

The APRM Process in South Africa: An Overview

**By
Khabele Matlosa***

February 2006

1.0. Conceptual and Contextual Background

My prefatory remarks in this section rotate around four ideas regarding South Africa's current democratic moment. First that since 1994 there has been a democratic transition and that transition has given birth to the current democratic dispensation now underway. But, it should be recognized that all transitions are dynamic and dialectical in the sense that they are marked by continuity and discontinuity. In other words, there are certain elements of transition that would be completed at a certain point in history while others may continue over a longer duration of time. South Africa has undergone a profound transition since the early 1990s. This transition is primarily two-pronged: (a) transition from war to peace (both internally and externally) and (b) transition from a racial segregation and minority-based authoritarian rule to multiracialism and majority-based democratic rule. These two trajectories of transition followed decades of a protracted war of liberation waged by nationalist movements, including the currently ruling African National Congress (ANC), which culminated in a negotiated settlement and the first democratic election of 1994 that ushered in a transitional Government of National Unity (GNU) under the leadership of Nelson Mandela, as the first President of the new democratic South Africa. There is no gainsaying, therefore that the release of Nelson Mandela from Robben Island Prison and his assumption of the presidency of Africa's giant state represented the climax of South Africa's successful political transition, perceived by many as a 'miracle' (see Sparks, 2003; Calland and Graham, 2005).

Mandela was succeeded by Thabo Mbeki, the second President of a democratic South Africa in 1999, at the time when the GNU was experiencing political strains resulting in the then Deputy President, F.W. de Klerk, withdrawing from what Sparks terms "an unnatural coalition of ex-enemies with different agendas and no agreed common policy framework" (2003:10). President Thabo Mbeki has already served his first term in office and is completing his second term which ends in 2009. During his tenure as president, Nelson Mandela focused enormous attention upon reconciliation and national unity, espousing what the veteran cleric and Noble Peace Prize-Winner, Rev. Desmond Tutu, terms "The Rainbow Nation" (see Butler, 2004). While still continuing Mandela's agenda of reconciliation and national unity, Thabo Mbeki has been pre-occupied mainly with service delivery and in that way allowing democracy to change peoples' lives positively hence the ANC's 2004 election manifesto entitled "better life for all". Further more, Mbeki has also made tremendous effort in turning South Africa into not just a peace-keeper and peace-maker in Africa, but more importantly as a promoter of democratic values, principles and norms. Thus, while South Africa has been painstakingly consolidating its own democracy at home, it has also actively involved in democracy promotion abroad.

The second ideation rotates around the extent to which South Africa's transition is leading to the consolidation of democracy and peace. All transitions in post-conflict societies in Africa and elsewhere in the world have been confronted with a daunting double burden of building democratic institutions, systems and values while at the same time building peace. This has required a lot of effort towards not only democratizing society, but also striving towards national harmony, reconciliation, nation-building and constructive management of conflict. The key question to pose here is whether or not the successful transition (from a protracted violent conflict and from a segregationist authoritarian rule) is resulting in the consolidation of democracy and peace both of which constitute *a condition sine qua non* for economic development and social advancement.

The third idea relates to the formal or procedural democracy versus substantive democracy or put simply the extent to which the constitution provides for certain kinds of democratic institutions and systems, yet in practice these institutions and systems do not broaden and deepen democracy. There is no gainsaying that South Africa has one of the most liberal constitutions in the whole world. Having a brilliant constitution is one thing and building a culture of constitutionalism is quite another. In a word, formal and procedural aspects of a democratic system are enshrined in constitutions, but the substantive aspects of democracy are realized when a culture of constitutionalism exists whereby the constitution becomes a living and lived experience of the people. Thus, while the constitution is a document and constitutionalism is the lived experience of the provisions of the constitution. For instance, when the constitution provides for a bill of rights are all those enjoyed by the South African citizens? (see South African Human Rights Commission, 2006).

The fourth ideation revolves around the notion of the existence in post-apartheid South Africa of a state capable of driving development, democratizing society and building peace. Evidence abounds suggesting that a developmental state is emerging in South Africa (see Southall, 2006). Five basic criteria for a developmental state are: (a) strong and capable state; (b) resource endowment to support state-driven policy initiatives; (c) market-friendly state interventionism in the development process; (d) development of policies that are responsive to socio-economic needs of the people; and (e) democratic state-society relations in which the state provides ample room for organized non-state social formations to express themselves and hold it to account while these formations, themselves, engage the state democratically and constructively (see Landsberg and Mackay, 2005). Evidently, since the 1994 transition, the notion of a developmental state has gained momentum in South Africa. Various policy initiatives do suggest that a developmental state exists or at least is emerging in South Africa. These include the 1994 Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP), in particular, which a social welfarist project aimed principally at redressing social ills of the apartheid era. South Africa needs not just a developmental state, but a democratic developmental state; a state that pursues development and peace in tandem in a democratic manner and not in an authoritarian fashion.

Casting the net broadly, we investigate how far the South African transition has gone thus far; its impact on the nurturing and consolidation of democracy and peace; the extent to which formal and substantive aspects of democracy intersect and how these give meaning to constitutionalism. Democratic transitions exhibit both continuities and discontinuities and are therefore dynamic. Ideally a democratic transition is supposed to lead to the nurturing and consolidation of democracy and peace. Democracy and peace should not only exist in well-crafted constitutions only, but should form part and parcel of the living and lived experience of citizens. Development and peace in post-apartheid South Africa require a deliberate development and institutionalization of a democratic developmental state. On all the four fronts of the South African governance architecture what achievements has the country made since 1994? What challenges still remain for the foreseeable future? This chapter, therefore, seeks to provide the status of the country's governance regime highlighting progress and remaining bottlenecks. We do this by focusing on four main areas namely (a) political developments; (b) economic management; (c) socio-economic development; and (d) developments in the corporate sector.

2.0. Political Governance Architecture

During the apartheid era, South Africa was not at peace with itself. Neither was South Africa at peace with its neighbours. The apartheid state faced resistance from the oppressed majority of the country's citizens. At the same time, the apartheid state also unleashed a war of aggression against its neighbours. Apartheid repression at home and aggression abroad invited the country's international isolation and support for the liberation movements.

2.1. Intra-State Conflict

Since the negotiated settlement of the liberation war and the transition to majority rule, internal peace has prevailed in South Africa. Whereas there have been incidences of intra-state conflict, especially those linked to elections, more so in KwaZulu-Natal province, the country has never experienced a large-scale and protracted violent conflict since 1994 (See Calland & Graham, 2005). Some of the recent conflicts have arisen as part of social disaffection regarding provision of social services to local communities and re-demarcation of boundaries across wards and provinces. In managing intra-state conflicts broadly, including election-related disputes, South Africa uses the following mechanisms:

- The Constitution;
- Conflict Management Panels;
- Party Liaison Committees;
- The Independent Electoral Commission;
- The Electoral Court;
- The Constitutional Court.

By and large, at present, the country enjoys a peace dividend that has come, in part, as a result of the transition to majority rule and its accompanying democratic dispensation. Be that as it may, it is worth noting, though, that intra-state conflicts in South Africa's neighbours do pose a serious security challenge to South Africa itself; a stable South Africa in an unstable regional context is as good as imagining a tail wag the dog. Sustainable political stability in South Africa, perforce, requires sustainable stability on a regional scale and vice versa.

2.2. Inter-State Conflict

The internal peace dividend of the democratic transition is buttressed by the existing peaceful co-existence between South Africa and its neighbours within Southern Africa and the African continent as a whole (Vale, 2004; Butler, 2004; Sidiropoulos, 2004; Landsberg, 2005; Southall, 2006). South Africa is an active member of the Southern African Development Community (SADC) since 1994. After decades of developing not apart from, but also against, the other southern African states, South Africa is now part and parcel of the region (Adedeji, 2003). Instead of pursuing a regional war of aggression akin to the destabilization campaign of the yesteryear, South Africa now pursues the agenda of regional integration through multilateral arrangements such as the Southern African Customs Union (SACU) and SADC. In like manner, South Africa also pursues continental integration through various inter-governmental institutions such as the African Union (AU) and its major organs espousing a continental project of African Renaissance aimed, in the main, at African unity.

Although South Africa pursues a foreign policy of peace-building and conflict management, it has had to contend with the negative image that a historical baggage of apartheid destabilization imposes. The diplomatic fall-out between Nelson Mandela's South Africa and Sani Abacha's Nigeria in 1995 around the seemingly deteriorating political situation in Nigeria especially following the military junta's execution the human rights activist Ken Saro-Wiwa and eight other Ogoni minority rights activists (see Adebajo, 2004). Peter Kagwanja recalls the developments around this incident by observing that "an outraged Mandela issued his famous threat that Abacha was 'sitting on a volcano and I am going to explode it under him' and started a spirited campaign for Nigeria's expulsion from the Commonwealth during the organisation's Heads of Government Meeting in Auckland, New Zealand"(Kagwanja, 2006: 32). Adekeye Adebajo also reminds us that

South Africa's president called on Washington and London to impose oil sanctions on Abacha, and advocated Nigeria's expulsion from the Commonwealth. On his return home, Mandela recalled his high commissioner to Nigeria, George Nene, who had been somewhat unfairly criticised by South African civil society groups for not having made contact with Nigerian opposition leaders and gaining better access to a notoriously reclusive leadership (2004:6).

