic order which entails promoting and "[u]pholding the supremacy of the law". In 2009, this was stated as "[a]dherence to the rule of law without according any favours to anyone". Further liberal democratic elements were seen, for example elections and separation of powers, in the 2004 manifesto AZAPO spoke of the ability of the sovereign people to exercise the "right to vote". Related to this in 2004 the party supported the independence of the judiciary. It further stated in the 2009 manifesto that the organs and institutions of the state "such as Parliament, the Executive, the Judiciary, the police and the army need to be protected", and it also referred to the prevention of the abuse of power through constitutionalism and the protection of state institutions.

Centralization and traditional governance has been a feature in the manifestos. A consistent intra-domain issue has been the abolition of provincial government and the support for traditional leaders. In the 2004 manifesto, the party made clear the form of state favoured,

> …central government should be directly responsible and answerable to the electorate and as such an AZAPO government will…Seek to abolish provincial governments and

> replace them with a few administrators answerable to central government…These administrators will work closely with local government to ensure effective service delivery and development…

In the manifesto of 2004, AZAPO stated that it will embrace cultural and traditional institutions, by ensuring that "traditional institutions are respected and recognized at local government level throughout the country". In 1999 the party stated that the role of traditional leaders needs to be negotiated because they have been "relegated to an inferior status when local government structures are put in place". This was again emphasized in 2004, that there is a need to ensure a "healthy relationship and coexistence of Local Government, Councillors and Traditional Leaders."

AZAPO can be seen as a centre-right party but because of its emphasis on centralization in politics, that is the abolition of the provinces, the party is far right on political matters.

Socio-economic domain

The party in 1999 (-0.83), 2004 (-0.60) and 2009 (-0.38) has been consistently to the left, emphasizing slight or to a large degree left more than right socio-economic elements, as shown in Figure 5.3 and 5.14. From Figure 5.20, the party makes favourable mentions to social welfare, redistribution and affirmative action, making the party centre-left or moderate left. However, from 1999 to 2004, the party has been opposed to market libertarianism. In this sense the party can be seen as far left. According to the expert survey, the party is close to the extreme left on some issues while extreme left on other issues, as shown in Figure 5.25 to 5.28. Experts positioned the party as close to the extreme left on state economic planning and state ownership of business, and extreme left on redistribution of wealth and affirmative action. To expand more on AZAPO's socio-economic position, it is possible to look at the manifesto statements.

The party is in favour of certain market mechanisms. In the 2004 manifesto, the party stated that it will ensure enterprise development and economic growth, and will fast track business such as informal businesses in the economy, it also encourages the culture of entrepreneurship. On the other hand, the party has been in constant opposition to market libertarianism. In 1999, five anti-market libertarian statements were mentioned, and together with 2004 and 2009, it totalled eight, as seen in Figure 5.20. In 1999, the party

argued that "[r]ampant market forces have failed to ensure the equitable redistribution of wealth, thus disqualifying themselves as the salvation of the poor."

Related to this, in the 2004 manifesto, the party opposed privatization, stating that,

> Privatization has led to uneven and skewed economic development patterns in both rural and urban communities. As government AZAPO pledges to…Reverse the privatization of state assets in order to create and maintain jobs for citizens of this country…Oppose and reverse the privatization of health services and essential services…and assume responsibility for delivery of such services…Reverse privatization in those areas of the transport system, which it considers to be in the public interest.

Redistribution of wealth and social welfare saw consistent mentions since the 1999 manifesto. In the 2004 manifesto, AZAPO stated that social welfare is one of its key priorities, discussed improved methods for it, and also stated the need to consider a social wage for the unemployment. Also in the manifesto of 2004, AZAPO stated that there is a need to "ensure an equitable redistribution of wealth". Affirmative action has been mentioned in 1999, 2004 but not in 2009. In 2004, the party claimed that there is certainly a need to "do away with all inequalities", and through "[e]conomic empowerment strategy provide favourable and sustainable conditions of increasing employment and business opportunities to the masses of our people"

AZAPO in this sense can be seen as a far left party, especially with the result from the expert survey, in this sense the party supports moderate left elements such as social welfare and affirmative action but this is outweighed by its support for close to the extreme left, namely state economic planning and state ownership, and far left elements, namely, redistribution of wealth and affirmative action.

Social and cultural domain

For the 1999 (1.00), 2004 (1.00) and 2009 (0.00) ideological index, the party has made right emphases and also right-left emphases to the same extent as seen in 2009, this is illustrated in Figure 5.4 and 5.14. In 1999 and 2004, the party gained a right score mainly because of its support for group identity. But in 2009, group identity was not mentioned but rather national solidarity and liberal multiculturalism, as seen in Figure 5.21. According to the expert survey, AZAPO is a centre-right party or moderately conservative on social and

cultural issues generally and liberal or centre on gay and lesbian rights – as shown in Figure 5.29 and 5.31. The latter issue is unable to be confirmed because the issue is not mentioned in the manifestos. AZAPO can be seen as a centre party in relation to its 2009 emphasis on multiculturalism, as opposed to its 1999 and 2004 emphasis on nationalist or group identity sentiments. However this should be taken with cautious, until more information become available then can a solid conclusion be made.

From the manifesto statements, nationalist sentiments were mentioned in 1999. This was references to 'black people' or the 'majority' in the context of black consciousness. However this kind of language was not used in 2004 and 2009. Rather in 2009, the party began to speak in terms of equality. The party began to emphasize multiculturalism by 2009. In the 2009 manifesto, AZAPO mentioned the diverse South African languages as equal, in this sense accepting diversity but also calling for equality. More directly on the point of diversity, in the 2004 manifesto, the party linked diversity to the importance of African identity, stating that,

> Indigenous languages are tools through which our people can reclaim their human dignity, respect and identity by making every effort to develop these languages to the level where they can address important issues…

Conclusion

AZAPO is a far right party on political issues, it supports centre-right elements such as liberal democracy and traditional governance but it emphasizes on centralization that is the desire to abolish the provinces, making the party far right. AZAPO is a far left party in the socio-economic domain, it opposes free market economics, supports state economic planning, state ownership, radical redistribution of wealth and radical affirmative action. This is particularly according to the expert survey result. On social-cultural issues, AZAPO is a centre or liberal party, supporting liberal multiculturalism instead of right issues such as group identity.

6.12 MF

The 1999 manifesto for the MF was unable to be obtained, the ideological index was based on the 2004 and 2009 manifesto. When looking at the overall ideological index, for 2004 the MF gained a score of 0.50 and 0.00 for 2009, as seen in Figure 5.1. The party emphasized

right more than left elements in 2004 whereas left and right elements were emphasized to the same extent in 2009. This was due to the political and the social-cultural domain, as shown in Figure 5.13. The MF tends to emphasize the socio-economic domain followed by the social-cultural domain, as illustrated in Figure 5.18. The expert survey placed the party as centre-right for its overall ideology, as shown in Figure 5.22. The responses from the expert survey are reliable as the interquartile range pertaining to the MF amounts to less than 4. From Figure 5.32, it can be deduced that the MF is moderately known by academics. After the interview with Shameen Rajbansi, the MF seems to be a centre-right party. Does the right index score mean that the MF is right in the socio-economic domain? Or does it apply to all domains? Even more, does it mean that the party has no left elements?

Political domain

For 2004 and 2009 the ideological index was 1.00 which suggests that the party emphasizes right more than left elements to a large degree, as shown in Figure 5.2 and 5.13. This was liberal democracy, liberal equality and liberal freedom, as shown in Figure 5.19. This rightward position of the MF on political issues correlates with the expert survey result which positioned the party as centre-right or moderate right on politics and government, as seen in Figure 5.23. In relation to the manifesto elements, according to the interview, Rajbansi spoke favourably of liberal democratic elements, especially constitutionalism, according to Rajbansi there needs to be an institutionalization of the constitution,

> Those [constitutionalism, elections, liberal democracy] are all the key features of a democratic order and rule of law. And I think that they are the basic ingredients or elements of good governance and good governance…and each one is imperative, each one has to be institutionalized.

Another factor that places the MF as rightward is the conservative element in politics. Minority rights are a core pillar of the party. Within the two manifestos, the party stated its role as an 'undisputed voice of minorities' and that such a voice is necessary in the new democratic order. The MF recognizes that there are 'many social minorities' in South Africa, and sees themselves as having a function to ensure that no minority group is marginalized by any government policy. Other minorities, though welcomed by the party, it nonetheless primarily represents the Indian community, as explained by Rajbansi, who went on to state that the party acts as a voice in parliament for minorities, and it "works within the broader

framework of government policies" but "are just like watchdogs" who ensure that "everybody who falls under minority" groups are protected. On saying a few words on the history of the MF, Rajbansi explained that,

> …generally the minority Indian community and he [Mr Rajbansi] had to…find a way of helping this voter base to adjust to the new democratic order… knowing the rights that minorities shared globally, and he wanted to then form a party of his own that would help them during the transition…he realized that minority rights were a very very critical and essential right in terms of being institutionalized in any democracy and the success of democracies are actually measured by how they accommodate the minorities…[he] formed the Minority Front to be the voice primarily of Indian people but also all other minorities because it then became so relevant in the new South Africa that any community that was marginalized on any basis, whether it was ethnicity, language or sexual orientation or disability or colour or even any other nationality, because they were less in number, they would fall under minorities and that didn't equate to being less in equality or value.

In this sense, the party view on politics is marked by the promotion and protection of minority rights. The party can be seen as a centre-right party on political issues. The group issue of the MF is not radical or revolutionary but moderate.

Socio-economic domain

According to the 2004 and 2009 manifesto, the MF gained an ideological index of -1.00 which reflects left elements more than right elements, as seen in Figure 5.3 and 5.13. Exactly which elements on the left were emphasized? By looking at Figure 5.20, social welfare and affirmative action were favourably referred to. But in 2009, higher mentions of this left dimension were seen when compared to 2004. This means that the MF had more left than right dimensions during these years and, more importantly, shows a consistency in its leftness. According to the expert survey, the MF is a centre-right party, favouring more right than left issues but in a moderate way, particularly on redistribution which is seen as centre-right, and affirmative action which is seen as centre, this is illustrated in Figure 5.25 to 5.28. This expert position of the centre-right is contrary to the ideological index which is showing a left position. Even more, the interview showed support for a centre-left position.

Does the MF only have left issues, what about right issues? The expert survey places the party on the centre-right which also included their views on economic planning and state ownership of business and industry, showing that the MF is more inclined to accept free

enterprise and private ownership in a moderate fashion. According to the interview, Rajbansi made a point about the MF's anti-communist stance, stating that "I don't believe that is possible to turn the wheel around and go back to socialism", pointing to countries that were previously communists which have become capitalist. The MF can be seen as a party which accepts market mechanisms.

On left elements, from the interview, Rajbansi made it clear that the MF supports redistribution of wealth but it must be done in a consultative manner with the parties, and also affirmative action is important but must be implemented in a non-skewed manner, that is, to avoid excluding minorities in the favour of a black majority, in other words, all previously disadvantaged communities must be beneficiaries of affirmative action. Another left issue that Rajbansi expanded on was social welfare which is regarded as "absolutely" important to the party, "the idea of social grants is to decrease the ills", and accepting the term social development rather than social security,

> …social security is one of the measures that gives you key capabilities to move from a developing state to a developed state…So you want to have a capable state you cannot go along disregarding the poor or people who just cannot make ends meet…every country has to have a social net within which people fall…the…constitutional responsibility of the government is to provide a safety net. But only where that safety net must be in line with developmental initiatives…that is why too we have changed the name of our department from social security to social development because it is developmental in its approach.

Moreover, the MF is trying to introduce a new grant, the widows grant. According to Rajbansi, the task is to "sensitize the government towards a widows grant". In this light, the MF is a party that accept market mechanisms, is not inclined to communism, and accepts some government intervention (redistribution, social welfare and affirmative action), making the party centre-left on socio-economic issues.

Social and cultural domain

From the ideological index, for 2004 the party scored 0.52 which indicates that the MF emphasizes more right than left elements to a large degree, whereas in 2009 it was 1.00 – as shown in Figure 5.4 and 5.13 Exactly what elements were mentioned? According to Figure 5.21, the right issues were mainly liberal multiculturalism and group identity. Though the MF emphasizes the right element of liberal multiculturalism which celebrates diversity

and pluralism, the right element of group identity outweighs this, which is, more particularly minority rights. According to the expert survey score, experts placed the party as centre-right or moderately conservative on social and cultural issues, as seen in Figure 5.29 and 5.31. This centre-right position is also seen in the interview. Rajbansi explained how the party protects cultural issues of the Indian community, particularly language rights and traditional customs, arguing that,

> …we have put up a huge fight for Eastern languages, and Eastern languages is now going to be accepted again in our curriculum, but every year they [government] threaten, and every year it's our fight and the government finally gives in and listen. You look at fireworks, every year Diwali time, they fight about fireworks, every year…[the MF has]…to put up a fight about fireworks and every Diwali we use fireworks. It's an on-going thing.

When asked about the party's view on other cultural and traditional groups, Rajbansi stated that the Zulu language, for example, "is an indigenous language of the province [KwaZulu Natal] and it must be protected. Rajbansi also gave a case of an Indian pupil whose right to equality was compromised because of her cultural tradition, in this sense Rajbansi argued that there is a need to treat those of different cultural or religious customs equally, giving the example a case in Durban she explains,

> …the constitutional court on equality, on the right to wearing a nose ring…not to discriminate against her in the…high school when this case of the noise ring came about…our parliament…was able to…intervene at a school level to ensure that this child was not discriminated against but also on the other hand the school didn't want to change its policy about giving her the right to practice her religion. However when the parents took it to constitutional court, they said that on the basis of equality they gave a verdict in her favour that it was her cultural right, then she could wear her nose ring.

Beside group rights, the other elements of social-cultural issues such as the conservative or liberal sentiments on homosexuality need to be explored. This can be seen by the expert survey which positioned the MF on homosexuality as moderately conservative, meaning that it does not want to extend liberty, it sticks to traditional morality or other factors but nonetheless it remains conservative and not liberal. However, from the interview, the MF is not a conservative but a libertarian party. When asked about its stance on homosexuality, Rajbansi stated that on homosexuality it is wrong to discriminate on the group because of their different sexual orientation, less in number does not equate to them being less in value. Rajbansi takes a strong view on extending liberty to people of different sexual

orientation mainly because, as she states, of her personal experience and her strong relationship with the gay community of South Africa. The party intends to become more inclusive to other minorities such as the gay community. From the interview, the MF is more inclined to a far left view not a moderate right view, making them highly liberal on social and cultural issues particularly homosexuality. In this sense, the MF is both left-right on social-cultural issues, left in the sense of liberal and right in the sense of group identity. The party is better seen as libertarian and nationalists on social-cultural issues.

