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Abstract
This study explores the ways in which a group of local fishermen in Durban understand and negotiate their categorical exclusion from a public space. Several months prior to the FIFA World Cup 2010 in South Africa, three piers on the Durban beachfront were closed for upgrading. The fishermen had used two of these piers for nearly three decades, but when they were re-opened, access for fishermen was no longer allowed. Working in the constructionist paradigm and within the field of Cultural Studies, this study describes the fishermen as engaged in the politics of signification through the organisation of public action.

To explore their understandings I applied a qualitative, mostly ethnographic approach, and focused particularly on those fishermen who fish on the beachfront and are active in the KwaZulu-Natal Subsistence Fishermen’s Forum (KZNSFF), a body that represents the fishermen in the public sphere. The study shows that the fishermen are a heterogeneous group who understand their exclusion in different ways. This variety and complexity of understandings in effect works against collective action and posed a challenge to the leadership of the KZNSFF who sought to construct a coherent collective action frame.

Drawing on Social Movement theory, two public protests in which the fishermen negotiated their exclusion were among the central focuses of this study. The first was held during the World Cup and organised by KZNSFF. The other protest was less coordinated and held after the World Cup. Both protests are analysed through comparison, and indicate the importance of access to resources of leadership. The role of the media in effective Social Movement Organisation (SMO) is discussed in terms of ‘media standing’ and the legitimisation of actions and position of speakers. Further, it is argued that the presence of democratic institutions does not necessarily lead to democratic decision-making as civil society is often demobilised by political society.

Additional to public protests, the fishermen negotiated their exclusion in the letters to the editor section of local press. Argumentative discourse analysis is applied in the analysis of a sample whereby strategies of othering are identified. The letter writers were engaged in an unequal contestation in which different sets of stake-holders sought to define what counts as truth in relation to access to the Durban beachfront.
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Figure 1: Durban beachfront. Looking from South Beach towards the north. Left from the photographer is the Point. The three beachfront piers are visible. First Dairy Beach pier, than North Beach pier, and the Bay of Plenty pier. The shorter Snake Park pier is the fourth pier in line. (Source: Migdoll, 1996)
We were born 5 kilometres away from the beachfront. God gave us the beach to have a good time, like the surfers are having a good time. Now we must spend hundreds of rands to go the South and North to do fishing. It’s very unjustified. Even during the apartheid era it was not like this. (Lovie, recreational fisherman, June 2011, Durban).

The coastal city of Durban has been a popular tourist destination for many decades. With mild winters, it is particularly the beachfront and its wide walking promenade that is host to many activities and stakeholder interests. Durban is also known in South Africa as “surf city” due to the moderate swells that brake at similar pace throughout the year and render them particularly suitable for surfing. The popular uShaka Marine World attracts visitors internationally to its acclaimed aquarium and accompanying restaurants and souvenir shops. The Bay of Plenty lawns offer spacious picnic spots for families, to play football or look at the skateboarders practising their skills in the neighbouring skate park. The promenade is host to traders who sell as diverse a product as street-art, sunglasses and cooled soft drinks. The Point, formerly a neighbourhood known for its drug trade and high levels of crime, is being re-developed into a high-end residential area, in which the luxurious apartments overlook the harbour and Indian Ocean.

Another stakeholder group that frequents the beachfront is recreational and subsistence fishermen. From the 1800s, Indian fishermen particularly have utilised the harbour and beachfront for their fishing endeavours, often with a commercial incentive to relieve economic stress on their households. The promenade of Durban is host to three long piers that were built in the mid-1980s. The Bay of Plenty pier and Dairy Beach pier, were especially popular with the fishermen and have been used for nearly three decades, enabling them to access the deeper waters.

1 The North Beach pier, the middle of the three piers, was never open for use by fishermen. When I refer to the ‘main’ or ‘long’ beachfront piers in relation to the fishermen’s issues, I am particularly concerned with the Bay of Plenty and Dairy Beach piers. As the North Beach pier was never open for fishermen it is not much of concern to the issues dealt with throughout this dissertation.
In 2004, the Republic of South Africa was elected to host the Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) World Cup 2010. Business and local politicians alike treated the awarding of the global event as providing opportunities for tourism and business as Durban was designated as one of the host cities (Alegi, 2010; Ginsberg, 2010; Nauright, 2004). During the period of national unrest and transition prior to democratic governance in the late 1980s and early 1990s, Durban’s infrastructure and reputation had deteriorated and after a period of economic decline in 2008 and 2009 (Bond, 2010) local politicians justified the football event as an opportunity to re-brand Durban as a popular tourist destination: ‘a World Class city’ (Roberts, 2010).