This incident, in the eyes of the critics, reinforced the then prevalent perception of a South Africa that is poised to project itself throughout the continent as a marauding 'bull in a Chinese shop' buoyed by the economic muscle and military might to push its weight around with impunity. Worse, still, South Africa seemed to have touched a sensitive

nerve in African diplomacy of solidarity and was thus “accused by many African leaders of becoming a western Trojan horse sowing seeds of division in Africa and undermining African solidarity”(Adebajo, 2004:6). Some observers used a more or less similar pattern of argumentation in castigating the military intervention of South Africa during the 1998 Lesotho political crisis, arguing that it was ironic that, opting for preventive diplomacy, the Mandela government had vehemently opposed a military intervention in the war in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) by Angola, Namibia and Zimbabwe, yet South Africa opted for a ‘bully boy’ military solution to the Lesotho crisis (see Vale, 2004). During the Lesotho crisis, 600 South African troops were deployed and eight South Africa soldiers and 58 Basotho were killed. Whatever the merits and demerits of these arguments, the fact of the matter is that South Africa has learnt serious lessons from its diplomatic debacle in Nigeria and the unpalatable ‘aftertaste’ of the military intervention in Lesotho. Consequently, upon Mbeki’s assumption of the Presidency, a deliberate foreign policy shift was noticeable. These can be summed as follows:

- Preventive diplomacy;
- Multilateral interventions through supra-national bodies;
- Accelerated involvement in peace-keeping missions;
- Constructive management of conflicts through negotiations;
- Building regional and continental institutions/mechanisms for conflict management

All the five elements of South Africa’s current approach to conflicts in Africa have featured in its involvement in conflict resolution in the DRC, Sudan, Cote d’Ivoire and Burundi. While South Africa’s ‘quiet diplomacy’ towards Zimbabwe (see Sachikonye, 2005) has been vehemently criticized by the Western world, in particular, the continuing constitutional crisis in Swaziland has tended to lead to cold relations between South Africa and the Kingdom. South Africa’s interventions in managing regional conflicts and peace-making are governed by specific legislation including the White Paper on South African Participation in International Peace Missions (1999) and the South African Foreign Military Assistance Act (1998). Recently, South Africa has given boost to its peace-making and peace-keeping role by creating the African Renaissance and International Cooperation Fund providing the requisite resources for post-conflict reconstruction and development initiatives. Given its emphasis on multilateralism as a pillar of its foreign policy, South Africa intervenes in regional conflicts through regional/continental supra-national bodies including, but not limited to:

- The African Standby Force of the African Union;
- African Union Peace and Security Council;
- SADC Organ on Politics, Defence and Security;
- The SADC Standby Brigade;
- SADC Parliamentary Forum
- Electoral Commissions Forum of SADC Countries;
- The Southern African Regional Police Chiefs Cooperation Organisation (SARPPCO);
- New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD);

- Pan-African Parliament (PAP);
- Joint and Bi-National Commissions through bilateral relations with selected countries

2.3. Constitutional Democracy

2.3.1. The Constitutional & Institutional Framework

South Africa boasts one of the most liberal constitutions in the world. The constitutional framework provides a firm legal and institutional anchor for a thriving liberal democracy. The Constitution, which was adopted in 1996, provides for common citizenship and equality among all the citizens irrespective of their race, sex, tribe etc with a mandate “to build a united, non-racial, non-sexist, prosperous and democratic South Africa, to ensure better life for all” founded upon the following values:

- Human dignity, the achievement of equality and the advancement of human rights and freedoms;
- Non-racialism and non-sexism;
- Supremacy of the constitution and the rule of law;
- Universal adult suffrage, a national common voters’ roll, regular elections and a multi-party system of democratic government, to ensure accountability, responsiveness and openness (South African Government, 1996)

The constitution further provides for a comprehensive bill of rights and provides for establishment of various state institutions supporting constitutional democracy such as:

- The Public Protector;
- The Human Rights Commission;
- The Commission for the Promotion and Protection of the Rights of Cultural, Religious and Linguistic Communities;
- The Commission for Gender Equality;
- The Auditor-General; and
- The Electoral Commission

2.4. The Judiciary

It is worth noting that over and above the statutory bodies mentioned above, South Africa’s democracy also rests upon an independent judiciary and there exists a Constitutional Court which plays a crucial role in promoting and protecting the principles and values of the country’s democracy. The independence of the judiciary is provided in section 165 of the Constitution and in practice, there have been no instances of political interference in the judiciary. The judiciary operates within the confines of the constitution as supreme law and the rule of law and not in accordance with the whims and caprices of politicians individually or as a collective. Judges are appointed by the Judicial Services Commission (JSC) which is established by section 178 (1) of the Constitution. Both the Chief Justice and the Deputy Chief Justice are appointed by the President following

consultations with political parties and parliament. Other judges are appointed by the President upon recommendation from the Judicial Service Commission (JSC).

Magistrates are appointed in terms of the Magistrates Act 90 of 1993 which, among others, establishes the Magistrates Commission. The magistrates are appointed by the Minister of Justice after consultations with the Magistrates Commission. Section 176 of the Constitution guarantees security of tenure for judges. The tenure of office for judges of the Constitutional Court is 12 years non-renewable and retirement at the age of 70. Other judges can hold office until they are discharged for various reasons or they reach age 70. The tenure of office for magistrates is spelled out in section 13 of the Magistrates Act. Magistrates can hold office until the age of 65. Judges can be removed from office by the President upon a two-thirds majority in Parliament pass a motion in this regard. But this can only happen upon the JSC having made a case for removal due to either misconduct or ill health etc. Magistrates can be removed from office upon recommendation by the Magistrates Commission to the Minister of Justice due either misconduct or ill-health.

2.5. The Legislature

The independence of the National Assembly and the National Council of Provinces is established by Chapter IV of the Constitution. Through the legislature two types of accountability are supposed to be ensured namely (a) horizontal accountability which means the accountability of the executive to the legislature and (b) vertical accountability which means accountability of MPs to the electorate who elected them into parliament. With regard to horizontal accountability, there is evidence that both houses of parliament do play their role in holding the executive to account, although some critics have raised the issue of dominant party system as having the potential to diminish the effectiveness of parliament in this regard. However, no concrete evidence has been adduced suggesting that the dominance of the ruling ANC and the enfeeblement of the opposition parties is weakening the legislature and compromising its independence. Parliament is granted powers to establish various mechanisms to ensure oversight over the executive. These include independent members' bills, plenary debates, question time and the committee system, among others. Although, overall, the system has worked well so far, there have been instances where parliament has been criticized for being a little reluctant to openly criticize executive action including the controversial stances of the executive on the HIV/AIDS, quiet diplomacy towards Zimbabwe, and the Arms deal. But other instances where parliament has been seen to take a back seat relate to the following:

- Debating the electoral model as part of the ETT process initiated by the Presidency in 2001;
- Debating South Africa's political system and clarifying whether or not it should be a parliamentary model or a presidential model or a hybrid system and in each case how exactly the relationship between the executive and the legislature should be;
- Focus of parliament has tended to be on over-turning the apartheid statute books hence between 1994 & 2003 parliament passed 90 pieces of legislation per

annum. While this is an impressive record, this has tended to shift parliament's focus away from oversight to law-making. There is need to balance both responsibilities.

Much more daunting challenges for the legislature relate to horizontal accountability. The main challenge relates to the manner in which MPs are elected and how they in turn maintain the linkage with the electorate. MPs are elected through the Proportional Representation system and not the First-Past-The-Post system and in this way, their election is dependent upon party bigwigs who determine the party list. The MPs then tend to be beholden to party leaders and this tends to undermine their accountability and responsiveness to the electorate and this horizontal accountability is further compromised by the 'now trendy' floor-crossing phenomenon. We have suggested elsewhere in this report that the practice of floor-crossing should be repealed as it does not conform to the conventions of the PR model. We have also suggested that there is need to rethink a prudent strategy for making MPs much more accountable to the electorate while not necessarily changing the current PR electoral model per se.

2.6. The Electoral System & Party System

The Constitution, thus, lays a framework for South Africa's liberal democracy to evolve. In order to ensure a fair competition for state power and fair representation in parliament, section 46 of the constitution provides that the National Assembly shall be constituted of a minimum of 350 and maximum of 400 men and women elected on the basis of an electoral system that ensures, in general, proportional representation. Hence it was that since 1994, South Africa has operated the Proportional Representation (PR) system for the election of MPs and a mixed-member proportional system for the election of councilors. There is no doubt that this system has been extremely useful in assisting the country achieving the following, inter alia:

- Fair distribution of votes cast;
- Fair representation of parties in the National Assembly;
- Reconciliation and national harmony;
- Constructive management of conflict;
- Enhanced women's participation in the democratic process.

In other words, it could be argued that the PR electoral system is helpful for building democratic institutions, culture and practice in post-conflict societies as illustrated also by the cases of Mozambique and Namibia. However, the implementation of the PR electoral model has triggered controversy that triggered, among others, the appointment of the Electoral Task Team (ETT), headed by Prof. van Zyl Slabbert, to review the electoral model and make appropriate recommendations. Some highlights of the controversies around the electoral system are in order. First, given the fact that the model concentrates political power in the hands of the party bigwigs, it is argued that the Member of Parliament (MP) tends to get beholden to party bosses and is not closely linked to any specific constituency to which s/he is accountable, responsive and responsible. This brings about a dilemma of the so-called 'faceless MP'. Second, centralization of power in

the hands of the party leadership tends to accentuate patronage politics especially where the party list is developed through a close-list, not open-list, system. Third, it is also common cause that while PR is indeed conducive for gender equality, enhancement of women's participation and representation in parliament, is also pretty much dependent upon deliberate party quotas adopted by parties themselves as well as the commitment of the party leadership towards gender parity. Fourth, while conventionally, the PR electoral model does not allow floor-crossing of MPs whereby an MP can move from his/her party and join another party in parliament without losing his/her seat, in South Africa, this is allowed since 2001.