Conclusion

The MF is centre-right in its politics supporting first, liberal democratic elements such as constitutionalism more than left issues such as participatory democracy, socialist equality and socialist freedom; and second, group right issues particularly minority rights. The party is centre-left in socio-economics, showing an anti-communist stance, supporting redistribution, social welfare and affirmative action. And the party is far left or libertarian on social-cultural issues, and centre-right or moderate nationalist as it advances and protects group rights, especially minority rights.

6.13 PAC

The PAC, for its overall ideology, in 1994 (0.54), 1999 (0.33), 2004 (0.08) and 2009 (0.43) has been consistently to the right, indicating that it emphasizes right more than left elements to a slight or to a large extent, as shown in Figure 5.1. This was due to the political and the social-cultural domain, as seen in Figure 5.7. The PAC tends to emphasize the socio-economic domain the most, followed by the political domain, as seen in Figure 5.18. The expert survey placed the party as a moderate left party for its overall ideology, as shown in Figure 5.22. The expert survey responses pertaining to the PAC are reliable primarily because the interquartile range is less than 3. From the expert survey, as seen in Figure 5.32, the PAC is a relatively known party. From the interview with Bennet Joko, the party seems to be far left. Exactly what elements have made the PAC right? Is the party moderate left or far left? And in which domain can this be seen in?

Political domain

According to the ideological index from the manifesto data, the PAC in 1994 (0.62), 1999 (0.92), 2004 (0.27) and 2009 (1.00) shows a right position, as seen in Figure 5.2 and 5.7. This means that the party emphasizes right more than left political elements to a slight or to a large extent. This was because of, namely, liberal democratic elements, liberal equality and liberal freedom, centralization and traditional governance – as seen in Figure 5.19. It emphasized this more than discussing its link with socio-economic freedom and equality.

This correlates with the expert survey score which positioned the party to the right or conservative in its politics, as seen in Figure 5.23. In terms of moderate or extremely right, the PAC from the expert survey score is closer to the extreme, and from the manifesto statements, the party talks of traditional governance that could alone make them moderate right but the discussion of centralization, that is the abolition of the provinces, makes the party extreme right. This further links to the interview, the rationale for abolishing the provinces was mentioned by Joko who stated that they "have not seen what is the use of these provincial governments except to gallop the limited resources which are there", arguing that if the provinces are removed, money will be saved, and national government can "redirect money to priority areas" and empower local government to be "near to the people". Joko also explained the PAC's position on traditional government, stating that the "whole institution is still very important and can play a significant role going forward…Traditional leaders have a role to play especially when you talk about the moral values which have degenerated so badly in this country…" The PAC is coupled with conservatism and authoritarianism in its political stance. It can be seen as a right party which is close to the far right.

Socio-economic domain

According to Figure 5.3 and 5.7, the PAC is on the left on socio-economic issues. Moreover, it has remained consistent in this regard. The ideological index for 1994 (-0.59), 1999 (-0.50), 2004 (-0.60) and 2009 (-0.56) clearly shows this. This indicates that the party emphasizes left more than right socio-economic issues to a large extent. According to the expert survey, the PAC is left, moreover in terms of moderate or extreme left, the party sits closer to the extreme left on state ownership, state planning and redistribution of wealth, even more, it

is extreme left when it comes to affirmative action, as seen in Figure 5.25 to 5.28. According to the interview with Joko, the PAC favours a planned economy, redistribution, anti-privatization and nationalization. Joko explains that when the PAC was formed in 1959 it was the height of the Cold War and "it was also fashionable for political parties to align themselves either with the East or with the West" but the PAC stated that it decided to not align to any bloc but to take what is good from the West and what is good from the East, and from the latter it was a "the planned economy". Also, Joko spoke of the need for the redistribution of income as a means to attend to the injustice committed to the African people and that equality cannot be spoken of until we speak of equality of income. This is what Joko further stated,

> Imagine if the government is the administrator of this land, it will have sufficient resources to attend to these particular problems, because it will now be in a position to make decisions about the mineral resources. The wealth we get it from the oceans and everything that is associated with land. Their responsibility is to bring it to the people because their responsibility is to be the trustees of the people. In the current context where you have land ownership not addressed, they are not accountable to the people. They are accountable to the shareholders and they continue to produce the billionaires of shareholders, of very few people, who have got these enormous resources, from time to time they release a million here and there, saying we help the destitute. If the government has to redistribute this wealth to everybody else, don't you think we will all be smiling?

"We don't believe in…private property…We believe in nationalization" (Joko 2013). Nationalization, according to the PAC, must benefit the people, in this sense the "[g]overnment must take charge". On its uneasiness with the private sector, the PAC argues we actually need more government, Joko stated,

> In this country it has been shown, once you leave things in private hands it comes an issue of survival of the fittest. Those with huge purse will trump and will forever trump and those who have nothing they don't stand a stance and they will remain and that particular situation forever. Now these issues need to be regulated and you need government to do that. In fact we need more government, we don't need less government, with the problems that we are facing in this country.

It is in this sense that the ideological index and the expert survey suggest that the PAC is left and moreover it is closer to the extreme, it is the interview that positions the PAC to the extreme left. The party is extreme left on socio-economic issues.

Social and cultural domain

The ideological index shows that in 1994 (0.90), 1999 (0.67), 2004 (1.00) and 2009 (1.00) that the PAC has been consistently to the right, emphasizing more right than left social-cultural elements, this is illustrated in Figure 5.4 and 5.7. This particular element was group identity, as seen in Figure 5.21. Group identity puts the PAC on a nationalist path. But there has not been consistent reference to group identity, the highest references were in 1994 and 2004 and the lowest was in the 1999 and 2009 manifestos respectively.

What exactly is this group identity that the PAC refers to? Though Joko spoke favourably about liberal equality especially among races, the right element of group issues outweighed this. The PAC in 1994 used terms such as Africans, indigenous African people, settler minorities, African majority, African masses, and 'our people'. The manifesto stated that the PAC will contest elections "to obtain a mandate from the African people", stating that the Interim constitution does not transfer power to the African majority, and that the PAC is a party that "never compromised any of the noble ideals of the African masses", it further stated that "our struggle has always been nationalist in content". These statements were specific to 1994 and 1999, but in 2009 the term 'African' was still used. Though the PAC has used terms such as non-racialism, it talks not in a way such as we represent 'the people of South Africa' but as representing the 'African people' specifically. Furthermore, the PAC has linked this to self-determination. In all the manifestos, this was not clearly defined as to what it exactly means and whether it is moderate or extreme, such as territorial separatism. Joko stated the need for self-determination of African identity and a government designed with ideas of the African people,

> African nationalism is not an end of its own. It is a rallying call, the need for the unity of Africans and the need for Africans to shape their own destiny. Basically it is the call to rally all Africans to attain a specific objective…ultimately you won't stop there because when you stop there on African nationalism you are limited. You might in the process exclude other people….The Africans have to mobilize themselves. Once we are mobilized and organized as Africans and we are able to articulate our own positions then the second step which we take as African people was to challenge the oppressive regime and overthrow it. But immediately when you overthrow it you must replace it with a system which is very humane. And that is where the issue of the government by Africans of Africans for the benefit of Africans would come in.

It is in this sense that the PAC can be seen as wanting to conserve African values and traditions, it wants to actually do more than just that. The party wants to encourage African ways in playing a part to structure society, politics and economics. This desire to preserve and promote African values particularly places the PAC as a nationalist party, reflecting the African interests, with elements of conservatism to retain the African nation's culture. This nationalism is not radical or revolutionary but moderate.

What about traditional morality issues? The PAC does not make mention of traditional morality or extending liberty on issues such as homosexuality or abortion. According to the expert survey, the party's position on homosexuality is centre, meaning liberal. From the interview result, when Joko was asked about the PAC's view on this issue, he showed a liberal stance on this issue, in the sense that the PAC does not want to take a legislating role on these issues, nor does it want to advance anti-homosexual campaigns, rather it simply states that what individual's chose to be that is his or her choice, but the government should not legislate on individual matters such as this. It can be concluded that the PAC is liberal and nationalist social-cultural issues. The PAC is a centre-right party.

Conclusion

The party is far right on political issues, favouring centralization in the sense of abolishing the provinces. The PAC is an extreme left party on socio-economic issues, favouring a planned economy, state ownership, anti-private property, nationalization and the redistribution of wealth. And it is a moderate right party on social-cultural issues, supporting group identity in the form of African nationalism.

CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSION

7.0 Is there a left-right dimension in South Africa?

This research has shown that South African politics contains a clear left-right dimension. It is composed of left-wing and right-wing parties. South African parties exhibit an implicit ideology, it is uncommon for parties to engage in party self-placement, in other words, it is rare to find parties using the terms left or right in their manifestos and when one directly interacts with party representatives. The ideologies found among South African parties are liberalism, socialism-communism, conservatism and nationalism. The left-right distinction makes a great deal of sense in understanding party politics in South Africa.

Essentially, the left-right distinction helps us to group parties that share common ideologies under the same label. It is useful because issue-politics and its link to the party becomes easier to understand. For instance, it says shows which parties support traditional governance or affirmative action. The left-right distinction accommodates issue-politics, which is primarily the base of the distinction and which helps us to measure party ideology by using issues or variables. The left-right distinction is however not reduced to its role in issue-politics, though crucial, but is or can be useful for a variety of other reasons such as in: elections, competition, voter ideology, policy-making, and so on.

Right-wing and left-wing parties exist in South Africa. However, this must be understood in conjunction with domains – political, socio-economic and the social-cultural. It is more common to find left-right parties than simply centre parties. However this research has found two centre parties. In the political domain the DA and the ID are seen as centre or liberal parties. Something must be said about the importance of the domain emphasis. There is a tendency in the literature on party positioning in South Africa to base final judgements of a party's ideology, what can be called a party's 'overall ideology', on two or three variables either socio-economic, religious or group issues. Even more, the socio-economic domain tends to predominant the scene. By focusing on particular variables or a particular domain causes us to ignore other domains which are also essential and leads us to downplay the role and significance of ideology in these domains. This perpetuates a 'thin' or 'narrow'

perspective of South African party ideology. Domains essentially provide a comprehensive, unambiguous and broad perspective of party positioning.

Some academics use an uneasy distinction between ideology and geographical base, where the former is reserved for parties on the left and the latter is reserved for parties that operate within certain regions that can also be ethnically based. There are two problems with this, first is to over-exaggerate left-wing parties and to undermine the right-wing parties, even more, the left-wing parties are predominantly reserved for the extreme left. Second, it assumes that not all parties contain an ideological base, in other words, being absent of a systematic set of ideas and thinking, essentially being absent of ideology. To better understand party ideology in South Africa there is a need to move beyond biasness and to think of ideology in a value-neutral sense as a systematic set of ideas.

7.1 Right-wing parties

The right-wing parties are composed of the centre-right (which can also be called the moderate right) and the extreme right (which can also be called the far right). Right-wing parties dominant in the political and the social-cultural domain whereas the socio-economic domain contains a lack of right-wing parties.

In the political domain, centre-right parties are composed of the ANC, COPE, IFP, UDM, APC, FFP, ACDP and the UCDP. These parties' are centre-right because it signifies their liberal-conservative stance. All these parties are liberal because of their support for liberal democracy or its elements particularly constitutionalism, elections, liberal equality and liberal freedom. The ANC, COPE, IFP, UDM and the APC are also found to be on the moderate right because they accept traditional governance. The FFP and the MF support liberal democratic elements but are also moderate right insofar as they promote and protect group rights or minority rights in politics. The ACDP and the UCDP are considered moderate right because of their religious stance in politics, though accepting liberal democratic elements, they support Christian democracy. The FFP can be considered as a party supporting religious values in politics. The ACDP, UCDP and the FFP are Christian parties.

The religious parties are also moderately right because of another element, that is, their support of traditional governance.

The far right is composed of AZAPO and the PAC. These parties accept liberal democratic elements and traditional governance, making them in this sense a centre-right or liberal-conservative parties. But they cannot be positioned as moderate right because they take a centralization stance – supporting the abolition of the provinces. In this sense, these parties are not on the decentralization side as the other parties but want central government to have more authority because it creates efficiency and redistributes government funds to priority areas, as they argue.

In the socio-economic domain, right-wing parties are scarce. There is only one component of the right-wing that is the far right. This is filled by the FFP. On right-wing parties in the socio-economic domain generally, the scarcity of parties simply means that parties support more left than right socio-economic elements. This however does not mean that parties do not altogether support any rightward elements or totally support leftward elements. The pattern is that the left dimension outweighs the right dimension. The right socio-economic elements supported by South African parties include support for the: free enterprise, capital, entrepreneurship, business, incentives, competition, investment, economic efficiency, private property, anti-nationalization, privatization, and opposition to redistribution and affirmative action. These parties however do not support unbridled, untrammelled or unregulated laissez-faire capitalism. The reason for the placement of the FFP as an extreme right party on socio-economic issues is because of the party's strong opposition to affirmative action and effectively being the only party to oppose it. Though the DA is seen as a party who opposes affirmative action, according to the research results, the party is in favour of it. The FFP opposes it for the reason that it is discriminatory to minorities and limiting in its ability to provide opportunities for all, arguing for a free market and equal opportunity environment.

In the social and cultural domain, right-wing parties are composed of the moderate right and the far right. This is in the realm of group issues and morality. Though many parties emphasize liberal multiculturalism, this is outweighed by other emphases by the

parties' – specifically those parties that do not emphasize group issues and morality tend to emphasize more on liberal multiculturalism but this is outweighed by their support for the left issue of civil liberties. The moderates are the FFP, MF, APC, PAC and the IFP whereas the extremists are the ACDP and the UCDP. The FFP, MF, APC and PAC are considered right-wing because it seeks to conserve group identity and group customs. Essentially these are nationalist parties though moderate not extreme. The IFP supports traditional morality issues but to a moderate extent whereas the ACDP and the UCDP support traditional morality issues to a large extent.

7.2 Left-wing parties

Left-wing parties are composed of the moderate left and the far left. Left-wing parties dominant in the socio-economic and the social-cultural domain whereas the political domain contains a lack of left-wing parties.

In the political domain, left-wing parties are composed of the centre-left which is the APC who articulates the mass-lines or people's power but in a moderate fashion. Left-wing parties in the political domain, from what parties articulate in their manifestos, are extremely scarce. Parties are more inclined to the right on politics instead of the left. Though parties mention left elements relating to the political domain this is outweighed by their right support. Left elements include: participatory democracy, socialist equality, socialist freedom, and decentralization. From this research, there is no far left party on political matters.