In preparation for the approaching World Cup, the beachfront piers were closed for upgrading. When the upgrading was completed in early 2010, the public was allowed back onto the piers but the fishermen were not. Prior to the football tournament, I heard strong rumours that suggested that the fishermen were preparing to utilise the World Cup 2010 to raise voice and contest and negotiate their exclusion from the beachfront piers. As the general attitude to the approaching World Cup appeared to be mostly celebratory, this counter-discourse attracted my research interest.

The research

This study is not primarily concerned with the exclusion from and enclosure of public space. I am interested in how the fishermen understood the ban, and organised activities to reverse it in the period around the World Cup. During May to August 2010 I spent many hours on the Durban beachfront as well as in the private spheres of several fishermen whom I came to know more closely. Meetings held by KwaZulu-Natal Subsistence Fishermen Forum (KZNSFF) debated strategies for public action and. I witnessed the mobilising efforts of the KZNSFF leadership amongst the beachfront fishermen, and noted how the fishermen were urged to stand up for their rights, and publicly address their issues. Much later, I also

---

2 Dray (2009) discusses the privatisation of public space in Durban. She has a particular interest in the closure of fishing sites.

3 KZNSFF and its activities are examined in detail in Chapter 2.
observed a sense of fatigue amongst the fishermen when it became clear that their efforts were not likely to attain the immediate and desired outcome.

One of the ways in which the fishermen engaged with other publics was by means of public protest. These public actions in which the fishermen contested the ban on access to the beachfront piers became the focus of my research. The organisation of these actions was studied. My study focuses on the unifying processes amongst the fishermen and attributes particular attention to the discursive struggles that occurred in the context of the KZNSFF meetings.

On 16 June 2010, five days into the FIFA World Cup, the fishermen took part in a march that was organised by several civil society groups. It received much coverage in national and international press and it was the first major public event that I witnessed in this context. This protest is an important focus of my research with regard to both the preparations and the actual march. I also focus on a much smaller protest that was organised with less formal leadership at the end of August 2010.

An important public space for negotiating their exclusion other than these protests was provided by local newspapers. Until the time of conducting this study (September 2011) Durban newspapers continued to give much attention to the issues concerning the fishermen’s access to (and exclusion from) the beachfront piers. In addition to journalistic reports, the fishermen themselves and members of the public engaged in debate through the letters to editor sections over issues of fishermen’s access. A sample of these letters are examined below.

**Theoretical framework**

This study is located within the field of Cultural Studies and a constructionist paradigm (Hall, 1997). It attends to a range of signifying processes and explores processes of constructing and negotiating meaning in the public sphere. It additionally draws on theories of the public sphere and Social Movement Organisation (SMO) theory. Chapter 3 elaborates on the theoretical framework that informs this study.
**Objective of Research**

The objective of this study is to explore the ways in which the fishermen *understand* the enclosure of the beachfront piers and how they *negotiate* their exclusion. Further, I aim to investigate the formation of the fishermen into a counterpublic, developing a repertoire of strategies and public actions, and the role of the leadership in that process.

**Research Position**

As a male student from the Netherlands registered at a South African university, at the time of research, I was 26 years of age. My undergraduate background is in cultural anthropology, which has informed my research process.

Further, being racially categorised as ‘white’ might have enabled my access amongst the fishermen, the majority of whom are of Indian extraction. ‘White’ people in South Africa are commonly associated with middle class positions and economic privilege. Hence, for working-class people (which in the wake of apartheid in South Africa more or less coincides with the other three racial categories) it could be considered beneficial to establish reciprocal relationships with the more privileged in order to raise one’s own social status.

On this note, it is important to establish how I deal with the concept of race. Formally, several government officials have articulated the ambition to de-racialise contemporary South African society⁴. However, and for a perhaps naïve Dutch student such as myself, I was rather shocked when asked to “tick my race” when first registering as a post-graduate student at the University of KwaZulu-Natal in 2010. The options I could choose from were: “White”; “African”; “Indian”; “Coloured”; and “Other, namely:…….”. In an attempt to resist this racist discourse I ticked “Other” and entered “human”⁵.