Contrary to the recommendations of majority report of the ETT, South Africa does not necessarily have to reform its electoral model at this moment. The challenge is not so much to change the current model, but rather finding creative ways of making the MPs more accountable to the people who elected them and less so to the party bigwigs who determine the party lists and one step towards doing this is to adopt an open party list system. The current PR electoral system should be maintained, but improved upon to address issues of MPs accountability to the people. It is also important that the model is applied appropriately and in this regard, it was surely imprudent for the government to facilitate the passage of a legislation allowing MPs and councilors to cross the floor. It is imperative that this error of judgment be rectified through the expeditious repeal of the said legislation. Another challenge confronting South Africa's electoral politics is the overwhelming political hegemony of the ruling party and the enfeeblement and fragmentation of opposition parties. This situation leads to a dominant party situation whereby even in the context of a multiplicity of parties, only one party reproduces itself over time as the ruling party with little challenge, if any, from opposition parties as the results of general elections of 1994, 1999 and 2004 clearly illustrate.

2.6.1. The Election Results and their Implications

The outcomes of the 1994, 1999 and 2004 elections were derived using this calculation culminating in the results as illustrated in tables 1, 2 & 3 below.

Table 1: 1994 South African Election Results

Party	Total Votes	% of Votes	Parliamentary Seats	% of Seats
African National Congress (ANC)	12 237 655	62.65	252	63
National Party (NP)	3 983 690	20.39	82	20.5
Inkatha Freedom Party (IFP)	2 058 294	10.54	43	10.75
Freedom Front (FF)	424 555	2.17	9	2.25
Democratic Party (DP)	338 426	1.73	7	1.75
Pan-African Congress of Azania (PAC)	243 478	1.25	5	1.25
African Christian Democratic Party (ACDP)	88 104	0.45	2	0.5
SOOCER	10 575	0.05	0	0
Keep it Straight and Simple (KISS)	5 916	0.03	0	0
Workers Rights Peace Party (WRPP)	6 434	0.03	0	0
Workers List Party (WLP)	4 169	0.02	0	0
Ximoko Progressive Party (XPP)	6 320	0.03	0	0
African Muslim Party (AMP)	34 466	0.18	0	
African Democratic Movement (ADM)	9 886	0.05	0	0
Dikwankwetla Party of South Africa (DPSA)	19 451	0.10	0	0
Federal Party (FP)	17 663	0.09	0	0
Luso-SA Party (LUSAP)	3 293	0.02	0	0
Miniroty Front (MF)	13 433	0.07	0	0
Total	19 533 498	100.0	400	100.0

Source: Independent Electoral Commission (IEC), 1994.

It is interesting to note how both the political opening brought about by the transition and the low threshold of the electoral model triggered a phenomenal mushrooming of political parties as shown in the table above. However, despite the proliferation of parties, essentially the main players in the South African politics following the founding election of new democracy were the ANC (63% of the votes), National Party (20% of the votes), Inkatha Freedom Party (11% of the votes), Freedom Front (2% of the votes), Democratic Party (2% of the votes) and the Pan-African Congress (1% of the votes). It is abundantly evident that despite the multiplicity of parties and broad representation on parliament, the

ANC has remained a hegemonic force in South African politics and this situation was further demonstrated by the outcome of the 1999 election illustrated in table 2 below.

Table 2: 1999 South African Election Results

Party	Votes won	% of Votes	Parliamentary Seats	% of Seats
African National Congress (ANC)	10 601 330	66.35	266	66.5
Democratic Party (DP)	1 527 337	9.56	38	9.5
Inkatha Freedom Party (IFP)	1 371 477	8.58	34	8.5
New National Party (NNP)	1 098 215	6.87	28	7
United Democratic Movement (UDM)	546 790	3.42	14	3.5
African Christian Democratic Party (ACDP)	228 975	1.43	6	1.5
Freedom Front (FF)	127 217	0.8	3	0.75
United Christian Democratic Party (UCDP)	125 280	0.78	3	0.75
Pan-African Congress of Azania (PAC)	113 125	0.71	3	0.75
Federal Alliance (FA)	86 704	0.54	2	0.5
Minority Front (MF)	48 227	0.3	1	0.25
Afrikaner Eenheidsbewiging (AEB)	46 292	0.25	1	0.25
Azanian Peoples' Organisation (AZAPO)	27 257	0.17	1	0.25
Abolition of Income Tax and Usury Party (AITUP)	10 611	0.07	0	0
Government by the People Green Party (GPGP)	9 193	0.06	0	0
Socialist Party of Azania (SOPA)	9 062	0.06	0	0
Total	15 977 142	100.0	400	100.0

Source: Independent Electoral Commission (IEC), 1999.

As happened in the 1994 election, the ANC scored a landslide victory in the 1999 election snatching 66% of the total valid votes, while the main opposition – the Democratic Party – was able to pocket a paltry 10%. The ANC electoral hegemony is firmly entrenched in South Africa and the election result of 2004 (see table 3 below) reinforces the dominant party system marked by an overwhelmingly strong ruling party on one hand and exceedingly enfeebled and fragmented opposition parties on the other.

In fact, as parties began to gear themselves up for the 2004 election, the ANC's primary strategy was to maintain its political hegemony while the opposition parties aimed principally to put up a spirited fight not so much to win state power as such, but rather to narrow the margin of the ANC's already presumed victory even well in advance of the electoral contest itself. So far, post-apartheid South Africa has held three general elections in 1994, 1999 and 2004. The fourth general election is due in 2009. It has also held two local government elections in 1995 and 1999 and its third local government election since the 1994 political transition was held on 1st March 2006.

Table 3: 2004 South African Election Results

Party	Total Votes	% of Votes	Parliamentary Seats	% of Seats
African National Congress (ANC)	10 878 251	69.68	279	69.75
New National Party (NNP)	257 824	1.65	7	1.75
Inkatha Freedom Party (IFP)	1 088 664	6.97	28	7
Independent Democrats (ID)	269 765	1.73	7	1.75
Freedom Front (FF)	139 465	0.89	4	1
Democratic Alliance (DA)	1 931 201	12.37	50	12.5
Pan-African Congress of Azania (PAC)	113 512	0.73	3	0.75
African Christian Democratic Party (ACDP)	250 272	1.6	6	1.5
Azania Peoples' Organisation (AZAPO)	41 776	0.27	2	0.5
United Democratic Movement (UDM)	355 717	2.28	9	2.25
United Front (UF)	11 889	0.08	0	0
Freedom Front+ (FF+)	139 465	0.89	4	1
United Christian Democratic Party (UCDP)	117 792	0.75	3	0.75
Minority Front (MF)	55 267	0.35	2	0.5
The Socialist Party of Azania (SOPA)	14 853	0.1	0	0
New Labour Party (NLP)	13 318	0.09	0	0
The Organisation Party (TOP)	7 531	0.05	0	0
Keep it Straight and Simple (KISS)	6 514	0.04	0	0
Nationale Aksie (NA)	15 804	0.1	0	0

Peace and Justice Congress (PJC)	15 187	0.1	0	0
The Employment Movement of South Africa (EMSA)	10 446	0.07	0	0
Total	15 612 667	100.0	400	100.0

Source: Independent Electoral Commission (IEC), 2004.

What is vividly obvious from tables 3 above is that the PR allots parliamentary seats to parties almost in direct proportion to their electoral strength. This demonstrates the fairness and inclusivity of this system. Consider for instance the correlation between the party's percentage of votes won and the percentage of seats acquired and see how closely related these are and this suggests that the number of seats won by each party is inextricably commensurate with its electoral strength. For instance, the ruling ANC won 62.65% of votes and a commensurate 63% of seats in 1994. In 1999, this party won 66.35% of votes and 66.5% of parliamentary seats. In 2004, this party won 69.68% of votes and a corresponding 69.75% of seats. Direct correlation of votes won and seats won by parties is a rare or scarce political commodity under the FPTP system.

It is worth noting, though, that in and of itself, dominant party syndrome does not represent a weakness of the democratic system. It simply speaks to the configuration of political power among political parties as key constants for the control of the state. The main challenges posed by the dominant party syndrome and enfeeblement of opposition parties in South Africa rotate around the following:

- Institutionalising and deepening internal party democracy;
- Constructive management of intra-party conflicts (e.g. conflicts within the ruling tripartite alliance);
- Management and sustenance of party coalition or alliance politics (see Kadima, 2006);
- Centralisation of power within party executives and the presidency in the case of a ruling party;
- Managing divisive politics of leadership succession with a view to avoid political crises that beset Malawi and Zambia in 2000 and 2004 respectively; and
- Deliberate strategies for linking MPs more to the electorate than to the party bigwigs.

It is therefore the responsibility of both ruling and opposition parties in a situation of dominant party syndrome and enfeebled opposition to work for their political advantage, but at the same time guarding jealously the principal tenets of democracy including accountability, responsiveness, transparency and openness striving more for public interests than the self-serving interests of party leaders. This last point brings into sharp relief the controversial issue public resources used to support parties including public funding.