In the socio-economic domain, left-wing can be divided into the centre-left or moderate left and the extreme left or far left. Centre-left parties dominant the entire socio-economic domain, outweighing the far left and the far right. The centre-left is composed of the majority of parties in South Africa which includes the: ANC, DA, COPE, IFP, ID, UDM, ACDP, UCDP and the MF. The far left is made-up of the APC, AZAPO and the PAC. The moderate left supports the following elements: a mixed economy, redistribution of wealth, social welfare and affirmative action. In the socio-economic domain, all parties including the FFP support social welfare but the party's rightward emphases outweighs this left element. The extreme left respectively support the following elements: state economic planning, state

ownership of business, anti-private property, common ownership, nationalization, radical redistribution of wealth, and the abolition of capitalism.

In the social-cultural domain, left-wing parties are composed of two parts, the moderate left and the far left. This is in the realm of civil liberties. Though parties emphasize the issue of national solidarity, this is outweighed by their support for civil liberties that better places them on the left. The moderate left is made up of the UDM. The far left is made up of the ANC, DA, COPE, ID and the MF. The moderate left, that is, the UDM, talks of the equality as extended to homosexuals but in a moderate fashion. The far left however are pro-abortion and pro-homosexual rights and not only support the constitutional right of these groups but support the protection of what they call 'human rights' and 'civil liberties'.

7.3 Ideologies: From liberalism to nationalism

By deconstructing the left-right dimension into its composite ideologies, South African parties embrace liberalism, socialism-communism, conservatism and nationalism. In the Western European literature, though the left-right distinction has similarities when applied to other regions, the specific ideologies within the distinction have a particular meaning, for example, conservative parties can be seen as religious parties but can also be seen, from a socio-economic perspective, as those parties who support free enterprise and the free market – who are positioned on the right. Liberal parties can be understood as those parties who support the welfare state, known as liberal democratic parties – who are positioned on the left. It is important, from a contextual point of view, to be clear about what a particular ideology means for a particular region. Since the left-right spectrum is broadly made up of ideologies, instead of looking only at elements within the spectrum, it is important to look at the ideologies as a whole.

7.3.1 Liberalism

All parties accept some degree of liberal ideology. In the political domain, parties accept working within a liberal democratic order including far right and far left parties. Since 1994 till 2009, parties have constantly emphasized, respectively, liberal democratic elements. These included constitutionalism, elections, decentralization or federalism, separation of powers, parliamentary oversight, respect for minority views in a majoritarian environment,

liberal equality and liberal freedom. In the socio-economic domain, parties support both classical liberal ideology and modern liberal ideology. The former is shown by the parties support for the free market and market mechanism, together with the aforementioned right socio-economic elements. The latter is shown by the parties support for government intervention for the poor and the previously disadvantaged, which is represented in the form of moderate state intervention, together with the aforementioned centre-left variables. The stronger version of classical liberal socio-economics is libertarianism that prioritizes the individual, this position is taken up by the FFP, who is against state intervention in the form of affirmative action and redistribution.

On social-cultural issues, liberalism is seen in its moderate and extreme sense. Liberal parties are those who are moderate on the extension of civil liberties whereas those who are on the far left can be seen as the libertarian parties. Liberal and libertarian parties prioritize individual rights and civil liberties over traditional morality on social, cultural and moral issues. Liberalism in the social-cultural domain is also made up of liberal multiculturalism. Parties recognize the diversity in the South African context and support pluralism and tolerance, that is, the equality for all individuals and groups irrespective of their race, culture, religion or ethnicity. Liberalism also contains the element of individualism, which was highly emphasized by the DA in 1994 and 1999 but this began to change as the party evolved. Contemporarily though, parties do not mention the term 'individualism' and the 'protection' of 'individual liberty' but it can be said that parties pursue this in another form which is particularly through the promotion and protection of civil liberties such as pro-abortion and gay and lesbian rights.

7.3.2 Conservatism

Conservatism is a common ideological feature among South African parties, this is especially so in the political environment. The majority of parties support a conservative element in politics and that is traditional governance, with reservations on this from the DA and the ID. Parties argue that it is important to recognize the role of culture and its institutions in the lives of people, and moreover, argue that the positive aspects of this must be kept alive. In this sense, parties do not straightforwardly support a liberal democratic model of politics. As

the UDM put it in the interview–this can be used to describe parties generally in the country–that there is a need for a 'complementary approach' to politics and government which incorporates individual rights and cultural issues. Parties view traditional governance as necessary because in one sense, it can positively contribute to the communities, such as its cultural values which play a role in building a moral fabric for individuals; and in another sense, as a cooperative task for partnering with traditional leaders for electoral purposes and to influence the community which is best reached through traditional leaders.

Conservatism in its socio-economic sense is scarce in South Africa, only being applied to the FFP. This party desires to conserve the free market order and strongly opposes affirmative action and redistribution of wealth. Essentially, the FFP is conservative in the face of a moderately socio-economic interventionist state. In light of the severe lack of 'conservative parties' espousing a libertarian ideology, the majority of parties do not exhibit signs of wanting to conserve, hold onto or are afraid of losing the free market system. But perhaps if South African politics evolves to incorporate revolutionary far left parties who threaten to dismantle the classical liberal market order and the moderate socialist elements, then parties will become 'conservative' – desiring to preserve the market order and the welfare state.

In the social-cultural domain, conservatism can be seen in its neoconservative form of traditional morality. This applies to a few parties, namely the ACDP, UCDP and the FFP. These parties problematize liberal values which they argue are causing the breakdown of traditional institutions and values, such as the family and marriages. This is in light of the legalization of abortion and homosexual marriages in the country. As the ACDP in the interview stated, there is a need to make known in society what is right and what is wrong. This is precisely the task of the religious conservative parties. Though other parties, such as the ANC, IFP, ID and the UDM discuss moral issues, the ACDP, UCDP and the FFP lead in the forefront of its promotion. Moreover, the moral issues discussed by the former parties are not religiously informed such as taking an anti-abortion and anti-homosexual stance but rather point to issues such as: partnership with religious institutions, parenthood, drug and alcohol abuse, child discipline, and school values – though still significant.

7.3.3 Socialism and communism

Socialism is a common ideology in South Africa. This is particularly reformist socialism. Socialism is dominant in the socio-economic domain and to a lesser extent in the political and social-cultural domain. In the political domain, parties emphasize left elements such as participatory democracy, socialist equality and socialist freedom but this is outweighed by the parties' rightward emphasis in politics. Socialism can be seen in a moderate way with the centre-right party on politics, the APC, emphasizing the mass-lines. In the socio-economic domain, parties are predominantly moderate socialist or social democrats. But there are extreme left parties inclined to communist principles such as the APC, AZAPO and the PAC. However all parties, including the FFP, have one commonality, they accept the welfare state – they support the social security support in South Africa. It shows that all parties in South Africa's support some form of regulated capitalism.

They also share an additional common concern, the alleviation of poverty and inequality in society. These parties take an egalitarian and state interventionist view on socio-economics, though the degree of these aspects differs between the moderates and the extremists. The moderate left parties accept the market order, in this sense they are not far left, but also recognize the necessity of intervention but argue that government must know its limitations in that its job is not to run the economy, and in this sense they are again not far left. Moderate left parties or reformist socialist parties have a liberal side, understanding that the role of government is to provide a framework for the market, and a socialist side, understanding that there is a need for intervention. In this sense, these parties see a role for both the state and the market however the same may not be said for the far left parties. On social and cultural issues, parties mention the left element of national solidarity emphasizing the ideal of togetherness and unity. It was mainly the DA that advocated for a rightward position shown by its articulation of individualism particularly in 1994 and 1999 however the majority of the parties talk of left solidarity elements. In this sense, socialism is represented in all the domains, however, from the manifestos of what parties articulate, socialism dominates in the socio-economic scene but the political and social-cultural scene is filled by liberalism, conservatism and nationalism.

7.3.4 Nationalism

Nationalism is another ideological feature that describes South African parties. Only a few parties advocate nationalist ideology. This is understood in the sense of group rights or group self-determination. These parties are composed of the FFP, MF, APC and the PAC. The FFP advocates group rights for primarily Afrikaners, the MF advocates group rights for primarily Indians, and the APC and the PAC talk of African identity and psychological self-determination. These nationalist parties are in contrast to other parties who pursue liberal multiculturalism and do not present themselves as rallying for particular groups in society. The nationalist parties, particularly the FFP and the MF, understand the democratic right to accommodate minorities in politics and society and argue that group identity is being diluted by various factors and hence desire to preserve cultural and linguistic heritages. Also, these parties, particularly the APC and the PAC, promote the upliftment of groups who have been previously seen as inferior, in this sense, making them internally appreciate their identity, tradition and values. The nationalism and self-determination that is articulated by these parties are not in a territorial separatist agenda, especially with the FFP recognizing its unpopularity among the Afrikaner community, but is rather pursued in other forms.

Parties can be captured as composing the following types of nationalism: Afrikaner nationalism, Indian nationalism and African nationalism. This label must however be used with caution because for example, with the FFP and the MF, though their primary consistency are Afrikaners and Indians respectively, they are 'minority nationalist parties' who welcome other groups and also promote the rights of other groups, as in the case of the MF as the gay community. And the APC and the PAC sees themselves as supporting liberal equality especially for all races. The nationalism that is articulated in the South African context is predominantly cultural nationalism in which parties see 'nations' within the nation. The nationalism promoted by these parties is anchored in liberal democratic values. Parties are not radical or revolutionary but accept the guiding principles of liberal democracy and are willing to work within that context to promote their unique issues.

7.4 Degrees of party ideology

It is critical to understand the degree or leftness or rightness of parties. South Africa is composed of both moderate and extreme parties. Overall, gathering from all domains,

moderate right parties are composed of the ANC, COPE, IFP, UDM, FFP, ACDP, UCDP, MF, APC and the PAC. The far right is composed of the ACDP, UCDP, FFP, AZAPO and the PAC. Centre-left parties include the ANC, DA, COPE, IFP, ID, UDM, ACDP, UCDP, MF, AZAPO and the APC. Far left parties include the ANC, DA, COPE, ID, UDM, APC, AZAPO, MF and PAC.

The problem is that parties overlap. In other words, they are moderate left on socio-economics and also in political matters, or far left in socio-economics and also in social-cultural matters, the same applies to the right. In this sense, this is primarily the case why the overall ideology of parties is so difficult to arrive at, and the justification of the result can highly be due to the fact that one domain is favoured over another. Therefore domains are the best way to accurately depict a party's ideology. The overall ideological position is narrow, ambiguous and essentially inaccurate, and fundamentally difficult, from a procedural point of view of measuring party ideology. It is however, safe to say that South Africa is made up of moderate and extreme parties but this can be best captured by looking at the particular ideologies and by further looking at the domains.

7.5 Party ideology in South Africa

'Cherry-picking' appropriately captures the party context in South Africa. Parties, when observed in a general light, have come to realize since 1994 up till 2009, that one single ideology cannot capture and accommodate their stance on many issues. It is in this sense that parties have found a middle point or as it is known in political science, an accommodation between liberalism and socialism, this is particularly from a socio-economic perspective. Using the words of Farouk Cassim, party representative from COPE,

> …the world in which we live today cannot exist by any single ideologies itself…you need to 'cherry pick' [that is] find the best elements and then to combine them in a construct that will allow for people of the country to achieve their potential…There is a lot of cherry picking…but from the left side of the fence. But if you cherry pick from the Right side of the fence, you take all the cherries and you keep them for yourself [but] when you pick from the left side of the fence then you share the cherries with all the people that are around you. There is a fundamental difference of which side of the fence you are on because that determines how you distribute what you have.

South African parties use ideology for practical action-oriented goals. Parties state that ideology is not simply meant to feed people but to help them in their immediate contexts. Parties often talk of 'bread and butter issues'. From the words of Shameen Rajbansi, leader of the MF, (though this quote comes from the MF, it can be seen as true for parties in the country generally),

> …ideology is not something people eat, drink and sleep…what people require is bread and butter politics. So our ideology is for us as a political party to have…a formal structure and a focused target group in niche politics but the daily work then for the political party–its functioning, its process, its value-systems–all that then has to take into account the broader spectrum of politics in South Africa and what are the day-to-day needs of the people. So in terms of the functioning then and the success, one of the key success factors for the MF, growing election upon election, was that we became grassroots party, we become a bread-and-butter party, and that had led to our growth.

Political variables, to a larger extent, and social-cultural variables, to a lesser extent, are over-emphasized in party manifestos from 1994 to 2009. The parties show support for more right than left political and social-cultural elements. This contributes to the overall ideological index from the manifestos being predominantly rightward. In this sense, though parties may be leftward more than rightward, in politics, for example, participatory democracy is mentioned but outweighed by liberal democratic elements. In some regard, the manifestos depict parties as constrained in what they actually emphasize or support. It could be the case that parties may not know they are constrained or that they deliberately are constrained. It does not make sense for the parties, who are predominantly centre or moderate, to not explicitly state their positions, especially if it is electorally appealing.

There is something to be highlighted here about what is said or mentioned in the manifestos and what parties actually are. For example, though parties emphasize the political variables predominantly in a liberal manner, when they are closely examined by other means, such as their policy documents, they most likely may demonstrate a socialist stance – favouring participatory democracy and socialist equality or freedom. In this sense, manifestos, as mentioned in the methodology, are limited. This however does not negate the essentialness of the information that can be gathered from manifesto data. This is suggesting the need for an all-encompassing approach, made up of policy documents, press

statements, behavioural aspects, and so on, which is a burdening task but indeed can generate more accurate, reliable and useful results on party ideology.

Ideology is implicit, perhaps parties need to comprehend their own position and articulate it more explicitly to the public. This is valuable in itself. By parties better understanding their ideological placements it helps them to better formulate policies, respond to government policy proposals, to identify commonalities and differences with other parties which can better enable shifts to cooperative politics – and from an issues-orientation perspective, parties may discover that they have more in common than they have apart.

Certain aspects of the function of ideology are indirect but there are other functions that require the direct role of parties. Ideologies by themselves achieve certain goals in an indirect fashion, for example, the orientation-function of ideology which provides people with a sense of identity and tells people how to think. Parties in South Africa have a tendency to simply state their position on issues, for example as supporting social welfare. First, parties state, recommend and prescribe the particular ideological order; second, they explain, in some sense, why we find ourselves in a particular situation for example because of apartheid or the lack of morals in society; and third, they often do have political programmes of action. However, parties do not justify their position. Why is it worth supporting liberal democracy? Why is it worth supporting traditional governance? Why is it worth supporting the market order? Parties take for granted this feature, for instance, when it comes to social welfare and affirmative action, because of the long existence and the parties' consistent support for of these programmes, parties assume that it is already understood as crucial or necessary. In this sense, parties do not convince people to believe in their ideology. In the words of Ben Turok, from the interview, the ANC needs to do more work on its ideology, it "ought to be far more rigorous about its programmatic position" or "ideological articulation". Parties need to reconsider, be more comprehensive and bolster their ideological position.

Something must be said about parties and competition and its link to ideology. According to Themba Godi's observation of party politics and ideology, South African parties compete on the basis of personalities not ideas.

> As the APC we think that there's been a poverty of ideas in the political discourse in our country...And we have seen how politics degenerated to the point where hailing insults and shouting at people became and at fore and where thoughtlessness has been given status…It is often believed that parties should compete on the basis of ideas and not on the basis of personalities. Where elections are reduced to a mere marketing gimmick...We would want to bring politics back into politics…

There is a need for competition on the basis of ideas. Instead of parties focusing principally on adversarial politics, trying to get their opponents out of the game, and gaining office, trying to mobilize popular support, parties need to look at themselves first before they look at others. Parties need to define their own position, they need to understand their own position and what kind of vision they are prescribing for society, whether such a vision is utopian or practical, whether it is able to adequately meet pressing societal challenges, whether it involves consultation with those whom they are meant to represent or is it a vision being pressed from above, and whether the ideology is built upon integrity or just impressive ideas for the short-term goal of gaining popular support. Fundamentally, parties need to think, not about their opponents or about gaining electoral support, but about themselves, their identity, their position. In this sense, to be rigorous about one's ideological position is valuable to provide government, civil society organizations, research institutions and voters with information about the party's position. Also and importantly, to think beyond adversarial politics and gaining office carries with it the capacity for parties to collaborate instead of conflicting on an ongoing basis and essentially being more effective as an institution of democracy, parliament, to improve society in a consistent manner. This can lead to collaboration on the basis of ideas.

Four components need to be considered when examining party ideology. First, what the parties say. This can be measured using party official documents or direct interviews. Second, what the parties may not be saying. This refers to the limitation of everything being captured in one source of data, such as manifestos, and the need to therefore turn to alternative sources of data, such as policy documents. Third, what parties may keep hidden. For instance, the party may be more radical or revolutionary than they appear to be but do not want to publically state their stance perhaps because of its unpopularity. In one sense, this can be captured by observing the behavioural aspect of party representatives to events or unexpected events. Ideology in the sense not of theoretical statements but as linked to

practice. Fourth, what the parties actually do. This is the point on practice. Party leader of the APC, Temba Godi, well-captures this point, though from the words of the APC, it is true for parties in general,

> [Competition of ideas] not only the level of just the theory that you can…[write]…out on paper [but] linked also to your practice, do you walk the talk…its election time [elections for 2014] then everyone comes out of the woodwork and then you have all sorts of policies being splashed around, that cannot to be linked to any sense of practice…the asset test of all ideas is social practice.

According to Ben Turok, on commenting on the relevance or importance of the ANC ideology, stated as a general point that ideology is important because "ideology drives everything". Ideology is the backbone and foundation of parties, it forms their identity. Understanding a party means in a large part, understanding their positions, thinking and the framework of ideas on issues. Party ideology shifts understanding South African politics from a point of view of power politics and corruption, though highly significant issues, to the deeper makeup of a party's identity. When one moves beyond the mist of power politics and corruption, parties can be examined from a value-neutral or scientific point of view, that is that, they have actually systematic ideas and positions. This in no way means ignoring the problems found within parties.

Also, on the point of performance politics, ideology on the hand plays a role motivating and formulating a party's policies and programmes, in the sense that it prescribes a vision of society. On the other hand, it does not provide the procedures for the implementation of that particular vision. This makes performance or how parties walk the talk dependent on the party's ability and skills. In this sense, practice is an important feature of ideology, articulation is useless without practice. On the one side of the coin, practice can be abstracted from ideology, and on the other, practice is inseparably linked to ideology. Though it is possible to focus on and measure practice separately from focusing on ideology, to understand why parties' practice what they do, ideology comes in handy.

Ideology, in a large part, can explain a party's behaviour and practice. Why do parties behave like they do? Why do they practice what they do? On behaviour and action, for instance, a party leader or party members who rally and protest, holding up placards stating "Increase Social Grants", shows that it stems from the idea that the state has an obligation

to care for the poor, the poor are entitled to the wealth of others, or wealth must be redistributed at higher rates, and so on. These ideas can be traced back to the ideology of socialism. Why do parties practice the support for traditional governance? It is because they want to, in one main sense, preserve cultural institutions and reach out to indigenous people through such cultural systems. Why do parties support social welfare? It is because they, in one main sense, recognize the high levels of poverty, unemployment and inequality, and moreover that the majority of people are in such conditions, who in turn form a large part of the electoral base.

Practice can be traced back to ideas. Policies and programmes can be traced back to ideas. Behaviours and actions of party leaders or representatives can be traced back to ideas. What parties say and what they do can be traced back to ideas. Ideas, essentially, are the source of many things in politics. Parties matter. Ideas matter. Party ideology matters.

Thesis word count: 57058

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ansell, A. E. (2001). Unravelling the Right: The New Conservatism in American Thought and Politics. Westview Press: USA.

Ball, T. and Dagger, R. (1995). Political Ideologies and the Democratic Ideal. (2nd edition). Harper Collins College Publishers.

Ball, T. Dagger, R. and O'Neill, D. (2014). Political Ideologies and the Democratic Ideal. (9th edition). Pearson Education: US.

Beck, P. A. (1997). Party Politics in America. New York: Longman.

Benner, E. (1997). 'Nationality without nationalism', *Journal of Political Ideologies*, Vol. 2, No. 2.

Benoit, K. and Laver, M. (2006). Party Policy in Modern Democracies. London: Routledge.

Benoit, K and Laver, M. (2007). 'Estimating party policy positions: Comparing expert surveys and hand-coded content analysis', *Electoral Studies*, Vol. 26: 90-107.

Biko, S. (1978). I write what I like. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Booysen, S. (2006). "The Democratic Alliance: Progress and Pitfalls", in Piombo, J. and Nijzink, L. (eds.). Electoral Politics in South Africa: Assessing the first democratic decade. HSRC Press: Cape Town.

Booysen, S. (2009). "Congress of the People: Between Foothold of Hope and Slippery Slope", in Southall, R. Daniel, J. (eds.). Zunami! The South African Elections of 2009. Jacana Media: Johannesburg.

Booysen, S. (28 June 2012). "The 'New ANC' as ideological hybrid", SABC News, archived July 2013, http://www.sabc.co.za/news/f1/867ef9004bc7cd609ebe9f4e20b1a252/The-%E2%80%98New-ANC%E2%80%99-as-ideological-hybrid-20120628.

Bond, P. (2013). 'Sub-imperialism as Lubricant of Neoliberalism: South African 'deputy sheriff' duty within brics' , *Third World Quarterly*, 34:2, 251-270.

Budge, I. Robertson, D. and Hearl, D. (1987). (eds.). Ideology, Strategy and Party Change: Spatial Analysis of Postwar Election Programmes in 19 Democracies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Budge, I. (1994). 'A new spatial theory of party competition: Uncertainty, Ideology and Policy equilibria viewed comparatively and temporarily', *British Journal of Political Science*, Vol 24: 443-467.

Budge, I., Klingemann, H. D., Volkens, A., Bara, J. L. and Tanenbaum, E. (2001). Mapping Policy Preferences: Estimates for Parties, Electors, and Governments, 1945–1998. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Budge, I. (2000). 'Expert Judgements of party policy positions: uses and limitations in political research', *European Journal of Political Research*, Vol. 37: 103-113.

Budge, I. (2013). 'The Standard Right-Left Scale', archived November 2013, https://manifesto-project.wzb.eu/down/papers/budge_right-left-scale.pdf

Calhoun, C. (1993). 'Nationalism and Ethnicity', *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 19.

Castles, F. G. and Mair, P. (1984). 'Left-Right Political Scales: Some 'Expert' Judgements', *European Journal of Political Research*. Vol. 12: 73-88.

Chapel Hill Expert Survey (2006), 'Reliability and validity of the 2002 and 2006 Chapel Hill expert surveys on party positioning', archived November 2013, http://chesdata.eu/, http://chesdata.eu/Papers/EJPR_2010.pdf

Chapman, P. C. (1960). 'The New Conservatism: Cultural Criticism v. Political Philosophy', in *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 75, No. 1.

Claassen, R. (2011). 'The Conservative Challenge to Liberalism', *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, Vol. 14. No. 4.

Comparative Manifesto Project, archived November 2013, https://manifesto-project.wzb.eu/coding_schemes/1

Cooper, S. (1994). "The PAC and AZAPO", in Reynolds, A. (ed). Election '94 South Africa: The Campaigns, results and future prospects. David Philip: Cape Town and Johannesburg.

Dalton, R. J. and Wattenberg, M. P. (2000). (eds). Parties without Partisans: Political Change in Advanced Industrial Democracies. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Davies, P. (2006). "Interview", in The SAGE Dictionary of Social Research Methods, Jupp, V. (ed.). SAGE Publications: London.

Desai, A. (2003). 'Neoliberalism and Resistance in South Africa'. *Monthly Review Press*, Vol. 54, Iss. 08.

Drolet, J-F. (2010). 'A Liberalism Betrayed? American neoconservatism and the theory of international relations', *Journal of Political Ideologies*, Vol. 15, No. 2.

Duverger, M. (1954). Political Parties. New York: Wiley. First French edition.

Dzur, A. W. (2002). 'Nationalism, Liberalism, and Democracy', *Political Research Quarterly*, Vol. 55, No. 1.

Eccleshall, R. (1984). "Introduction: the world of ideology", in Eccleshall, R. Geoghegan, V., Jay, R. and Wilford, R. (eds.). Political Ideologies: An Introduction. Hutchinson and co: London.

Editorial, (2001). 'Editorial: What is special about ideologies?', *Journal of Political Ideologies*, Vol. 6. No. 1.

Eldersveld, S. J. (1964). Political Parties: A Behavioural Analysis. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Elo S. and Kyngas, H. (2008). 'The qualitative content analysis process'. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*. Vol. 62, No. 1.

Evans, G., Heath, A. and Lalljee, M. (1996). 'Measuring Left-Right and Libertarian-Authoritarian values in the British Electorate', *The British Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 47. No. 1.

Fatton, R. Jr. (1984), 'The African National Congress of South Africa: The Limitations of a Revolutionary Strategy', *Canadian Journal of African Studies / Revue Canadienne des Études Africaines*, Vol. 18, No. 3 pp. 593-608.

Franzmann, S. and Kaiser, A. (2006). 'Locating Political Parties in Policy Space. A Reanalysis of Party Manifesto Data', *Party Politics*, 12: 163–88.

Freeden, M. (1996). Ideologies and Political Theory: A Conceptual Approach. Oxford University Press: Oxford.

Freeden, M. (1998, 2004). "Ideology". In E. Craig (Ed.), Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy. London: Routledge. Archived January 2014, http://www.rep.routledge.com/article/S030.

Gabel, M. J. and Huber, J. D. (2000). 'Putting Parties in Their Place: inferring party Left-Right Ideological positions from Party Manifesto Data', *American Journal of Political Science*. Vol. 44. No. 1.

Gerhart, G. M. (1978). Black Power in South Africa: The Evolution of an Ideology. University of California Press: California.

Giddens, A. (1994). Beyond the Left and Right: The Future of radical politics. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gould, A.J. and Truitt, W.H. (eds). (1973). Political Ideologies. NY: MacMillan.

Grimes, A. P. and Horwitz, R. H. (1959). Modern Political Ideologies. New York: Oxford University Press.

Grofman, B. and Kline, R. (2011). 'How many political parties are there, really? A new measure of the ideologically cognizable number of parties/party groupings', *Party Politics*, Vol. 18, No. 4.

Gunther, R. and Diamond, L. (2003). 'Species of political parties: a new typology', *Party Politics,* Vol. 9. No. 2.

Habermas, J., Nicholsen, S. W., and Wolin, R. (1994). The New Conservatism: Cultural Criticism and the Historians' Debate. MIT Press: Massachusetts.

Hamilton, M. B. (1987). 'The Elements of the Concept of Ideology', *Political Studies*, Vol. 35, Iss. 1.

Hamilton, G. and Mare, G. (1994). "The Inkatha Freedom Party", in Reynolds, A. (ed). Election '94 South Africa: The Campaigns, results and future prospects. David Philip: Cape Town and Johannesburg.

Helbling, M. and Tresch, A. (2011). 'Measuring party positions and issue salience from media coverage: Discussing and cross-validating new indicators', *Electoral Studies*, Vol. 30: 174-183.

Herr, R. S. (2006). 'In Defense of Nonliberal Nationalism', *Political Theory*, Vol. 34, No. 3.

Heyn, H. M. (2009). "South Africa's Smaller Parties (UDM, ACDP, ID and FF+): Searching for a Role and Fighting for Survival", in Southall, R. Daniel, J. (eds.). Zunami! The South African Elections of 2009. Jacana Media: Johannesburg.

Huber, J.D. and Inglehart, R. (1995). 'Expert interpretations of party space and party locations in 42 societies'. *Party Politics*, 1, 73-111.

Heywood, A. (2003). Political Ideologies: An Introduction. (3rd Edition). Palgrave Macmillan: Houndmills.

Hoeane, H. (2006). "Struggling to Represent the Left: The Pan Africanist Congress, the Azanian People's Organization", in Piombo, J. and Nijzink, L. (eds.). Electoral Politics in South Africa: Assessing the first democratic decade. HSRC Press: Cape Town.

Holden, B. (1988). Understanding Liberal Democracy. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Hosper, J. (1974). "What Libertarianism is", in Machan, T. R. (ed.). The Libertarian Alternative. Nelson-Hall Inc.

Huntington, S. P. (1957). 'Conservatism as an ideology', *The American Political Science Review*. Vol. 51, No. 2.

Jahn, D. (2011). 'Conceptualizing Left and Right in comparative politics: Towards a deductive approach', *Party Politics*, Vol. 17. No. 6.

Jahn, D. (2014). 'What is left and right in comparative politics? A response to Simon Franzmann. *Party Politics*. Vol. 20: 297.

Janda, K. (1993). "Comparative Political Parties: Research and Theory", in Political Science: The state of the discipline II, Ada W. Finifter (ed.). Washington, D.C.: American Political Science Association.