2.7. Party Funding

Without support through public funding, parties may not be able to survive and play their role as agents of democracy. In South Africa, political parties receive public funding through the IEC and get their own private funding on their own accord without any legislation compelling them to publicly disclose this information in conformity with the Promotion of Access to Information Act, 2000. While public funding for political parties is less contentious, private funding of parties is a major contentious issue. We can isolate five (5) main problems with respect to private funding for political parties as follows:

- donations often come with strings attached;
- donations are never (or are hardly ever) publicly disclosed;
- donations are not (are hardly ever) regulated in the same way as public funding;
- in utilising private donations, parties are not accountability to either EMB or registration authority; and
- private donations to parties also present a risk of undue influence of money on politics and the democratic process.

In a recent study undertaken by the Institute for Democracy in South Africa (IDASA), three (3) possible options open to countries for purposes of dealing with private funding for political parties are (a) a highly regulated system in which no private funding is allowed altogether; (b) a laissez faire system in which private funding is unregulated, as is the situation in a number of SADC countries now; and (c) a middle ground option in which private funding is allowed, but within certain limits and with a regulatory framework encompassing public disclosures and accountability by political parties (IDASA, 2003:4). For International IDEA, global experiences suggest the existence of about four (4) options with regard to how private funding for political parties is handled:

- The autonomy option which essentially treat parties as voluntary associations entitled to unregulated of their internal organisation and financial transactions (e.g. Sweden);
- The transparency option which emphasises the right of citizens to know and their ability to judge party behaviour including fund-raising, income and expenditure as well as financial accountability (e.g. Germany);
- The advocacy option which emphasises the need for the creation of a public agency whose main task would be to monitor and check the flow of funds to parties on behalf of the general public (e.g. USA); and
- The diversified regulation option which is basically an admixture of interrelated strategies including benign neglect, precise regulation, public incentives and occasional sanctions (e.g. Canada) (IDEA, 2003:10-13).

It is abundantly evident from the above discussion, especially the various options for private funding from IDASA and IDEA studies, that there are no easy and straight forward solutions to the complex issue of party funding. South Africa still needs to find the right formula for party funding taking into consideration the need for fair play and level playing field, prudent utilization of public resources, ensuring public disclosure and the right to know and encouraging a vibrant multi-party system that is the hallmark of the country's liberal democracy.

2.8. Local Governance

There is no doubt that South Africa's democratic transition which was mediated principally through the 1994 multiparty elections marked a beginning of a new social, economic and political dispensation in the country. A democratically elected government came into being with a mandate to craft and implement policy and institutional reforms that would, amongst other things, ensure the creation of a free and just society and improve socio-economic conditions (especially for the marginalized social groups). Although remaining a unitary state, South Africa has evolved a fairly decentralised system with three main tiers of governance that are distinct, albeit interdependent, namely (a) national level; (b) provincial level and (c) local government sphere.

Thus the governance process becomes a chain linking national government to provincial government and down to local government authorities. At all levels the government structures are constituted through democratic elections. Local government is surely the primary level of democratic expression as it is closest to communities. In a thriving democracy, governance responsiveness to citizens' aspirations is better and effectively expressed through local authorities, among other institutions. It was this realisation that prompted the government to introduce the Integrated Development Planning (IDP) in 2001. Like the Reconstruction and Development Programme, the IDP is intended to reverse the historical imbalances of the apartheid era at the community level. It is a five-year planning framework and its core elements focus on three intertwined elements namely:

- Municipal planning must be developmentally oriented;
- Municipal planning must ensure cooperative government; and
- Local government must adopt integrated development plans (Government of South Africa, 2001)

Following a successful political transition in 1994 and subsequent general elections and local government elections in 1999 and 2000 respectively, the nurturing and consolidation of the country's democracy was set apace. The challenge of building democracy at both national and local community level is no mean task. Often the focus of government tends to be towards institutionalising democracy at national level and either by design or by default forgetting the critical area of community development and democracy at local level. It is encouraging that South Africa's new-found democracy has also embraced institutionalisation of local governance. To this end, government evoked

provisions of the new Constitution adopted in 1996 to establish a new system of local government. This sphere of government has a clear mandate to provide democratic and accountable governance in its area of jurisdiction and to encourage the community organisations to participate in local governance.

The first local government elections in 2000 ushered in a new system of democratic local governance whereby municipalities are not just another extension of government bureaucracy (power de-concentration) but are rather organs of state that are central to deepening democracy, advance human rights, promote good governance and involve the citizenry in governance (power devolution). Given the meagre resources at their disposal, municipalities have constantly faced the challenge to harmonize the competing interests and to satisfy their entire constituencies. This has often caused dissatisfaction among the electorate as witnessed in the recent sporadic outbreaks of mass protests for service delivery in the Free State and Western Cape provinces (and other provinces in the country). It is worth noting that despite these challenges, a lot of landmarks were made in local government as a sphere and within individual municipalities around the country. These developments include efforts to strengthen institutional structures, deliver services, facilitating community participation and alleviating poverty. While the ability, extent and pace at which these activities were undertaken vary from one municipality to another, one major success story in terms of poverty alleviation at local level relates to the system of social grants whose beneficiaries increased from about 2.6 million in 1994 to about 5.1 million in 2003. In terms of access to services, since 1994, an additional 6 million people have housing; 86% of the population have access to clean portable water; 70 % have access to electricity; and government provides free basic health services to mothers and children.

Thus, local government elections of 2006 were a critical political barometer for gauging citizen participation in South Africa's vibrant democracy. It worth noting that while there is abundant evidence that citizen participation rate is quite high in general elections judging by the experiences of the 1994, 1999 and 2004 elections, this has tended to be rather low in local government elections as experienced in 1999 and 2006. An election is an indicator of the extent to which citizens truly participate in public decision making. Elections occupy a central place in determining citizens' satisfaction of how well the government has performed in fostering a wide range of institutions of participatory democracy. In the local elections of the 1st March 2006, voter turn-out was far less than 50% and this is an indictment to citizens' interest in this sphere of governance and the public trust in local government authorities. It is possible that the efficacy (or lack thereof) of service delivery combined with protests against re-demarcation of municipalities may have influenced the low voter turn-out in 2006 local government elections. Thus the challenges facing local governance in South Africa can be summed as follows:

- Deepening devolution of power to local authorities while maintaining the unitary state system through a cooperative governance within the framework of the Intergovernmental Relations Framework Act of 2004;

- Providing local authorities with the resources they require to meet their developmental mandate including human, technological and financial wherewithal;
- It is also imperative that while modern structures of local governance are strengthened, traditional institutions of governance such as the chiefs are not sidelined, but rather mainstreamed into the democratic process at the local level and to this end, the Congress of Traditional Leaders in South Africa (CONTRALESAs) has to be fully engaged in all efforts aimed at devolution of powers;
- Combating corruption and lack of public accountability of some local authorities with a view to accelerating community development and democracy at local level;
- Effective implementation of Project Consolidate which aims at supporting local municipalities in which currently about 136 form part of the project; and
- Floor-crossing for members of local authorities tends to diminish public trust in these institutions, the same way it does to the National Assembly and for this reason, needs to be reviewed and ultimately repealed by parliament.

2.9. Gender and Democracy

South Africa is a state party to various international instruments on gender equality including the 2003 AU protocol committing member states to 50:50 gender parity in its key organs as well as the 1997 SADC Declaration on Gender and Development which committed member states to achieving 30% representation of women in key organs of the state by 2005 and following the Gaborone Summit of 2005, member states have now committed themselves to a 50:50 gender parity. South Africa is one of the few SADC countries that have been able to achieve agreed continental and regional benchmarks for gender equality. Besides its established Commission on Gender Equality, South Africa has formulated the National Policy Framework for Women's Empowerment in striving towards gender parity.

Currently, since 2005, the Deputy President is a woman, Mrs. Phumzile Mlambo-Ngcuka, the first woman deputy head of state. Women ministers and deputy ministers have increased from 12 (31.57%) in 1997 to 22 (44.89%). National Assembly has about one-third of its members (32.75%) being women. The Speaker, Madam Baleka Mbete, and Deputy Speaker of National Assembly are women. Four out of nine Premiers of the Provinces are women. There are 19 women (35.18%) who are Permanent Members of the National Council of Provinces (NCOP). At the provincial level, women represent 32.3% of MPs in the provincial legislature. As for the judiciary, of the 207 judges only 28 are women (a paltry 13.52%) one of whom is the deputy judge president. There are 632 female magistrates (35%). Within the civil service, 52.5% of the staff complement comprises women.

Although the data above is not meant to provide an exhaustive indication of women's participation in all spheres of governance, it is sufficient enough to provide a snap-shot of the state of women's representation in key organs of the state. These data indicate that there is commitment on the part of the government and the ruling party to strive towards

gender parity in the country at all layers of society. However, a point needs to be raised that bringing women in numbers in key positions is one thing, while granting them the requisite power and authority that goes with those positions is quite another.

The current discourse on gender and governance suggests that there is dire need to transcend sheer numbers in striving towards gender parity. All stakeholders have to ensure that the idea is not just to point to simple numbers or quantitative aspects in determining progress made in achieving gender parity. Much more importantly, there is need to inject qualitative value of gender equality by according women in key positions power and authority to influence and direct the policy trajectories of governments.