Jolobe, Z. (2009). "The Democratic Alliance: Consolidating the Official Opposition", in Southall, R. Daniel, J. (eds.). Zunami! The South African Elections of 2009. Jacana Media: Johannesburg.

Jost, J. T., Federico, C. M and Napier, J. L. (2009). 'Political ideology: Its Structure, Functions, and Elective Affinities', *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol. 60: 307-37.

Kaiser, D. (1994). 'Lessons of the History of Nationalism: Comments', *Theory and Society*, Vol. 23, No. 1.

Kalof, L., Dan, A. and Dietz, T. (2008). Essentials of social research. Open University Press.

Katz, R. and Mair, P. (1992). Party Organizations: A Data Handbook on Party Organizations in Western Democracies 1960–90, Newbury Park, California: Sage.

Keman, H. (2007). 'Experts and Manifestos: Different Sources – Same Results for Comparative Research?', *Electoral Studies*, 26: 76–89.

Kim, H. and Fording, R. (1998). 'Voter Ideology in Western Democracies', *European Journal of Political Research*, Vol. 33: 73–97.

Kim, H. and Fording, R. C. (2001). "Extending Party Estimates to Governments and Electors", in Mapping Policy Preferences: Estimates for Parties, Electors, and Governments, 1945-1998, Budge, I., Klingemann, H. D., Volkens, A., Bara, J. L. and Tanenbaum, E., London: Oxford University Press.

Klemmensen, R., Hobolt, S. B., and Hansen, E. M. (2007). 'Estimating policy positions using political texts: An evaluation of the Wordscores approach', *Electoral Studies*, Vol. 26: 746-755.

Klingemann, H. D., Volkens, A. Bara, J. L., Budge, I. and McDonald, M. D. (2006). Mapping Policy Preferences II: Estimates for Parties, Electors, and Governments, 1990–2003. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

LaPalombara, J. and Weiner, M. (1966). (eds.). Political Parties and Political Development. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Laver, M. and Schofield, N. (1990). Multiparty Government: The Politics of Coalition in Europe. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Laver, M. and Hunt, B. W. (1992) Policy and Party Competition. New York: Routledge.

Laver, M. and Budge, I. (1992). "Measuring policy distances and modelling coalition formation", in Party Policy and Government Coalitions, Laver, M. and Budge, I. (eds). New York: St. Martin's.

Laver, M. and Budge, I. (1993). (eds). Party Policy and Coalition Government in Western Europe. London: Macmillan.

Legard, R., Keegan, J., and Ward, K. (2003). "In-depth Interviews", in Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers, Ritchie, J. and Lewis, J. (eds.). SAGE Publications: London.

Levine, A. (2004). "A Future for Marxism", in Gaus, G. F. and Kukathas, C. (eds.). Handbook of Political Theory. London: SAGE.

Louw, E. (1997). 'Nationalism, modernity and postmodernity: comparing the South African and Australian experiences', *Politikon: South African Journal of Political Studies*, Vol. 24, No. 1.

Mair, P. and Mudde, C. (1998). 'The Party Family and Its Study', *Annual Review of Political Science*. Vol. 1: 211-29.

Marais, H. (2001). South Africa: Limits To Change: The Political Economy of Transition. Palgrave Macmillan.

Marx, C. (2002). 'Ubu and Ubuntu: On the dialectics of apartheid and nation building', *Politikon: South African Journal of Political Studies*, Vol. 29, No. 1.

McDonald, M. D. and Budge, I. (2005). Elections, Parties, Democracy: Conferring the Median Mandate. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McDonald, M. D., Mendes, S. M. and Kim, M. (2007) 'Cross-Temporal and Cross-National Comparisons of Party Left–Right Positions', *Electoral Studies*, 26: 62–75.

Memela, S. (October 29, 2008). "The ANC political mansion has many ideological rooms. If it were not so, Shikota would win", Mail and Guardian, archived July 2013, http://www.thoughtleader.co.za/sandilememela/2008/10/29/the-anc-political-mansion-has-many-ideological-rooms-if-it-were-not-so-shikota-would-win/

Miscevic, N. (2010). "Nationalism", in Edward N. Zalta (ed.), The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, archived January 2014, http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2010/entries/nationalism/

Naidu, S. and Manqele, M. (2006). "The Smallest Parties: The ACDP, UCDP, FF+, MF, and UDM", in Piombo, J. and Nijzink, L. (eds.). Electoral Politics in South Africa: Assessing the first democratic decade. HSRC Press: Cape Town.

Nattras, N. (1997). Macroeconomics – theory and policy in South Africa. David Phillips: Cape Town.

Narveson, J. (1998). 'Libertarianism vs. Marxism: Reflections on G. A. Cohen's "Self-Ownership, Freedom and Equality"', *The Journal of Ethics*, Vol. 2. No. 1.

Nichols, R. (1997). "'Conservatism' and 'the right' in America: Ideological conflict, categories and language", *Journal of Political Ideologies*, Vol. 2. No. 3.

Pennings, P., Keman, H. and Kleinnijenhuis, J. (2006). Doing Research in Political Science. Second Edition. Sage publications: London.

Pennock, J. R. (1979). Democratic Political Theory. Princeton University Press.

Petlane, T. (2009). "Azapo, MF, PAC and UCDP: Searching for a Role and Fighting for Survival", in Southall, R. and Daniel, J. (eds.). Zunami! The South African Elections of 2009. Jacana Media: Johannesburg.

Piper, L. (2006). "The Inkatha Freedom Party: Between the Impossible and the Ineffective", in Piombo, J. and Nijzink, L. (eds.). Electoral Politics in South Africa: Assessing the first democratic decade. HSRC Press: Cape Town.

Plattner, M. F. (2009). "From Liberalism to Liberal Democracy", in Diamond, L. and Plattner, M. F., Democracy: A Reader. John Hopkins University Press.

Powell, G. B. Jr. (1982). Contemporary Democracies. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Prasad, B. D. (2008). "Content Analysis: A Method in Social Science Research", in Lal Das, D.K and Bhaskaran, V (eds.). (2008) Research methods for Social Work, New Delhi: Rawat.

Ray. L. (1999). 'Measuring Party Orientations Towards European Integration: results From an Expert Survey', *European Journal of Political Research*, Vol. 36. No. 6.

Robertson, D. (1976). A Theory of Party Competition. London: John Wiley.

Rueschemeyer, D. (2002). "Why and How Ideas Matter", The Oxford Handbook of Contextual Political Analysis. In Goodin, R. E. and Tilly, C. (eds.). Oxford University Press: Oxford.

Rugg, G. and Petre, M. (2007). A Gentle Guide to Research Methods. Open University Press: England.

Ryan, A. (2007). "Liberalism", in A Companion to Contemporary Political Philosophy. (2nd edition, Volume 1), Goodin, R. E., Pettit, P., and Pogge, T. (eds.). Blackwell Publishing: UK.

Scarrow, S. E., Webb, P. and Farrel, D. M. (2000). "From Social Integration to Electoral Contestation", in Parties without Partisans: Political Change in Advanced Industrial Democracies. Dalton, R. J. and Wattenberg, M. P. (eds). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schattschneider, E. E. (1942). Party Government. New York: Rinehart.

Scheidegger, U. and Lodge, T. (2005). Political Parties and Democratic Governance in South Africa. EISA Research Report No. 25. EISA: Johannesburg.

Schwarzmantel, J. (2008). Ideology and Politics. London: SAGE.

Scott, J. (1990). A Matter of Record. Documentary Sources in Social Research. Wiley: Oxford.

Scott, J. (2006). "Content Analysis", Jupp, V. (ed.). (2006). The Sage Dictionary of Social Research Methods. SAGE Publications: London.

Seiler, D. L. (1980). *Partis et Familles Politiques*. Paris: Presses Univ. de France.

Sellitiz, C., Jahoda, M., Deutsch, M and Cook, S. W. (1959). Research Methods in Social Relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Simpson, E. (1987). 'Moral Conservatism', *The Review of Politics*, Vol. 49. No. 1.

Smith, H. W. (1975). Strategies of Social Research. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Steinfels, P. (1979). The Neoconservatives. New York.

Stokes, S. C. (1999). 'Political Parties and Democracy', *Annual Review of Political Science*. Vol. 2: 243-67.

Strom, K. (2000). "Parties at the Core of Government", in Parties without Partisans: Political Change in Advanced Industrial Democracies. Dalton, R. J. and Wattenberg, M. P. (eds). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Terreblanche, S. J. (1999). "The Ideological Journey of South Africa: From The RDP to the GEAR Macro-economic Plan", archived July 2013, http://web.uct.ac.za/depts/ricsa/confer/me99/procs/pro_terr.htm

Turok, B. (ed.). (2012). Readings in the ANC Tradition. Volume II: History and Ideology. Jacana Media: Johannesburg.

van Biezen, I. (2003). 'The Place of Parties in Contemporary Democracies', *Western European Politics*, Vol. 26. No. 3.

van Rooyen, J. (1994). "The White Right", in Reynolds, A. (ed). Election '94 South Africa: The Campaigns, results and future prospects. David Philip: Cape Town and Johannesburg.

Vincent. A. (1992). Modern Political Ideologies. Blackwell: Oxford UK.

Volkens, A. (2008). 'Strengths and weaknesses of approaches to measuring policy positions of parties', *Electoral Studies*, Vol. 26: 108-120.

von Beyme, K. (1985). Political Parties in Western Democracies. Gower Publishing: England.

Ware, A. (1996). Political Parties and Party Systems. Oxford University Press: Oxford.

Warwick, P. V. (2006). Policy Horizon and Parliamentary Government. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Weale, A. (2007). Democracy. Palgrave Macmillan. England.

Welsh, D. (1994). "The Democratic Party", in Reynolds, A. (ed). Election '94 South Africa: The Campaigns, results and future prospects. David Philip: Cape Town and Johannesburg.

Wolff, J. (1998, 2012). "Libertarianism". In E. Craig (Ed.), Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy. London: Routledge. Archived November 07, 2013, http://0-www.rep.routledge.com.innopac.wits.ac.za/article/S036

Wolinetz, S. (2002). "Beyond the Catch-all Party: Approaches to the Study of Parties and Party Organization", in Richard Gunther, José Ramón Montero and Juan J. Linz (eds). Political Parties: Old Concepts and New Challenges. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Yack, B. (2001). 'Popular Sovereignty and Nationalism', *Political Theory*, Vol. 29, No. 4.

Yanai, N. (1999). 'Why do political parties survive? An Analytical Discussion', *Party Politics*, Vol. 5. No. 5.

INTERVIEWS

Cassim, Farouk (Congress of the People), Head of Research, 03/12/2013.

Godi, Themba (African People's Convention). Party Leader, 10/02/2014.

Greyling, Lance (Independent Democrats), Member of Parliament and Chief Whip, 25/11/2013.

Joko, Bennet (Pan Africanist Congress), Deputy Secretary General, 09/12/2013.

Kwankwa, Nqabayomzi (United Democratic Movement), Member of Parliament and Deputy Secretary General, 28/02/2014.

Meshoe, Kenneth (African Christian Democratic Party), Party Leader, 20/02/2014.

Mfundisi, Isaac Sipho (United Christian Democratic Party), Party Leader, 05/12/2013.

Rajbansi, Shameen Thakur (Minority Front), Party Leader, 20/11/2013.

Selfe, James (Democratic Alliance), Member of Parliament and Shadow Minister of Correctional Services, 30/01/2014.

Turok, Ben (African National Congress), Member of Parliament and co-head of Ethics Committee, 06/03/2014.

Uys, Piet (Freedom Front Plus), Secretary General, 14/02/2014.

APPENDICES

Appendix A – Participant Information Sheet: Interview

Interview Participant information Sheet

Dear potential participant,

I am a Master's student at the University of Witwatersrand in the Department of Political Studies. I am currently writing my dissertation and the research which I am conducting is based on **political parties in South Africa**. The aim of the research is to measure the ideology of the political parties. The research question is: **What is the ideology of South African parties?**

My role as a researcher is to assist in the gathering of information for the purpose of creating knowledge that can contribute to enhancing our understanding of the country we find ourselves in. This research has the potential benefit of expanding knowledge in the field of political parties in South Africa, and practically, it may contribute to enhancing democracy in South Africa, in the long-term, by expanding or clarifying the options voters have available to them, and also allowing political parties to clearly define their views and programmes.

I would like to invite you to help me accomplish the aim of my research project by sharing your knowledge on the topic. You were selected because of your leadership position in the political party. Your involvement in my study will be extremely helpful to the completion of my research.

If you would like to help me in my research project, a **1 – 2 hour interview** will be scheduled according to your availability. The interview is semi-structured and the main question is: **What do you think the ideological position of the party is?** The interview will be recorded via audio and video-tape. If you also choose to be anonymous, this will be granted to you. And the data collected from you will follow data protection procedures to ensure confidentiality, if you require this.

Please kindly understand that this research does not involve financial payment and your participation is voluntary. The information gathered from you will be used in the writing of this academic research project and will be published by Wits University. If you would like to view the published project, you are free to contact me.

If you would like to participate in this research please let me know as soon as possible so we can schedule an interview date and time.

Once again, your participation in this research will be highly appreciated and tremendously useful in discovering what the ideological status of your party is.

Thank you,
Letitia Rohanlall
Political Studies Department, University of Witwatersrand
Email: tishrohan@live.com
Mobile: 084 989 1006 or Telephone: 011 717 4354
Fax: 086 579 5499
…….
Supervisor: Professor Daryl Glaser
Email: daryl.glaser@wits.ac.za or Telephone: 011 717 4373

Appendix B – Participant Information Sheet: Expert Survey

EXPERT SURVEY ON PARTY IDEOLOGY IN SOUTH AFRICA

Participant Information Sheet

Dear potential participant,

I am a Master's student at the University of Witwatersrand in the Department of Political Studies. I am currently writing my dissertation and the research which I am conducting is based on **political parties in South Africa**. The aim of the research is to measure the ideology of the political parties. The research question is: **What is the ideology of South African parties?** This research has the potential benefit of expanding knowledge in the field of political parties in South Africa, and practically, it may contribute to enhancing democracy in South Africa, in the long-term, by expanding or clarifying the options voters have available to them, and also allowing political parties to clearly define their views and programmes.

I would like to invite you to help me accomplish the aim of my research project by sharing your knowledge in the field. Your involvement in my study will be extremely helpful to the completion of my research. You were selected because of your association with the discipline of Political Studies or a related Social Sciences discipline.

If you would like to help me in my research project, I would like you to complete a **questionnaire** which amounts to **no more than 10 close-ended questions,** requiring you to rate the ideological position of the thirteen parties in the National Assembly, from a scale of 0 to 10. The questionnaire has a *don't know* option if you are uncertain. It is an online survey. If you are interested I will forward the link to you.