2.10. Civil Society and Governance

With the onset of the political transition from apartheid to democratic rule since the early 1990s, democracy discourse in South Africa, like elsewhere in Africa, has been marked by a critical probe into the state and role of civil society organisations in the governance process (see Landsberg, 2005; Landsberg and Mackay, 2005). This a welcome development, indeed, given that democratic governance is not the preserve of the state and the political elite alone; it is supposed to be the pre-occupation of an array of both state and non-state actors including government, business, labour, and non-governmental organisations. Landsberg and Mackay perceive civil society as “the realm in which citizens associate with one another to ensure that government and state institutions respond to their needs and are accountable to them. This requires that citizens enjoy independent access to the means to organise and, therefore, to resources. This entails civil society engaging the state in independent but critical fashion” (2005:7). Sachikonye corroborates the above definition by arguing that civil society is the “aggregate of institutions whose members are engaged primarily in a complex of non-state activities ... and who serve and transform their identity by exercising all sorts of pressure or controls upon state institutions” (Sachikonye, 1995:400).

These institutions do play an important role in the governance process and have been (and continue to be) influential in both the political transition and democratisation processes in Africa in general. Gyimah-Boadi refreshes our minds on this point too: “among the forces that dislodged entrenched authoritarianism in Africa and brought about the beginnings of formal democracy in the early 1990s, the continent’s nascent civil societies were in the forefront” (1996:118). Civil society organisations played a crucial role in the liberation struggle in South Africa and, subsequently, in the building of new post-apartheid democratic dispensation since the 1990s. However, the observations above should not be read to imply that civil society organisations, in and of themselves, are inherently democratic internally and in the manner in which they engage the state. As Sachikonye observes, “such organisations can be obstructive to the democratic process as was the case in the minority white settler societies, and in certain instances in other colonial contexts more generally” (1995:402). Chris Landsberg reminds us that,

There are an estimated 100,000 non-profit organisations in South Africa, most of them community based organisations (CBOs) in poor urban areas concerned with the welfare

and developmental needs of communities. Only a small percentage of non-governmental organisations (NGOs) organise to influence government in formal terms. Yet the majority of CBOs are the ones who do not have their voices heard; the policy debates and policy influence processes are dominated by small groups of organised NGOs rather than CBOs and grassroots organisations. The reach of these small NGOs inability or unwillingness to reach out to more ordinary grassroots organisations means that huge chunks of communities and peoples are excluded from having their voices heard. The small pockets of mainly urban-based NGOs are far better resourced than community-based organisations. They certainly dominate funding from the donor community, and typically speak on behalf of the poor, while in fact many are disconnected from the poor. The poor and weaker sectors of society therefore typically lack the means and resources to access official state channels for policy influence, and are neglected by the well-organised NGOs (2006:14).

There is therefore a tendency by urban-based and elite-driven organised social formations to monopolise the policy discourse assuming that they represent everyone while at the same time marginalising rural-based CBOs that are closer to the ordinary people in rural villages, yet the CBOs form the critical social capital for community development and daily livelihoods of the poor and marginalised.

3.0. Overview Macro-Economic Performance

3.1. Nature of the Economy

Not only has South Africa undergone a profound political transition since 1994, but, equally importantly, the country is also undergoing economic transformation. The democratization of the country that began in the early 1990s has also been accompanied an admixture of political stability and economic stability due largely to popular legitimacy of new government and prudent macro-economic management. South Africa has powerful economic with higher output than all other neighbouring Southern African states combined together and it is also the most robust, advanced and sophisticated economy in the whole African continent (Butler, 2004:47). The mainstay of the South African economy comprises the mining sector, the agricultural sector, the manufacturing sector and the services sector. According to Butler, “the country entered the twenty-first century a reasonably diversified and robust economy, dominated by the services sector (65 per cent) with the secondary sector (including manufacturing) accounting for 20 per cent and the primary sector for only 13 per cent”(2004:49). A combination of accelerated economic growth and curtailment of the inflation rate have attracted investment and allowed room for resources to be earmarked for social development and infrastructure development. The table 4 depicts trends in economic growth between 1996 and 2001.

Table 4: Economic Growth, 1996-2001

Year	GDP, 1995 Rand*	% Growth
1996	571 706	4.3
1997	586 838	2.6
1998	591 309	0.8
1999	603 842	2.1
2000	628 129	3.4
2001	638 010	2.2

Source: Butler, 2004:48

*GDP at constant 1995 prices (Rand millions)

3.2. Jobless Growth

Impressive as the economic growth and management of inflation have been, the South Africa economy still confronts structural problems linked to its bifurcation which Mbeki refers to as a paradox of “Two Nations with Two Economies”; one nation being predominantly white and prosperous (the first economy) and the other being predominantly black and impoverished (the second economy). It is this structural bifurcation that presents an enormous challenge for South Africa’s development trajectory. Whereas the political rainbow has evolved smoothly and with considerable amount of success since 1994, the economic rainbow tends to reinforce racial ‘apartness’ of the South Africa society “acquired during the segregationist and apartheid eras”(Butler, 2004:30). Daunting challenges that still confront the country’s economy include the following unemployment which is estimated to be in the region of 40.5%, poverty estimated in the region of 49.5% and the HIV/AIDS pandemic whose adult prevalent rate is estimated at 21.5%. The table 5 illustrates the indicators of poverty in South Africa.

Table 5: Poverty Indicators in South Africa

Poverty Indicators	1996	2000	2003
Human Development Index	0.724	0.696	0.658
Gini-Coefficient	0.60	0.63	0.64
Unemployment Rate	33.9%	33.1%	41.0%
Illiteracy Rate (% of population older than 20 years without Grade 7)	31.7%	29.4%	28.1%

People living in Poverty	40.5%	48.5%	49.5%
People earning Income Lower than US\$1 per day	4.5%	7.2%	9.4%

Source: Botes & van Rooyen, 2005:17.

Thus while South Africa has experienced positive, albeit low, economic growth rates since 1994, this has essentially been a ‘jobless growth’ with numbers of people engaged in formal non-agricultural employment plummeting (Butler, 2004:48). Further more, it is worth observing that despite economic growth, poverty has been on the increase, estimated at 40.5% in 1996 and up by about 9% by 2003. It should be cause for worry if democracy is not delivering jobs, health, housing, water, electricity, sanitation and other essential services with a view to ensuring better life for all. It should be cause for concern if democracy is not redressing poverty and illiteracy. This is the key challenge: how does the government ensure that political democracy so far achieved deliberately and systematically creates a conducive environment for uplifting the socio-economic well-being of the people, especially the poor and marginalized. According to Thipanyane, “while numerous measures, such as the Public Works programme and the housing and land programmes, have been instituted to eradicate poverty (...), 28% of households and 48% of the population lived below poverty line in 1995, while 33% of South Africa’s households were living below poverty line in 1999 (...). Most of these households were of African people. Poverty also had more impact on women than men. In this regard, 45% of female-headed households lived below the poverty line in 1999, compared with 26% of male headed households (...)” (2005:223). By 2006, the South African government, responding to the above challenges, had formulated a seven-point commitment to turn the economy around and improve social welfare as follows:

- Reduce inequalities;
- Reduce wealth – and- asset – gaps between the rich and the poor;
- Halve poverty and unemployment by 2014;
- Meet the Millennium Development Goals;
- Grow the economy by accelerating to an economic growth rate of at least 6% by 2010;
- Ensure that the benefits of economic growth are more equally distributed between the ‘first’ and ‘second’ economies; and
- Improve the quality of life of all South Africans by enhancing their access to housing, water, electricity, health care, sanitation etc.

3.3. Macro-Economic Policy Framework

The new government that came into power in 1994 evolved an economic policy which was aimed at redistribution of wealth and eradication of the apartheid era inequalities and wealth disparities. It is worth noting from the on-set that the institutional framework for economic policy development in South Africa is fairly inclusive in that four key actors

namely labour, government, business and civil society are supposed to consider policy proposals through the statutory National Economic Development and Labour Council (NEDLAC) established in 1995.

According to Landsberg,

A very important avenue for consultation on policy development has been the National Economic Development and Labour Council (Nedlac), which was established in 1995 to usher in a new era of inclusive decision making and consensus seeking in the economic, social and development spheres. Nedlac has turned out to be more of a tripartite forum where labour is represented by the COSATU, the National Council of Trade Unions (Nactu) and the Federation of Unions in South Africa (Fedusa). Government delegations are made up of ministers, director's general and senior officials from several ministries and departments, while Business Unity South Africa (BUSA) represents business. Unfortunately, the community constituency has comprised representatives of women, youth, disabled and civics, and this has again been the most neglected sector of society. Nedlac also has a dispute resolution function. (2006:14)

Macro-economic policy frameworks also form part and parcel of deliberations at Cabinet retreats (Makgotla or Imbizos) in January and July every year. Commenting on the significance and short-comings of the Makgotla or Imbizos, Chris Landsberg observes as follows:

Both national and provincial governments have embarked on a series of "Imbizos" whereby various departments visit communities and invite the public to discuss policy and development issues. In theory, this system could be used for consultation on major development projects. But they have not been used to do this, thus far. So, the "Imbizos" are one of the most innovative forms participation but have both major advantages and disadvantages. Its advantage is that it has worked well in drawing members of the public to discuss their problems and expectations as well as hear government policy proposals, achievements and failures. Its weakness is that there is a lack of feedback to respondents on their inputs or on government's promises, and it is a vehicle more for government to share information rather than afford people opportunities to help shape policies (2006: 13).

In between, regular Cabinet meetings and committee meetings reflect upon these policy frameworks and assess progress of their implementation from time to time. The annual Presidential State of the Nation to Parliament also reflects of the progress made in implementation of policies and highlighting challenges ahead.