Please kindly understand that this research does not involve financial payment and your participation is voluntary. If you would like to view the published project, you are free to contact me.

Once again, your participation in this research will be highly appreciated and tremendously useful in discovering what the ideological status of South African parties are from an expert viewpoint.

Thank you,
Letitia Rohanlall
Email: tishrohan@live.com
Mobile: 084 989 1006
Telephone: 011 717 4354
Fax: 086 579 5499
…….
Supervisor: Professor Daryl Glaser
Email: daryl.glaser@wits.ac.za
Telephone: 011 717 4373

Appendix C – Consent Form: Interview

INTERVIEW CONSENT FORM

PARTY IDEOLOGY IN SOUTH AFRICA

Section A

I, the participant, _____ (full name and surname), in the position of _____ (work title) in service too _____ (political party) understand that by signing this Consent Form, I agree to become involved in the research study which is intended to measure political party ideology in South Africa.

Section B

This aim of this research, including the research and interview question, has been explained to me in the Interview Participant Information Sheet, which also includes the following:

- An introduction of the researcher and her role in knowledge production,
- The research topic and question,
- The potential benefits of the research,
- A non-coerced, non-paid and voluntary invitation to participate in the research,
- A reason stating why I was selected,
- The procedure of the research which is a 1 – 2 hour interview,
- The interview type and question,
- This research will provide anonymity (not identifying me), if I want this,
- The interview data will be used for academic purposes, in writing the research project, and
- The availability of the final research project.

Section C

(a) By becoming involved in the research project, I understand that I will be required to be interviewed.

_____
Participant signature

(b) I agree to the interview being audio-taped.

_____
Participant signature

(c) Do you want anonymity in this research project? This means that your name will be made anonymous. Please state yes or no _____

_____
Participant signature

Appendix D – Consent Form: Expert Survey

EXPERT SURVEY CONSENT FORM

PARTY IDEOLOGY IN SOUTH AFRICA

I am a Master's student from the University of Witwatersrand, in the Department of Political Studies. This is a consent form for the research undertaken on party ideology in South Africa. Please note that it has been approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee, Protocol Number H13/09/13. *Before you sign the consent form please also see the Expert Survey Participant Information Sheet.*

Section A

I, the participant, _____ (full name and surname), in the position of _____ (work title) in service to_____ (university) understand that by signing this Consent Form, I agree to become involved in the research study which is intended to measure political party ideology in South Africa.

Section B

This aim of this research, including the research question, has been explained to me in the Expert Survey Participant Information Sheet, which also includes the following:

- The research topic and question,
- The potential benefits of the research,
- A non-coerced, non-paid and voluntary invitation to participate in the research,
- A reason stating why I was selected,
- The procedure of the research which is an expert survey,
- The survey questions and content,
- The survey data will be used for academic purposes, in writing the research project, and
- The availability of the final research project.

Section C

(d) By becoming involved in the research project, I understand that I will be required to be part of an expert survey.

_____ _____

Participant signature Date signed

Appendix E – Interview Questions

PARTY IDEOLOGY IN SOUTH AFRICA – GENERAL QUESTIONS

1. WHAT IS THE GENERAL IDEOLOGY OF THE PARTY?

2. WHAT IS THE PARTY'S VIEW ON EQUALITY? THAT IS, OF RACE, RELIGION, CULTURE AND ETHNICITY?
3. CAN YOU SAY SOMETHING ABOUT MINORITY OR GROUP RIGHTS (SUCH AS PROTECTING CULTURAL OR LINGUISTIC HERITAGES)? WHAT LEVEL OF IMPORTANCE DOES THE PARTY ATTACH TO IT?

4. HOW IMPORTANT IS AFFIRMATIVE ACTION TO THE PARTY?
5. CAN AFFIRMATIVE ACTION AND EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY CO-EXIST?
6. HOW SIGNIFICANT IS SOCIAL WELFARE?
7. IS THE PARTY CONTENT WITH THE CURRENT SOCIAL WELFARE SYSTEM (OLD AGE GRANT, DISABILITY GRANT, CHILD SUPPORT GRANT, AND FOSTER CARE GRANT)?
8. WHAT IS THE PARTY'S VIEW ON TAXATION FOR PUBLIC SPENDING? TAXATION AS DEFINED AS: "THE STATE NEEDS TAX RANDS TO FUND SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC PROGRAMMES, AND TO PROVIDE PUBLIC GOODS AND SERVICES, SUCH AS SCHOOLS, UNIVERSITIES, HOSPITALS, CLINICS AND ROADS, AS WELL AS DEFENCE AND SECURITY." RELATED TO THIS, DOES THE PARTY SUPPORT THE PROGRESSIVE TAX SYSTEM THAT IS IN SOUTH AFRICA? DOES THE PARTY THINK THE TAX RATE IS TOO HIGH OR TOO LOW? (THIS ALSO LINKS WITH THE QUESTIONS ON REDISTRIBUTION OF WEALTH AND SOCIAL WELFARE.)
9. DOES THE PARTY FAVOR BIG GOVERNMENT OR MINIMAL GOVERNMENT? THIS IS THE ISSUE OF GOVERNMENT REGULATION IN THE ECONOMY.
10. IS REDISTRIBUTION OF WEALTH CRUCIAL? AND WHAT ABOUT THE REDISTRIBUTION OF LAND?
11. WHICH IS WORTH PURSUING: COMMON OWNERSHIP OR PRIVATE OWNERSHIP? AND WHY? IN SOUTH AFRICA THERE IS A CONTINUOUS TALK OF NATIONALIZATION. WHAT IS THE POSITION OF THE PARTY ON THIS?
12. IS CLASS CONFLICT BETWEEN WORKERS AND EMPLOYERS SOMETHING THAT SITS AT THE HEART OF THE VISION OF THE PARTY? THIS IS THE ISSUE OF WORKERS' DEMOCRACY AND WORKERS' RIGHTS, AND MOREOVER IN A WAY THAT IS SUPERIOR TO THE EMPLOYER (PROLETARIAN DEMOCRACY TO OVERTHROW THE BOURGEOIS ORDER).


13. ON SOCIAL ISSUES, WHAT IS THE PARTY'S VIEW ON ABORTION AND CAPITAL PUNISHMENT?
14. DOES THE PARTY HAVE ANY RESERVATION ON PROSTITUTION AND GAY AND LESBIAN MARRIAGES?
15. WHAT IS THE PARTY'S STANCE ON GENDER EQUALITY? AND DOES THE PARTY SUPPORT THE QUOTA SYSTEM THAT IS DIRECT GOVERNMENT REGULATION TO EQUALIZE GENDER'S IN SOCIETY? THIS IS THE ISSUE OF EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY (LIBERAL EQUALITY) VERSUS EQUALITY OF OUTCOME (SOCIALIST EQUALITY).
16. WHAT IMPORTANCE DOES THE PARTY GIVE TO THE INDIVIDUAL OVER THE FAMILY OR COMMUNITY? THAT IS INDIVIDUAL EXPRESSION AND FAMILY VALUES OR COMMUNITY VALUES. (THIS IS THE ISSUE OF CIVIL LIBERTIES VERSUS TRADITIONAL MORALITY OR INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS VERSUS GROUP RIGHTS.)

17. IN THE POLITICAL ARENA, HOW IMPORTANT IS CONSTITUTIONALISM AND ELECTIONS?
18. WHAT DOES DEMOCRACY MEAN FOR THE PARTY? (IS THE PARTY IN FAVOUR OF A LIBERAL DEMOCRATIC MODEL OR A PARTICIPATORY DEMOCRATIC MODEL?)
19. SHOULD RELIGION HAVE A PLACE IN POLITICS?
20. WHAT DOES THE PARTY THINK ABOUT TRADITIONAL GOVERNANCE IN SOUTH AFRICA AND ITS PLACE IN POLITICS?
21. A CONTROVERSIAL ISSUE IN SOUTH AFRICAN POLITICS IS THE SECRECY BILL WHICH SEVERELY LIMITS ACCESS TO STATE INFORMATION. IS THE PARTY CONCERNED THAT IT JEOPARDIZES ACCOUNTABILITY AND OPENNESS?
22. WHAT IS THE PARTY'S POSITION ON COOPERATION IN POLITICS AND SOCIAL LIFE? DOES IT WIN OVER SELF-INTEREST?

23. HOW RELEVANT IS THE IDEOLOGY OF THE PARTY TO THE SOUTH AFRICAN POLITICAL LANDSCAPE?

Appendix F – Expert Survey

EXPERT SURVEY ON PARTY IDEOLOGY IN SOUTH AFRICA



EXPERT SURVEY - PARTY IDEOLOGY IN SOUTH AFRICA

WELCOME


Dear participant,

We are extremely grateful for your participation in this Expert Survey on party ideology in South Africa.

Thank you in advance for taking the time to share your expertise with us!

Next

Powered by SurveyMonkey
Check out our sample surveys and create your own now!



EXPERT SURVEY - PARTY IDEOLOGY IN SOUTH AFRICA

INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONS

This expert survey contains 10 close-ended questions and will take approximately 10 to 15 minutes of your time to complete. The survey requires you to rate the ideological position, of thirteen parties represented in parliament, on a scale of 0 to 10.

The 10 questions contained in this survey are dedicated to political, economic and social issues.

There is a 'Don't Know' option in the survey.

On the next page you will find the abbreviations and full names of the parties as represented in Parliament.

Thank you once again for your time and consideration.

And please remember if you would like to comment on party ideology in South Africa or generally on ideology in the country, you can send your comment to me at tishrohan@live.com.

Your academic insight will be valuable in this research project.

Prev Next

Powered by SurveyMonkey
Check out our sample surveys and create your own now!

EXPERT SURVEY - PARTY IDEOLOGY IN SOUTH AFRICA

PARTY NAMES

ANC: African National Congress

DA: Democratic Alliance

COPE: Congress of the People

IFP: Inkatha Freedom Party

ID: Independent Democrats

UDM: United Democratic Movement

FF+: Freedom Front Plus

ACDP: African Christian Democratic Party

UCDP: United Christian Democratic Party

PAC: Pan Africanist Congress of Azania

MF: Minority Front

AZAPO: Azanian People's Organization

APC: African People's Convention

Prev Next

Powered by SurveyMonkey
Check out our sample surveys and create your own now!

EXPERT SURVEY - PARTY IDEOLOGY IN SOUTH AFRICA

IDEOLOGICAL POSITIONS

1. Please tick the option that best describes each party's overall ideology.

	0: Extreme Left	1	2	3	4	5: Center	6	7	8	9	10: Extreme Right	Don't Know
ANC	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
DA	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
COPE	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
IFP	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
ID	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
UDM	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
FF+	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
ACDP	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
UCDP	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
PAC	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
MF	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
AZAPO	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
APC	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Prev Next

Powered by SurveyMonkey
Check out our sample surveys and create your own now!

EXPERT SURVEY - PARTY IDEOLOGY IN SOUTH AFRICA

POLITICAL ISSUES

2. Please tick the option that best describes each party's overall ideological views on politics and government.

	0: Democratic	1	2	3	4	5: Center	6	7	8	9	10: Anthoritarian	Don't Know
ANC	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
DA	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
COPE	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
IFP	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
ID	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
UDM	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
FF+	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
ACDP	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
UCDP	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
PAC	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
MF	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
AZAPO	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
APC	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Prev Next

Powered by SurveyMonkey
Check out our sample surveys and create your own now!

EXPERT SURVEY - PARTY IDEOLOGY IN SOUTH AFRICA

ECONOMIC ISSUES

3. Where would you position the party on its views on taxation and public spending?

	0: Strongly in favour of increasing public spending and taxes	1	2	3	4	5: Center	6	7	8	9	10: Strongly in favour of reducing public spending and taxes	Don't Know
ANC	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
DA	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
COPE	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
IFP	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
ID	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
UDM	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
FF+	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
ACDP	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
UCDP	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
PAC	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
MF	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
AZAPO	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
APC	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

4. Where would you position the party on its views on economic planning versus market?

	0: Strongly promotes economic planning	1	2	3	4	5: Center	6	7	8	9	10: Strongly opposes economic planning	Don't Know
ANC	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
DA	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
COPE	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
IFP	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
ID	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
UDM	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
FF+	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
ACDP	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
UCDP	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
PAC	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
MF	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
AZAPO	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
APC	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

5. Where would you position the party on its views on ownership and the means of production?

	0: Strongly promotes maximum public ownership of business and industry	1	2	3	4	5: Center	6	7	8	9	10: Strongly opposes all public ownership of business and industry	Don't Know
ANC	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
DA	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
COPE	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
IFP	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
ID	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
UDM	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
FF+	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
ACDP	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
UCDP	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
PAC	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
MF	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
AZAPO	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
APC	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

6. Where would you position the party on its views on redistribution of wealth from the rich to the poor?

	0: Strongly promotes redistribution of wealth	1	2	3	4	5: Center	6	7	8	9	10: Strongly opposes redistribution of wealth	Don't Know
ANC	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
DA	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
COPE	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
IFP	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
ID	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
UDM	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
FF+	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
ACDP	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
UCDP	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
PAC	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
MF	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
AZAPO	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
APC	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Prev Next

Powered by SurveyMonkey
Check out our sample surveys and create your own now!

EXPERT SURVEY - PARTY IDEOLOGY IN SOUTH AFRICA

SOCIAL AND CULTURAL ISSUES

7. Please tick the option that best describes each party's overall social and cultural ideology.

	0: Liberal	1	2	3	4	5: Center	6	7	8	9	10: Conservative	Don't Know
ANC	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
DA	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
COPE	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
IFP	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
ID	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
UDM	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
FF+	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
ACDP	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
UCDP	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
PAC	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
MF	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
AZAPO	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
APC	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

8. Where would you position the party on its views on affirmative action measures to improve opportunities for historically disadvantaged groups?

	0: Strongly in favour of affirmative action	1	2	3	4	5: Center	6	7	8	9	10: Strongly opposed to affirmative action	Don't Know
ANC	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
DA	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
COPE	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
IFP	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
ID	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
UDM	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
FF+	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
ACDP	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
UCDP	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
PAC	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
MF	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
AZAPO	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
APC	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

9. Where would you position the party on its views on gay and lesbian rights?

	0: Strongly in favour of gay and lesbian rights	1	2	3	4	5: Center	6	7	8	9	10: Strongly opposed to gay and lesbian rights	Don't Know
ANC	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
DA	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
COPE	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
IFP	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
ID	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
UDM	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
FF+	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
ACDP	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
UCDP	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
PAC	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
MF	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
AZAPO	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
APC	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

10. Where would you position the party on its views on gender equality?

	0: Strongly in favour of gender equality	1	2	3	4	5: Center	6	7	8	9	10: Strongly opposed to gender equality	Don't Know
ANC	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
DA	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
COPE	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
IFP	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
ID	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
UDM	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
FF+	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
ACDP	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
UCDP	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
PAC	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
MF	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
AZAPO	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
APC	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Prev Done

Powered by SurveyMonkey
Check out our sample surveys and create your own now!