The early policy framework that emerged in post-apartheid South Africa emphasized social welfarism reinforced by a strong state interventionism without disregarding the role of the market in a free enterprise economy that South Africa is. In essence, this was an attempt at striking a fine balance between democracy and free enterprise (market)

economy and between a developmental state and private enterprise. This policy framework came in the form of the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) incorporating popular aspirations for social transformation and improvement of the social well-being of the ordinary people and restoration of their basic human rights which had been whittled by apartheid. The linchpin of the RDP the evolution of a people-centered development strategy and, to this end, it accelerated service delivery including, among others, housing, electricity, water, health care, social grants system for the elderly and children etc.

However, a social welfarist and people-centred RDP was changed in 1995 when a new policy shift came about. The government adopted a neo-liberal and market-centred policy in 1996 styled Growth, Employment and Redistribution (GEAR) developed by a team of economic experts led by Stephen Gelb of the Edge Institute based in Johannesburg. GEAR departed from the welfarist thrust of the RDP and instead evolved around a myriad of neo-liberal tenets: low fiscal debt, low inflation and interest rates, higher investment, jobs and growth etc (See Hudson, 2006). Butler reminds us that:

The pursuit of economic stability, market-friendly policy, and fiscal discipline as the prerequisites for sustained economic growth. A stable environment for private investment, the attraction of foreign investors, labour market flexibility, industrial policy, and partially privatized public assets are policies that according to GEAR will create the potential for a faster growing economy with higher levels of employment (2004:50).

Despite the market-orientation and neo-liberal character of GEAR, government still emphasized that South Africa is committed to building a developmental state that has the capacity to intervene in socio-economic matters, while at the same time recognizing the important role played by the private sector and markets in economic development process. It is worth noting, however, that GEAR triggered a heated controversy within the ruling tripartite alliance comprising the ANC, South African Communist Party (SACP) and the Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU). Both COSATU and SACP criticized GEAR for being a neo-liberal policy that is likely to reverse the social gains made through the social welfarist RDP and the evolution of this policy strategy was not marked by a consultative process. Indeed, GEAR was adopted without broad-based discussion by key stakeholders even within NEDLAC. In particular, COSATU has raised concerns that:

GEAR entrenches unemployment and has so far delivered few pay-offs in return for its conservative macro-economic position. While the government has recently re-affirmed in the strongest possible terms its commitment to GEAR, it has moved towards a more interventionist macro-economic strategy, an expended industrial policy, and the creating of more elaborate systems of social welfare support to ameliorate the implications of economic restructuring for the poor (Butler, 2004:50).

Following the review of South Africa's ten years of democracy undertaken by the government in 2004 which also involved a planning framework by way of scenarios building process, it is quite evident that the government intends to embark on a state-

interventionist economic policy strategy while at the same time creating ample room for private enterprise development. Within this scheme of things, government is deliberately promoting black entrepreneurs through the Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment (BBBEE) programme.

It is behind this backdrop that the government has, since 2005, initiated a new programme known as Accelerated and Shared Growth Initiative of South Africa (ASGISA) under the stewardship of the Deputy President, Mlambo-Ngcuka. The primary objective of ASGISA is to halve poverty and unemployment by 2014. Through ASGISA, government intends to accelerate growth while at the same time addressing social welfare issues such as employment creation and poverty eradication as well as promoting BBBEE. The key elements of ASGISA revolve around:

- Public Sector Investment;
- Electronic Communication;
- Infrastructure development especially in light of the 2010 FIFA World Cup to be hosted by South Africa;
- Development of a broad National Industrial Policy;
- Business process outsourcing;
- Tourism;
- Bio-fuels;
- Human resource and skills development, through, among others, the Joint Initiative for Priority Skills Acquisition (JIPSA);
- Elimination of the ‘Second Economy’.

Even though ASGISA does have a heavy dose of state interventionism and forms the hallmark of the evolution of a developmental state in South Africa, the other two alliance partners (SACP and COSATU) have taken issue with it much the same way that they have done with GEAR. Issues around lack of consultations and prior discussions before the programme was officially adopted as government policy have again been raised.

3.4. Regional Integration

During the apartheid era, South Africa became a pariah state isolated from regional and international supra-national institutions. The only regional integration scheme that the apartheid South Africa remained a part of was the 1910 Southern African Customs Union (SACU) which the regime used to maximum effect in terms of exploiting its neighbourhood comprising mainly labour reserve economies which provided it with extra-cheap labour and a captive market for its products as well as a launching pad for sanction-busting machinations, through manipulation of rules of origin for its exports to Europe and North America. Whereas apartheid South Africa remained a member of SACU, there were two other important regional integration initiatives that were established not only without South Africa’s participation, but, in fact, against the apartheid regime. The Southern African Development Coordination Conference (SADCC) was established in 1980 primarily to reduce member states’ economic dependence on South Africa. The Front Line States (FLS) was established in 1976 with

the sole purpose of supporting the liberation struggles in the region, including South Africa. Even at the continental level, the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) which was established in the 1960s, not only isolated the apartheid regime, but took deliberate measures to assist the liberation movements in South Africa, including the ANC, to dislodge it and establish a democratic state. This explains in large measure the important role played by the OAU, through its Liberation Committee, in providing assistance for the liberation struggle in South Africa. It is also worth noting that Nigeria formed part of the Front Line States despite the fact that it was not on the front-line physically, but through the OAU, Nigeria was on the front-line at least politically.

Thus, barring SACU, major regional integration initiatives in Southern Africa emerged not only without the apartheid South Africa, but, in fact, as a direct response to apartheid itself, given that independent regional states perceived South Africa as the prime enemy. It should be recalled that South Africa had declared a war of aggression against its neighbours code-named Total National Strategy (TNS) which was perceived as a response to the so-called communist onslaught engineered by the Eastern Bloc countries using the liberation movements, including the ANC, as proxies. The FLS was seen by South Africa as part of this so-called communist onslaught. Even SADCC was perceived as part of the communist grand strategy on the economic front. It was in response to these initiatives that in 1982 South Africa attempted, in vain, to establish the Constellation of Southern African States (CONSAS) which was an attempt to build a countervailing regional bloc to SADCC. However, CONSAS became a dismal fiasco. South Africa therefore remained isolated internationally and regionally.

With the political transition of the early 1990s and with the demise of apartheid, South Africa became part of the Southern Africa region and the African continent. It remains a member of the restructured SACU. In 1992, SADCC was transformed into a new regional integration scheme now known as the Southern Africa Development Community (SADC). The difference between SADCC and SADC is not only in the name change, but it is about the nature of regional cooperation pursued through initiatives. SADCC was a simple coordination scheme and did not harbour any ambitions towards deep integration. SADC, on the other hand, pursues deep developmental integration along various fronts including:

- Coordination and harmonization;
- Economic integration;
- Political integration; and
- Security cooperation.

South Africa signed the SADC Treaty in 1994 during the Annual Summit held in Gaborone, Botswana. Since then, it has played an important role, as a dominant regional power, in striving towards deep integration around the four elements mentioned above. Further afield, South Africa is also an active member of the African Union and hosts the AU Pan-African Parliament (PAP). It has played a pioneering role in the development of the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) and its twin-initiative, the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM). Through all these regional and continental

integration schemes, one fact that is worth observing is that South Africa is now part of Africa and in its new role in the continent, South Africa has opted to move cautiously by adopting more and more a multilateralist, as against a unilateralist, foreign policy outreach for good reasons one being the historical baggage of apartheid destabilization and the other being the fear of being mis-perceived as acting like a bully. Mandela's peace-making efforts in countries like Burundi and Mbeki's African Renaissance and his passionate quest for African unity should be understood within this context.

4.0. Socio-Economic Development

The Institute for Democracy in South Africa (IDASA) undertook a project in 2004 aimed at assessing the state of South Africa's democracy. That project was undertaken at an auspicious moment given that South completed its ten years of democracy during the same year. The outcome of this project was an impressive report entitled *Democracy in the time of Mbeki* edited by Richard Calland and Paul Graham. I am starting off this section on socio-economic development with reference to this report because the data collected and analysed in this report is quite revealing. Using its own Democracy Index, IDASA selected five major components of democracy and scored each component as illustrated in the table 6 below.

Table 6: State of Democracy in South Africa (IDASA Democracy Index)

Index Section	Score (%)
Participation and Democracy	62
Elections and Democracy	72
Accountability and Democracy	57
Political Freedom and Democracy	69
Human Dignity and Democracy	47
Average	63

What is interesting to note from the table above is that while South Africa is doing fairly well in areas of political governance scoring highest in elections (72%), followed by political freedoms (69%) and then participation (62%), the country is performing poorly in the social governance front wherein it scores a paltry 47% in respect of human dignity. On the basis of the data above, Thipanyane concludes that

While it cannot be said that the state is not taking progressive measures to realize socio-economic rights for the poor, especially when taking into account the availability of resources, the fact that more than 40% of our population out of an estimated 44 819 778 people is still subjected to poverty after ten years of a democratic dispensation based on the promotion and protection of human rights means that socio-economic rights are not adequately enjoyed by all South Africans. This is notwithstanding the measures installed by the state in this regard and the constraints facing the state (2004:229).

The data above and the poignant observation by Thipanyane are both illustrative of the major challenge facing South Africa's democracy namely that advancements in

democratic political governance have to move apace with prudent macro-economic governance and stability and these in turn have to translate in improved social governance wherein people's daily livelihoods get improved. This challenge should be understood within the context of not only the government's commitment to reversing the socio-economic inequalities of the apartheid era, but also in the context of government's commitment to global social contracts such as the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) adopted in 2000 by UN member states. The eight MDGs and indicators of their achievement are summed up in the table 7.

Table 7: MDGs and Targets

MDGs	Targets
Goal 1: Eradicate Extreme Poverty and Hunger	<i>Target 1: Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people whose income is less than \$1 a day</i>
	<i>Target 2: Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people who suffer from hunger</i>
Goal 2: Achieve Universal Primary Education	<i>Target 3: Ensure that by 2015, children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling</i>
Goal 3: Promote Gender Equality and Empower Women	<i>Target 4: Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education, preferably by 2005 and in all levels of education no later than 2015</i>
Goal 4: Reduce Child Mortality	<i>Target 5: Reduce by two-thirds, between 1990 and 2015, the under-five mortality rate</i>
Goal 5: Improve Maternal Health	<i>Target 6: Reduce by three-quarters, between 1990 and 2015, the maternal mortality ratio</i>
Goal 6: Combat HIV/AIDS, Malaria and other Diseases	<i>Target 7: Have halted by 2015 and having begun to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS</i>
	<i>Target 8: Have halted by 2015 and have begun to reverse the incidence of malaria and other major diseases</i>
Goal 7: Ensure Environmental Sustainability	<i>Target 9: Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes and reverse the loss of environmental resources</i>
	<i>Target 10: Halve by 2015 the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water</i>
	<i>Target 11: Have achieved by 2020 a significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers</i>
Goal 8: Develop a Global Partnership for Development	<i>Target 12: develop further an open, rule-based, predictable, non-discriminatory trading and financial systems</i>
	<i>Target 13: Address the special needs of the least developed countries</i>
	<i>Target 14: Address the special needs of landlocked countries and small island developing states</i>
	<i>Target 15: Deal comprehensively with the debt problems of developing countries</i>
	<i>Target 16: Develop and implement strategies for decent and productive work for youth</i>
	<i>Target 17: Provide access to affordable essential drugs in developing countries</i>

	<i>Target 18: Make available the benefits of new technologies, especially information and communication technologies</i>
--	--

Source: Human Development Report, 2003:1-3.

Judging by these wide-ranging commitments above, the MDGs constitute a global social contract which if successfully implemented would transform societies in a positive direction. However, a review of their implementation in 2005 revealed that their achievement still remains a distant mirage for many countries including South Africa. As part of addressing the socio-economic challenges that faced its new-found democracy over the past ten years and in an effort to accelerate the implementation of the MDGs, the government developed vision 2014 whose key objectives include:

- Reducing unemployment by half;
- Reducing poverty by half;
- Providing skills;
- Ensuring dignity for all people;
- Improving health; and
- Reducing levels of crime

The above issues are crucial in determining the extent to which South Africa's democracy is indeed consolidating or not. It is important that the nurturing and consolidation of democracy is assessed and examined not only in respect of the frequency, regularity and freeness/fairness of elections, (and alternation of governments) alone, but the extent to which democratic regimes deliberately and systematically improve socio-economic lives of the people.

4.1. Challenges posed by HIV/AIDS

Another pertinent issue in interrogating the interface between democracy and development is the impact of diseases (such as Malaria, Tuberculosis and HIV/AIDS) on governance. While considerable research and analysis has been undertaken to establish the social and economic impact of HIV/AIDS in our societies, little has thus far been made to understand and make sense of the political impact of HIV/AIDS. Evidence is now increasingly emerging that suggests, for instance, that the impact/implications of the HIV/AIDS on democracy in the SADC region are quite severe, albeit not yet publicly acknowledge by the political leadership (see Mattes, 2003; Chirambo, 2004; Strand et al, 2005; Poku & Sandkjaer, 2006). What are the likely linkages between HIV/AIDS and democratic governance? The table 8 depicts the state of HIV/AIDS prevalence in the SADC region.

Table 8: HIV/AIDS Prevalence Rate in SADC (2003 figures)

Country	Number of adults and Children with AIDS	HIV Prevalence Rate (%) in Adults Aged 15-49	Number of AIDS Orphans	AIDS Deaths in 2003
Angola	240 000	3.9	110 000	21 000
Botswana	350 000	37.3	120 000	33 000
Dem. Republic of Congo	1 100 000	4.2	770 000	100 000
Lesotho	320 000	28.9	100 000	29 000
Madagascar	140 000	1.7	30 000	7 500
Malawi	900 000	14.2	500 000	84 000
Mauritius
Mozambique	1 300 000	12.2	470 000	110 000
Namibia	210 000	21.3	57 000	16 000
South Africa	5 300 000	21.5	1 100 000	370 000
Swaziland	220 000	38.8	65 000	17 000
Tanzania	1 600 000	8.8	980 000	160 000
Zambia	920 000	16.5	630 000	89 000
Zimbabwe	1 800 000	24.6	980 000	170 000

Source: UNAIDS, 2004:189-207

In a recent study that we undertook under the aegis of the Institute for Democracy in South Africa (IDASA) which culminated in the production of a book entitled *HIV/AIDS and Democratic Governance in South Africa: Illustrating the Impact on Electoral Processes*, published in 2005, we found out that given both the paucity of reliable data on HIV/AIDS as well as the secrecy & stigma that cloud the pandemic direct linkage between HIV/AIDS and participation of citizens in the democratic process may not be scientifically proven. However, some useful inferences can be made regarding the possible interconnections or nexus between HIV/AIDS and democracy, via the medium of elections, in the SADC region focusing specifically on the electoral systems that SADC member states use for the selection of leaders at both national and local government levels, translation of votes into parliamentary seats and replacement of MPs in the legislature due to illness and possibly death. Our linkage of the HIV/AIDS pandemic to electoral systems runs through four main strands of thought as follows:

- (a) Replacement of MPs becomes one of the major financial costs associated with elections especially in countries that operate the FPTP or MMP system due to the necessity for the holding of periodic by-elections (**cost-effectiveness of elections**);
- (b) However, irrespective of whichever electoral system is in place, replacement of MPs in parliament may amount to a political cost to a party that loses its leadership in the legislature (**leadership turn-over within parties and in the legislature**);
- (c) Replacement of MPs in parliament may also have the effect of shifting power balance in the legislature often in favour of ruling parties and to the disadvantage of

opposition parties (**power-shifts and political complexion of the national assembly**); and

(d) Equally importantly, a related down-side of by-elections under the FTPT or MMP system is that with low levels of voter turn out relative to national elections the political mandate of MPs gets technically denuded (**diminution of political mandates**).

The HIV/AIDS epidemic threatens democracy in that it denudes various key institutions of governance of critical mass of skilled personnel, among other things. Some of these institutions that are adversely affected by the HIV/AIDS pandemic which development in turn threatens democracy include political parties, electoral management bodies, the legislature, civil society organisations and local government authorities. Not only that; the pandemic has specific impact on the nature of the electoral systems that SADC countries have in place. Thus Robert Mattes observes poignantly that “countries with specific types of electoral systems may come under additional pressures. Increased deaths among Members of Parliament (MPs) and local councillors in constituency based systems will increase the number of by-elections. A steady flow of by-elections may increase government sensitivity to shifts in public opinion, but may also be financially unsustainable. Countries may be forced to abandon constituency representation in favour of party list proportional representation systems. While the list system provides the swift and cheap replacement of sick and dead legislators, it also removes the fundamental linkage governors and the governed” (2003:14). Thus, the FPTP electoral system is much more susceptible to the adverse effects of the HIV/AIDS epidemic than the proportional representation model. Thus, besides the urgency to address the health, social and economic dimensions of HIV/AIDS, South Africa faces a daunting challenge to address and redress the governance dimensions of HIV/AIDS. In 2004, 5.3 million South African were living with HIV/AIDS; 21% of adults (15-49 age range) were HIV positive; the pandemic had left 1.1 million children as orphans and it had resulted in 370 000 deaths.

5.0. Developments in the Corporate Sector

As indicated in earlier sections of this paper, South Africa has the most robust and well-developed economy with a strong infrastructural base and resource endowment. The country has an expansive private sector comprising large-scale companies, medium-size enterprises and small-scale enterprises. By and large, the largest corporations, including Multinational Corporations (MNCs) and the medium-sized companies are concentrated in the formal sector or ‘the first economy’. The main concentration of small-scale companies is primarily in the informal sector or ‘the second economy’. The number of registered enterprises is illustrated in the table 9 below.

Table 9: Registered Companies

Companies	Numbers
Close Companies	1 092 482
Private Companies	382 863
Public Companies	3 756
Listed Companies	- 381
Non-profit Companies	14 438
Companies limited by guarantee (partnership with limited liabilities)	88
Incorporated Professionals	7 447
Unlimited Companies	7
External Companies	967
Co-operatives	5 700
Total	1 508 129

Source: APRM Country Self-Assessment Report, South Africa Third Draft, March 2006:57

While the 1973 Companies Act that regulates operations of business concerns is outmoded, corporate governance in both the private and public sectors is influenced largely by the King II Report which sets out some general codes and standards for ethical conduct in conformity with international best practices. According to the APRM Draft Country Assessment Report, Working Draft, July 2006,

Though the King II report encourages disclosure of all risks, the guidelines are voluntary, and although companies listed on the Johannesburg Securities Exchange (JSE) do have to abide by many of its reporting guidelines, they can refrain from doing so as long as they explain the reasons behind non-compliance. Also, while King II promotes the extension of non-financial reporting in various aspects of their activities (including social, transformation, ethical, safety, health and environmental management policies and practices), it is only of persuasive rather than mandatory value (2006:25).