Appendix G – Manifesto Analysis Raw Data

These are the variables:

Political domain		Socio-economic domain		Social-cultural domain	
D(S)	Participatory democracy	M	Market	TO	Togetherness or national solidarity
D(L)	Liberal democracy	ML	Market libertarianism	I	Individualism
EQ(L)	Liberal equality	ML(O)	Oppose market libertarianism	DI	Diversity
EQ(R)	Socialist equality	PP	Private property	GR/NAT	Group identity or nationalist sentiments
F(L)	Liberal freedom	PP(O)	Oppose private property or common ownership	MOR	Morality or traditional morality
F(R)	Socialist freedom	ME	Mixed economy		
PL	Decentralization	S	Social welfare		
PL(O)	Oppose decentralisation or centralisation	R	Redistribution		
TL	Traditional leadership	AA	Affirmative action		
REL	Religion in politics	AA(O)	Oppose affirmative action		

ANC- MANIFESTO ANALYSIS								
Variable	1994 Manifesto		1999 Manifesto		2004 Manifesto		2009 Manifesto	
	Left Count, L	Right Count, R	Left Count, L	Right Count, R	Left Count, L	Right Count, R	Left Count, L	Right Count, R
POLITICAL DOMAIN								
D(S)	16				3		14	
D(L)		19		10		16		13
EQ(L)			3		3		2	
EQ(R)		9		8		9		10
F(L)			4		4		2	
F(R)		8		9		6		5
PL	2		13		5		1	
PL(O)								
TL		2		10		2		1
REL								
Sub-total	**18**	**38**	**20**	**37**	**15**	**33**	**19**	**29**
Index = (R-L)/(R+L)	**0.36**		**0.30**		**0.38**		**0.21**	

SOCIO-ECONOMIC DOMAIN								
M		12		18		12		5
ML								
ML(O)								
PP		2		3				
PP(O)								
ME	1		6		5		3	
S	8		11		10		9	
R	2		1		3		5	
AA	6		6		6		10	
AA(O)								
Sub-total	**17**	**14**	**24**	**21**	**24**	**12**	**27**	**5**
Index = (R-L)/(R+L)	**-0.10**		**-0.07**		**-0.33**		**-0.69**	
SOCIAL & CULTURAL DOMAIN								
TO	8		20		16		19	
I								
DI		4		2				3
GR/NAT								
MOR				4		2		2
Sub-total	**8**	**4**	**20**	**6**	**16**	**2**	**19**	**5**
Index = (R-L)/(R+L)	**-0.33**		**-0.54**		**-0.78**		**-0.58**	
OVERALL								
Total	**43**	**56**	**64**	**64**	**55**	**47**	**65**	**39**
Overall Index	**0.13**		**0.00**		**-0.08**		**-0.25**	

DA- MANIFESTO ANALYSIS								
Variable	1994 Manifesto		1999 Manifesto		2004 Manifesto		2009 Manifesto	
	Left Count, L	Right Count, R	Left Count, L	Right Count, R	Left Count, L	Right Count, R	Left Count, L	Right Count, R
POLITICAL DOMAIN								
D(S)	4				2			
D(L)		42		25		27		25
EQ(L)							1	
EQ(R)		6		5				1
F(L)								
F(R)		12		9		1		1
PL	18		3		10		10	
PL(O)								
TL						4		
REL								
Sub-total	**22**	**60**	**3**	**39**	**12**	**32**	**11**	**27**
Index = (R-L)/(R+L)	**0.46**		**0.86**		**0.45**		**0.42**	

SOCIO-ECONOMIC DOMAIN								
M		4		3		11		3
ML		10		10		3		2
ML(O)								
PP		4				4		3
PP(O)								
ME	2		1				3	
S	1		2		9		9	
R								
AA								
AA(O)				10		9		
Sub-total	**3**	**18**	**3**	**23**	**9**	**27**	**12**	**8**
Index = (R-L)/(R+L)	**0.71**		**0.77**		**0.50**		**-0.20**	
SOCIAL & CULTURAL DOMAIN								
TO	2				1		2	
DI						8		9
I		12		19		2		2
GR/NAT								
MOR								
Sub-total	**2**	**12**	**0**	**19**	**1**	**10**	**2**	**11**
Index = (R-L)/(R+L)	**0.71**		**1.00**		**0.82**		**0.69**	
OVERALL								
Total	27	90	6	81	22	69	25	46
Overall Index	**0.54**		**0.86**		**0.52**		**0.30**	

COPE- MANIFESTO ANALYSIS								
Variable	**1994 Manifesto**		**1999 Manifesto**		**2004 Manifesto**		**2009 Manifesto**	
	Left Count, L	**Right Count, R**	**Left Count, L**	**Right Count, R**	**Left Count, L**	**Right Count, R**	**Left Count, L**	**Right Count, R**
POLITICAL DOMAIN								
D(S)							7	
D(L)								31
EQ(L)							3	
EQ(R)								6
F(L)								
F(R)								5
PL							9	
PL(O)								
TL								7
REL								
Sub-total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**19**	**49**
Index = (R-L)/(R+L)	**#DIV/0!**		**#DIV/0!**		**#DIV/0!**		**0.44**	

SOCIO-ECONOMIC DOMAIN								
M								5
ML								
ML(O)								
PP								
PP(O)								
ME							6	
S							4	
R							1	
AA							3	
AA(O)								
Sub-total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**14**	**5**
Index = (R-L)/(R+L)	**#DIV/0!**		**#DIV/0!**		**#DIV/0!**		**-0.47**	
SOCIAL & CULTURAL DOMAIN								
TO							6	
DI								2
I								
GR/NAT								
MOR								
Sub-total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**6**	**2**
Index = (R-L)/(R+L)	**#DIV/0!**		**#DIV/0!**		**#DIV/0!**		**-0.50**	
OVERALL								
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	56
Overall Index	**#DIV/0!**		**#DIV/0!**		**#DIV/0!**		**0.18**	

IFP- MANIFESTO ANALYSIS								
Variable	1994 Manifesto		1999 Manifesto		2004 Manifesto		2009 Manifesto	
	Left Count, L	Right Count, R	Left Count, L	Right Count, R	Left Count, L	Right Count, R	Left Count, L	Right Count, R
POLITICAL DOMAIN								
D(S)							2	
D(L)				4		2		8
EQ(L)								
EQ(R)						1		6
F(L)								
F(R)								9
PL			1		3		4	
PL(O)								
TL						1		4
REL								
Sub-total	**0**	**0**	**1**	**4**	**3**	**4**	**6**	**27**
Index = (R-L)/(R+L)	**#DIV/0!**		**0.60**		**0.14**		**0.64**	

SOCIO-ECONOMIC DOMAIN								
M				1		4		3
ML				1		3		1
ML(O)								
PP								2
PP(O)								
ME								
S							9	
R								
AA								
AA(O)								
Sub-total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**7**	**9**	**6**
Index = (R-L)/(R+L)	**#DIV/0!**		**1.00**		**1.00**		**-0.20**	
SOCIAL & CULTURAL DOMAIN								
TO			4		2		6	
DI						1		5
I								
GR/NAT								
MOR				3				11
Sub-total	**0**	**0**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**6**	**16**
Index = (R-L)/(R+L)	**#DIV/0!**		**-0.14**		**-0.33**		**0.45**	
OVERALL								
Total	0	0	5	9	5	12	21	49
Overall Index	**#DIV/0!**		**0.29**		**0.41**		**0.40**	

ID- MANIFESTO ANALYSIS								
Variable	1994 Manifesto		1999 Manifesto		2004 Manifesto		2009 Manifesto	
	Left Count, L	Right Count, R	Left Count, L	Right Count, R	Left Count, L	Right Count, R	Left Count, L	Right Count, R
POLITICAL DOMAIN								
D(S)					1		4	
D(L)						20		37
EQ(L)							2	
EQ(R)						1		2
F(L)								
F(R)								3
PL					2		8	
PL(O)								
TL								
REL								
Sub-total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**21**	**14**	**42**
Index = (R-L)/(R+L)	**#DIV/0!**		**#DIV/0!**		**0.75**		**0.50**	

SOCIO-ECONOMIC DOMAIN								
M						10		11
ML								
ML(O)								
PP								3
PP(O)								
ME							6	
S					6		15	
R							2	
AA							1	
AA(O)								
Sub-total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**6**	**10**	**24**	**14**
Index = (R-L)/(R+L)	**#DIV/0!**		**#DIV/0!**		**0.25**		**-0.26**	
SOCIAL & CULTURAL DOMAIN								
TO					4		9	
DI						2		4
I								
GR/NAT								
MOR								13
Sub-total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**2**	**9**	**17**
Index = (R-L)/(R+L)	**#DIV/0!**		**#DIV/0!**		**-0.33**		**0.31**	
OVERALL								
Total	0	0	0	0	13	33	47	73
Overall Index	**#DIV/0!**		**#DIV/0!**		**0.43**		**0.22**	

UDM- MANIFESTO ANALYSIS								
Variable	1994 Manifesto		1999 Manifesto		2004 Manifesto		2009 Manifesto	
	Left Count, L	Right Count, R	Left Count, L	Right Count, R	Left Count, L	Right Count, R	Left Count, L	Right Count, R
POLITICAL DOMAIN								
D(S)			1		2		5	
D(L)				29		31		29
EQ(L)								
EQ(R)				6		2		4
F(L)			2		1		2	
F(R)				5		5		
PL			5		2		2	
PL(O)								
TL				3		3		
REL								
Sub-total	**0**	**0**	**8**	**43**	**5**	**41**	**9**	**33**
Index = (R-L)/(R+L)	**#DIV/0!**		**0.69**		**0.78**		**0.57**	

SOCIO-ECONOMIC DOMAIN								
M				14		6		6
ML								
ML(O)								
PP				3		2		
PP(O)								
ME								
S			2		1			
R								
AA			1					
AA(O)								
Sub-total	**0**	**0**	**3**	**17**	**1**	**8**	**0**	**6**
Index = (R-L)/(R+L)	**#DIV/0!**		**0.70**		**0.78**		**1.00**	
SOCIAL & CULTURAL DOMAIN								
TO			3				1	
DI				4				2
I								
GR/NAT								
MOR								2
Sub-total	**0**	**0**	**3**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**4**
Index = (R-L)/(R+L)	**#DIV/0!**		**0.14**		**#DIV/0!**		**0.60**	
OVERALL								
Total	0	0	14	64	6	49	10	43
Overall Index	**#DIV/0!**		**0.64**		**0.78**		**0.62**	

FFP- MANIFESTO ANALYSIS								
Variable	1994 Manifesto		1999 Manifesto		2004 Manifesto		2009 Manifesto	
	Left Count, L	Right Count, R	Left Count, L	Right Count, R	Left Count, L	Right Count, R	Left Count, L	Right Count, R
POLITICAL DOMAIN								
D(S)								
D(L)				1				6
EQ(L)								
EQ(R)								1
F(L)								
F(R)								8
PL							3	
PL(O)								
TL								
REL								8
Sub-total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**23**
Index = (R-L)/(R+L)	**#DIV/0!**		**1.00**		**#DIV/0!**		**0.77**	

SOCIO-ECONOMIC DOMAIN								
M				1				1
ML				3				
ML(O)								
PP								6
PP(O)								
ME								
S								
R								
AA								
AA(O)								14
Sub-total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**21**
Index = (R-L)/(R+L)	**#DIV/0!**		**1.00**		**#DIV/0!**		**1.00**	
SOCIAL & CULTURAL DOMAIN								
TO							2	
DI								5
I								
GR/NAT				8				31
MOR								6
Sub-total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**8**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**42**
Index = (R-L)/(R+L)	**#DIV/0!**		**1.00**		**#DIV/0!**		**0.91**	
OVERALL								
Total	0	0	0	13	0	0	5	86
Overall Index	**#DIV/0!**		**1.00**		**#DIV/0!**		**0.89**	

ACDP- MANIFESTO ANALYSIS								
Variable	**1994 Manifesto**		**1999 Manifesto**		**2004 Manifesto**		**2009 Manifesto**	
	Left Count, L	**Right Count, R**	**Left Count, L**	**Right Count, R**	**Left Count, L**	**Right Count, R**	**Left Count, L**	**Right Count, R**
POLITICAL DOMAIN								
D(S)	3							
D(L)		1				7		8
EQ(L)								
EQ(R)		1						
F(L)								
F(R)						3		2
PL	4				2		1	
PL(O)								
TL								
REL		10				18		3
Sub-total	**7**	**12**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**28**	**1**	**13**
Index = (R-L)/(R+L)	**0.26**		**#DIV/0!**		**0.87**		**0.86**	

SOCIO-ECONOMIC DOMAIN								
M		2				3		1
ML		3				6		2
ML(O)								
PP						1		1
PP(O)								
ME							1	
S					1		4	
R								
AA								
AA(O)								
Sub-total	**0**	**5**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**10**	**5**	**4**
Index = (R-L)/(R+L)	**1.00**		**#DIV/0!**		**0.82**		**-0.11**	
SOCIAL & CULTURAL DOMAIN								
TO	6				4			
DI						1		
I								
GR/NAT								
MOR						29		16
Sub-total	**6**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**30**	**0**	**16**
Index = (R-L)/(R+L)	**-1.00**		**#DIV/0!**		**0.76**		**1.00**	
OVERALL								
Total	13	17	0	0	7	68	6	33
Overall Index	**0.13**		**#DIV/0!**		**0.81**		**0.69**	

UCDP- MANIFESTO ANALYSIS								
Variable	1994 Manifesto		1999 Manifesto		2004 Manifesto		2009 Manifesto	
	Left Count, L	Right Count, R	Left Count, L	Right Count, R	Left Count, L	Right Count, R	Left Count, L	Right Count, R
POLITICAL DOMAIN								
D(S)								
D(L)								6
EQ(L)								
EQ(R)								5
F(L)								
F(R)								
PL							8	
PL(O)								
TL								7
REL								4
Sub-total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**8**	**22**
Index = (R-L)/(R+L)	**#DIV/0!**		**#DIV/0!**		**#DIV/0!**		**0.47**	

SOCIO-ECONOMIC DOMAIN								
M								5
ML								4
ML(O)								
PP								2
PP(O)								
ME							2	
S							9	
R							1	
AA								
AA(O)								
Sub-total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**12**	**11**
Index = (R-L)/(R+L)	**#DIV/0!**		**#DIV/0!**		**#DIV/0!**		**-0.04**	
SOCIAL & CULTURAL DOMAIN								
TO							3	
DI								3
I								
GR/NAT								
MOR								5
Sub-total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**8**
Index = (R-L)/(R+L)	**#DIV/0!**		**#DIV/0!**		**#DIV/0!**		**0.45**	
OVERALL								
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	41
Overall Index	**#DIV/0!**		**#DIV/0!**		**#DIV/0!**		**0.28**	

APC- MANIFESTO ANALYSIS								
Variable	1994 Manifesto		1999 Manifesto		2004 Manifesto		2009 Manifesto	
	Left Count, L	Right Count, R	Left Count, L	Right Count, R	Left Count, L	Right Count, R	Left Count, L	Right Count, R
POLITICAL DOMAIN								
D(S)							6	
D(L)								8
EQ(L)								
EQ(R)								5
F(L)								
F(R)								
PL								
PL(O)								
TL								10
REL								
Sub-total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**6**	**23**
Index = (R-L)/(R+L)	**#DIV/0!**		**#DIV/0!**		**#DIV/0!**		**0.59**	

SOCIO-ECONOMIC DOMAIN								
M								
ML								
ML(O)								
PP								
PP(O)							1	
ME								
S								
R								
AA								
AA(O)								
Sub-total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**
Index = (R-L)/(R+L)	**#DIV/0!**		**#DIV/0!**		**#DIV/0!**		**-1.00**	
SOCIAL & CULTURAL DOMAIN								
TO							1	
DI								1
I								
GR/NAT								6
MOR								
Sub-total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**7**
Index = (R-L)/(R+L)	**#DIV/0!**		**#DIV/0!**		**#DIV/0!**		**0.75**	
OVERALL								
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	30
Overall Index	**#DIV/0!**		**#DIV/0!**		**#DIV/0!**		**0.58**	

AZAPO- MANIFESTO ANALYSIS								
Variable	1994 Manifesto		1999 Manifesto		2004 Manifesto		2009 Manifesto	
	Left Count, L	Right Count, R	Left Count, L	Right Count, R	Left Count, L	Right Count, R	Left Count, L	Right Count, R
POLITICAL DOMAIN								
D(S)							5	
D(L)						3		11
EQ(L)								
EQ(R)								3
F(L)								
F(R)						1		3
PL								
PL(O)				1		2		4
TL				3		3		2
REL								
Sub-total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**9**	**5**	**23**
Index = (R-L)/(R+L)	**#DIV/0!**		**1.00**		**1.00**		**0.64**	

SOCIO-ECONOMIC DOMAIN								
M				1		3		5
ML								
ML(O)			5		4		4	
PP								
PP(O)								
ME								
S			4		5		6	
R			1		1		1	
AA			1		2			
AA(O)								
Sub-total	**0**	**0**	**11**	**1**	**12**	**3**	**11**	**5**
Index = (R-L)/(R+L)	**#DIV/0!**		**-0.83**		**-0.60**		**-0.38**	
SOCIAL & CULTURAL DOMAIN								
TO							1	
DI								1
I								
GR/NAT				7		2		
MOR								
Sub-total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7**	**0**	**2**	**1**	**1**
Index = (R-L)/(R+L)	**#DIV/0!**		**1.00**		**1.00**		**0.00**	
OVERALL								
Total	0	0	11	12	12	14	17	29
Overall Index	**#DIV/0!**		**0.04**		**0.08**		**0.26**	

MF- MANIFESTO ANALYSIS								
Variable	1994 Manifesto		1999 Manifesto		2004 Manifesto		2009 Manifesto	
	Left Count, L	Right Count, R	Left Count, L	Right Count, R	Left Count, L	Right Count, R	Left Count, L	Right Count, R
POLITICAL DOMAIN								
D(S)								
D(L)						3		
EQ(L)								
EQ(R)						1		
F(L)								
F(R)						1		1
PL								
PL(O)								
TL								
REL								
Sub-total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**5**	**0**	**1**
Index = (R-L)/(R+L)	**#DIV/0!**		**#DIV/0!**		**1.00**		**1.00**	

SOCIO-ECONOMIC DOMAIN								
M								
ML								
ML(O)								
PP								
PP(O)								
ME								
S					1		7	
R								
AA					1		2	
AA(O)								
Sub-total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**9**	**0**
Index = (R-L)/(R+L)	**#DIV/0!**		**#DIV/0!**		**-1.00**		**-1.00**	
SOCIAL & CULTURAL DOMAIN								
TO					5			
DI						4		
I								
GR/NAT						12		8
MOR								
Sub-total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**5**	**16**	**0**	**8**
Index = (R-L)/(R+L)	**#DIV/0!**		**#DIV/0!**		**0.52**		**1.00**	
OVERALL								
Total	0	0	0	0	7	21	9	9
Overall Index	**#DIV/0!**		**#DIV/0!**		**0.50**		**0.00**	

PAC- MANIFESTO ANALYSIS								
Variable	1994 Manifesto		1999 Manifesto		2004 Manifesto		2009 Manifesto	
	Left Count, L	Right Count, R	Left Count, L	Right Count, R	Left Count, L	Right Count, R	Left Count, L	Right Count, R
POLITICAL DOMAIN								
D(S)	5		1		3			
D(L)		27		8		5		3
EQ(L)	1							
EQ(R)		3		2		1		3
F(L)	1							
F(R)		4		5		1		
PL	1				1			
PL(O)				2				5
TL				7				6
REL								
Sub-total	**8**	**34**	**1**	**24**	**4**	**7**	**0**	**17**
Index = (R-L)/(R+L)	**0.62**		**0.92**		**0.27**		**1.00**	

SOCIO-ECONOMIC DOMAIN								
M		6		5		5		4
ML								
ML(O)			3		7			
PP								
PP(O)	5		2				5	
ME	1							
S			8		10		3	
R	7				3		6	
AA	10		2					
AA(O)								
Sub-total	**23**	**6**	**15**	**5**	**20**	**5**	**14**	**4**
Index = (R-L)/(R+L)	**-0.59**		**-0.50**		**-0.60**		**-0.56**	
SOCIAL & CULTURAL DOMAIN								
TO	4		1					
DI								
I								
GR/NAT		76		5		16		14
MOR								
Sub-total	**4**	**76**	**1**	**5**	**0**	**16**	**0**	**14**
Index = (R-L)/(R+L)	**0.90**		**0.67**		**1.00**		**1.00**	
OVERALL								
Total	35	116	17	34	24	28	14	35
Overall Index	**0.54**		**0.33**		**0.08**		**0.43**	

Appendix H – Expert Survey Raw Data

QUESTION 1													
	ANC	DA	COPE	IFP	ID	UDM	FFP	ACDP	UCDP	PAC	MF	AZAPO	APC
Number of expert responses, N	46	46	39	40	38	38	47	42	33	41	32	39	21
Median	4,00	6,00	5,00	6,00	5,00	5,00	8,00	7,00	7,00	3,00	6,00	2,00	3,00
Interquartile Range	2,00	2,00	2,00	3,75	2,00	2,00	2,00	3,25	3,00	3,00	3,75	3,00	4,00
Mean	4,22	6,00	4,82	6,13	5,05	4,92	8,02	6,57	6,30	2,90	5,47	2,62	3,29
Standard Deviation	1,74	1,70	1,55	1,96	1,52	1,44	1,98	2,40	2,21	2,17	2,74	2,50	2,26
QUESTION 2													
	ANC	DA	COPE	IFP	ID	UDM	FFP	ACDP	UCDP	PAC	MF	AZAPO	APC
Number of expert responses, N	39	38	34	34	30	30	33	27	23	31	20	28	13
Median	6,00	4,00	5,00	7,00	5,00	5,00	7,00	5,00	5,00	8,00	6,50	7,50	5,00
Interquartile Range	3,00	3,75	1,00	1,00	2,75	3,00	4,00	3,00	2,50	3,50	3,00	3,50	3,00
Mean	5,74	3,68	4,47	6,26	4,33	4,60	6,12	5,44	5,65	6,81	6,10	6,57	5,54
Standard Deviation	2,23	2,31	1,69	2,05	2,15	2,06	2,70	2,44	2,42	2,39	2,45	2,82	2,47
QUESTION 3													
	ANC	DA	COPE	IFP	ID	UDM	FFP	ACDP	UCDP	PAC	MF	AZAPO	APC
Number of expert responses, N	36	36	24	22	23	21	24	16	11	24	14	22	10
Median	3,00	7,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	6,00	5,50	5,00	2,00	6,50	2,00	4,50
Interquartile Range	2,00	3,00	1,00	1,75	0,50	2,00	3,00	3,00	2,50	1,50	2,50	2,50	3,50
Mean	3,11	6,58	4,79	5,55	5,30	5,29	6,79	6,19	6,00	3,13	6,64	3,41	4,40
Standard Deviation	1,97	1,89	1,14	1,65	1,58	1,65	1,72	1,87	2,05	2,68	1,69	3,00	2,17
QUESTION 4													
	ANC	DA	COPE	IFP	ID	UDM	FFP	ACDP	UCDP	PAC	MF	AZAPO	APC
Number of expert responses, N	34	34	26	22	19	16	25	13	11	21	9	20	10
Median	3,00	6,50	4,50	6,00	5,00	5,00	6,00	6,00	6,00	2,00	7,00	2,00	3,00
Interquartile Range	2,75	3,00	1,00	1,75	2,00	1,25	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	4,00	2,00	2,00
Mean	3,53	6,09	4,38	5,73	5,21	5,00	6,16	6,15	6,45	2,62	7,22	2,25	3,60
Standard Deviation	1,60	2,47	1,44	1,91	1,90	1,63	2,34	2,48	1,92	1,91	2,11	1,94	1,90

QUESTION 5													
	ANC	DA	COPE	IFP	ID	UDM	FFP	ACDP	UCDP	PAC	MF	AZAPO	APC
Number of expert responses, N	35	36	25	24	21	18	25	18	12	27	13	26	9
Median	4,00	7,50	5,00	6,00	5,00	5,00	7,00	5,50	5,00	2,00	6,00	2,00	3,00
Interquartile Range	2,00	3,25	1,00	2,00	2,00	1,50	4,00	3,00	1,25	3,00	3,00	2,75	3,00
Mean	4,09	6,86	5,40	6,21	6,05	5,33	6,64	6,44	5,92	3,37	6,69	3,12	4,11
Standard Deviation	1,52	2,63	1,00	1,59	1,69	1,50	2,46	1,95	1,88	3,21	1,75	3,13	3,10
QUESTION 6													
	ANC	DA	COPE	IFP	ID	UDM	FFP	ACDP	UCDP	PAC	MF	AZAPO	APC
Number of expert responses, N	36	36	27	26	22	17	26	17	12	27	13	28	9
Median	3,00	6,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	4,50	9,00	5,50	5,00	2,00	6,00	1,00	3,00
Interquartile Range	1,50	3,00	1,00	3,00	3,00	1,25	3,00	2,00	2,00	3,00	3,00	2,50	1,00
Mean	3,39	6,11	4,67	5,46	5,27	4,76	7,85	6,00	5,75	2,19	6,69	2,00	3,67
Standard Deviation	1,42	2,19	1,47	2,28	2,31	1,99	2,13	1,84	2,05	2,29	2,43	2,11	2,00
QUESTION 7													
	ANC	DA	COPE	IFP	ID	UDM	FFP	ACDP	UCDP	PAC	MF	AZAPO	APC
Number of expert responses, N	34	34	27	30	21	20	30	28	18	23	17	22	10
Median	4,50	4,00	5,00	7,00	5,00	5,50	9,00	9,00	8,00	6,00	7,00	6,00	7,50
Interquartile Range	2,75	3,00	1,00	2,00	2,00	1,00	2,00	3,25	3,75	3,00	3,00	3,00	2,50
Mean	4,76	3,74	4,81	7,20	4,90	5,90	8,60	7,89	7,33	6,48	7,53	6,55	7,30
Standard Deviation	1,88	2,27	0,92	1,75	1,81	1,62	1,25	2,23	2,52	2,33	1,81	2,34	2,21
QUESTION 8													
	ANC	DA	COPE	IFP	ID	UDM	FFP	ACDP	UCDP	PAC	MF	AZAPO	APC
Number of expert responses, N	36	36	29	30	22	26	31	20	15	27	18	26	12
Median	1,00	6,50	4,00	4,00	5,00	4,00	9,00	5,00	5,00	1,00	5,00	1,00	2,00
Interquartile Range	2,00	3,00	1,00	2,00	2,00	2,00	1,50	3,50	2,50	2,50	2,50	2,00	4,25
Mean	1,61	6,47	3,52	4,30	4,91	3,73	8,94	5,30	4,73	1,56	5,22	1,46	2,67
Standard Deviation	1,52	2,09	1,38	2,10	2,18	1,95	1,44	2,45	2,40	1,85	2,58	1,88	3,17

QUESTION 9													
	ANC	DA	COPE	IFP	ID	UDM	FFP	ACDP	UCDP	PAC	MF	AZAPO	APC
Number of expert responses, N	33	34	21	24	18	14	22	27	16	14	11	13	8
Median	2,00	2,00	4,00	7,00	3,00	4,00	8,00	10,00	8,50	5,00	8,00	5,00	7,00
Interquartile Range	2,00	3,00	2,00	2,00	1,75	1,75	2,00	2,00	2,00	4,00	3,00	2,00	3,00
Mean	3,00	2,44	3,95	6,58	3,22	4,21	7,36	8,93	8,75	5,79	7,64	5,85	7,13
Standard Deviation	2,14	2,02	1,96	2,12	1,44	1,25	2,24	1,36	1,13	2,75	1,86	2,58	2,59
QUESTION 10													
	ANC	DA	COPE	IFP	ID	UDM	FFP	ACDP	UCDP	PAC	MF	AZAPO	APC
Number of expert responses, N	34	35	27	28	24	20	26	24	17	19	16	20	12
Median	2,00	2,00	3,00	5,50	3,00	4,00	5,50	6,50	5,00	6,00	6,50	5,00	6,00
Interquartile Range	3,00	3,00	2,50	3,00	2,25	3,25	2,00	3,00	3,00	3,00	2,50	3,00	2,50
Mean	2,44	2,74	2,89	5,18	3,29	3,60	5,35	6,04	5,71	5,00	5,75	4,45	5,25
Standard Deviation	1,73	2,29	1,76	2,60	2,33	2,46	2,58	2,79	3,14	2,62	3,26	2,50	2,99