The banking system provides financial services for smooth operations of businesses and the state provides a conducive legislative framework business to thrive. While the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI) plays a key role in evolving policy for the business to operate, other critical state enterprises that are meant to promote business enterprise include (a) the Industrial Development Corporation (IDC) which provides equity financing to large and medium-sized companies especially enterprises owned by historically disadvantaged people; and (b) the Land Bank which is an agricultural development finance institution that supports that provision of retail, wholesale, project and micro-financial services to agriculture and related industries (APRM Country Self-Assessment Report, Third Draft, March 2006).

Even more daunting challenge for the South African democracy is the stark reality that it is not often that interests of a democratic government always coincide with those of

capital, especially big business conglomerates. It is, thus, important to heed the caution provided by Fine and Levin in this regard. They argue that

The democratic state must be aware that the vested interests of capital will try their best to ensure the protection of those of their interests which were guaranteed by the apartheid state and which they feel they cannot protect through their own actions.... Private capital must recognize that the democratic state offers the best possible environment for the realization of the interest of capital. So the partnership between the democratic state and capital is mutually beneficial. The alternative is an environment of social and economic dislocation, which is not conducive to the interests of the two parties (2005:42).

A democratic developmental state must balance the often mutually exclusive interests of capital and those of society as a whole. It must act as a bridge between profit-maximisation and cost-minimisation by business companies while at the same time ensuring the social welfare of the people.

6.0. Conclusion

Following the preceding discussions, we have come to four main conclusions. Firstly, South Africa has undergone a successful transition in 1994 which some observers perceived as a 'miracle'. The transition was two-pronged: (a) transition from authoritarian rule to a democratic dispensation and (b) a transition from a protracted violent conflict to peace. Following the transition the critical challenge that still confronts South Africa is the consolidation of democracy and peace. There is no gainsaying that South Africa has enjoyed an internal peace dividend since 1994. It is also incontrovertible that South Africa enjoys peaceful relations with its neighbours.

Secondly, it is therefore worth noting that the internal and external peace dividend provides a conducive environment for the nurturing and consolidation of democracy. Has South Africa's democracy consolidated? Some observers argue that given that South Africa has already held three successive and successful democratic elections, it has now reached the consolidation stage. But this perspective, either by default or by design, they tend to equate elections to democracy and thus fall into the trap of the 'fallacy of electoralism'. We argue that while South Africa's democracy is indeed fairly stable, it is not yet consolidated. It is still in the process of consolidating. Its major challenge lies precisely on how the political governance improves the socio-economic governance in such a way that people reap sustainable material benefits from the new found democratic dispensation and in this regard the dilemma of two nations and two economies presents a conundrum.

Thirdly, we have noted that South Africa has a fabulous constitution which forms a bedrock for its democratic system. We have cautioned that having a well-crafted constitution is one thing, while having a democratic constitutionalism as a living and lived experience by the ordinary people is quite another. In a word, the country's

democratic constitution must inform the way people practically experience the country's democracy every day at various layers of society. For instance, while the constitution provides a comprehensive bill of rights, some rights still remain a distant mirage for citizens. Indeed, with regard to civil liberties, the constitution has delivered positive results, this has not been so for social and economic rights. This situation explains, in part, why the major challenges facing South Africa's democracy twelve years after the transition still revolve around social welfare provision including jobs-creation and poverty eradication within the framework of the MDGs.

Fourthly and finally, we have also argued that South Africa should not only strive to become just a developmental state, but rather it should aim to build a democratic developmental state. In other words, the state should see its primary task being driving the democracy and development projects in tandem with equal vigor. It must be acknowledged that South Africa has made impressive strides in this direction. In 1994, the government introduced the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) which was clearly aimed at reinforcing a developmental and welfarist state. However, later on a paradigmic shift happened when the Growth, Employment and Redistribution (GEAR) strategy was later introduced in 1996 embracing the basic tenets of neo-liberal orthodoxy such as privatization and other related austerity measures. The current development strategy, the Accelerated and Shared Growth Initiative of South Africa (ASGISA), in both form and substance, seems to strike a balance between promoting state interventionism in the development process and providing the private sector ample room to contribute to growth and development. Within the framework of ASGISA, therefore, clearly a market-friendly democratic developmental state is underway in South Africa.

* Khabele Matlosa is the Research Director, Electoral Institute of Southern Africa (EISA), 14 Park Road, Richmond, Johannesburg; Tel: 011-4825495; Fax: 011-4826163; Email: Khabele@eisa.org.za

References

- Adedeji, A. (ed). 1996. *South Africa and Africa: Within or Apart*, London: Zed Books.
- Adebajo, A. 2004. 'An Axis of Virtue? South Africa and Nigeria in Africa', Paper prepared for a Policy Seminar hosted by Centre for Conflict Resolution, Centre for Policy Studies and African Centre for Development and Security Studies on "South Africa in Africa", Cape Town.
- APRM Country Self-Assessment Report, Working Draft, Department of Public Service, Johannesburg, March, 2006
- Botes, L. & van Rooyen, D. 2005. Background Document on Socio-Economic Development in South Africa, APRM Secretariat, Midrand, South Africa.
- Butler, A. 2004. *Contemporary South Africa*, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan
- Calland, R. and Graham, P. (ed). 2005. *Democracy in the Time of Mbeki*, Cape Town: IDASA.
- Chirambo, K. 2004. 'HIV and AIDS and Electoral System: the implications for participation, political stability and accountability', OSISA Journal, Edition 3, Issue 2, June.
- Fine, A. and Levin, M. 2005. 'Business and Democracy', in Calland and Graham, opcit
- Government of South Africa, 2001. Local Government: Municipal Systems Act, No. 32 of 2000, Johannesburg.
- Gyimah-Boadi, E. 1996. 'Civil Society in Africa', *Journal of Democracy*, 1996.
- Hudson, J. 2006. 'Economic and Corporate Governance in South Africa', EISA, Johannesburg (mimeo).
- Independent Electoral Commission (IEC). 1994. Report on the National and Provincial Elections, Pretoria (mimeo).
- Independent Electoral Commission (IEC). 1999. Report on the National and Provincial Elections, Pretoria (mimeo)
- Independent Electoral Commission (IEC). 2004. Report on the National and Provincial Elections, Pretoria (mimeo).

Institute for Democracy in South Africa.2003. 'Regulation of Private Funding to Political Parties', Cape Town, IDASA (mimeo).

International IDEA.2003. Funding of Political Parties and Election Campaigns, Stockholm: IDEA

Kadima, D. 2006. *The Politics of Party Coalitions in Africa*, Auckland Park: Electoral Institute of Southern Africa (EISA).

Kagwanja, P. 2006. 'Power and Peace: South Africa and the refurbishing of Africa's multilateral capacity for peacemaking', in Southall, R. (ed). South Africa's role in conflict resolution and peacemaking in Africa: Conference Proceedings Report, Pretoria, HSRC Press.

Landsberg, C. 2004. *The Quiet Diplomacy of Liberation: International Politics and South Africa's Transition*, Johannesburg: Jacana.

Landsberg, C. 2006. 'A Developmental Democracy? Democracy and Political Governance', Discussion Paper prepared for Phase One of the South African APRM, Centre for Policy Studies, Johannesburg (mimeo).

Landsberg, C. and Mackay, S. 2005. Engaging the New Pan-Africanism: Strategies for Civil Society, Policy Paper prepared for Action Aid & Open Society Initiative for Southern Africa, Johannesburg (mimeo).

Landsberg, C. and Mackay, S. 2006. 'South Africa, 1994-2004', in South African Human Rights Commission (SAHRC), Reflections on Democracy and Human Rights: A Decade of the South African Constitution (Act 108 of 1996), Johannesburg (mimeo).

Mattes, R. 2003. 'Healthy Democracies? The Potential Impact of AIDS on Democracy in Southern Africa', Institute for Security Studies, Paper 71, April.

Poku, N. and Sandkjaer, B. 2006. 'HIV/AIDS, Governance and Impact', Paper Prepared for the CCR Conference on "HIV/AIDS and Human Security in South Africa", Vineyard Hotel, Cape Town, 26-27 June.

Sachikonye, L. 1995. 'Civil Society, Social Movements and Democracy in Southern Africa', *Innovation*, 8 (4).

Southall, R. 2006. 'Introduction: can South Africa be a developmental state?', in Buhlungu, S. et. al *South Africa 2005-2006: State of the Nation*, Cape Town: HSRC Press.

Sidiropoulos, E. (ed). 2004. *South Africa's Foreign Policy 1994-2004: Apartheid Past, Renaissance Future*, Johannesburg: SAIIA.

Sparks, A. 2003. *Beyond the Miracle: Inside the New South Africa*, Johannesburg: John Ball Publishers.

Strand, P., Matlosa, K., Strode, A. and Chirambo, K. 2005. *HIV/AIDS and Democratic Governance in South Africa: Illustrating the impact on electoral processes*, Pretoria, IDASA.

Thipanyane, T.2005. 'Human Dignity and Democracy: Can socioeconomic rights be realized without human rights?', in Calland and Graham, opcit

Thipanyane, T. 2006. 'Cultural, Religious and Linguistic Rights', in South African Human Rights Commission (SAHRC), *Reflections on Democracy and Human Rights: A Decade of the South African Constitution (Act 108 of 1996)*, Johannesburg (mimeo).

UNDP. 2003. *Human Development Report*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wagle, U. 1999. 'The Civil Society Sector in Developing World', *Public Administration and Management: an Interactive Journal*, 4 (4).