Some one-and-a half years later while writing these chapters, I regularly found myself forced to draw on racial terminology in order to explain my findings. Throughout this dissertation, I

---

⁴ See Appendix H:1
⁵ When I talked to other students about this I found out that many would joke when providing their racial position. One of the answers frequently given by students when asked for their ‘race’ was ‘100 meter’, thereby jokingly but sturdily refusing to participate in racist discourse.
refer to ‘Africans’, ‘Coloureds’ and, taking the particular social parameters of this study based in KwaZulu-Natal into account, particularly to ‘Whites’ and Indians’. In line with a constructionist framework, I take ‘race’ to be socially constructed and therefore to have an arbitrary relationship with its signified as it is not established prior to discourse (Hall, 1997). While any biological grounds for ‘race’ are challenged (Livingstone, 1964; Graves, 2004), racism, of course, does exist. Racist discourse has arguably become hegemonic, and no one, perhaps especially in South Africa, escapes racial positioning. As it is not my aim here to study, criticise or restructure common daily discourse among ordinary South Africans, I have decided to use the hegemonic racial categories, despite their reductionism and their continuing work in the re-production of essentialised collective identities and categorical inequalities that are still prevalent in South Africa today.

**Structure of the dissertation**

Chapter 2 presents background relating to the arrival of the indentured labourers from India, and a history of fishing in Durban. It also discusses the political organisation and mobilisation of fishermen during the 1980s and 2000s. Issues of concern among fishermen in Durban are addressed. The chapter concludes with a reflection on the FIFA World Cup. My conclusion is that it remains difficult to establish if, and if so, how the most vulnerable classes of South Africa were to benefit from the tournament.

Chapter 3 presents the theoretical framework. As this study is concerned with the construction of meaning in a context of power relations, issues of culture, representation, the public sphere and social movement organisation are central. Chapter 4 describes the methods of analysis and elaborates on their use in the particular context of this study.

Approaching the World Cup, KZNSFF proposed to engage in protest and other forms of public action so to negotiate their categorical exclusion. In order for this group to successfully engage in social movement organisation, Chapter 5 argues that a collective action frame was needed. The internal power relations and how these influenced the articulation of a collective action frame are studied. Chapter 6 engages with the public processes of negotiating the fishermen’s exclusion. The focus here is on two protests that
were held during and after the World Cup. One was held a few days into the tournament on 16 June 2010. The other protest, which was more modest, was held on 21 August 2010. The two events are compared and I reflect on their effectiveness, or lack thereof, and pay particular attention to the availability of resources and the role of the groups’ leadership in strategising the events.

Throughout this dissertation the importance of the media in effective social movement organisation and public action is noted. Local newspaper coverage of the fishermen was collected and explored in Chapter 7. The letters to editor sections offer an important discursive field where fishermen and the broader public engage in contesting particular frames of meaning.

A list of appendices follows, as does a DVD. Appendix Z contains a documentary that was edited from audiovisual material of some of the field encounters. The documentary can be viewed at any point but does not talk to the thesis along strict lines. However, I do refer to the DVD when discussing particular encounters that were recorded on camera. The video further contextualizes the environment in which the fishermen live and work. It offers an idea of the diversity of this group of people and pays particular attention to efforts of representation and resistance in the public sphere.

---

6 In May 2011, all my equipment, including my laptop; external hard-drives; back up drives and USB sticks were stolen. The data that was left was reduced to some 40 hours of video material and an extensive collection of newspaper articles. The data as generated from the fieldwork was reduced to that which was already used in rough drafts of early versions of chapters that still circulated on the email server. As a result, I cannot present the list of interviews and annotated dates of fieldwork that I had carefully and consistently crafted while conducting research. I do present a list of all dates that audiovisual material was generated by means of a video camera. A list of newspaper articles as used here is presented in the Bibliography and Appendices.
CHAPTER 2

BACKGROUND

Introduction
An exploration of the understandings and ways of negotiating their exclusion by the Durban fishermen cannot be carried out justifiably without regard for history and socio-political dynamics. Rather than a “people without history” (Wolf, 1982), the fishermen constitute a group with a shared history in relation to their race and class positions, and also to their fishing related activities. Since the arrival of indentured labourers from around 1870, fishing activity and hence the business of drying and selling fish increased exponentially. The Group Areas Act of 1950 facilitated the forced removal of many Indian families in Durban from Fynnlands, via the Bayhead, to the townships of Chatsworth, and later Phoenix (Scott, 1994) . This resulted in the dispersion of the Indian fishing community that had existed for several decades.

Over time the fishermen had to adapt to increased regulation of fishing activity. Some policies have resulted in denial of access to fishing sites and disproportionate increases in license fees. These incursions resulted in the political mobilisation of fishermen and the organisation of collective resistance. The first mobilisation in Durban took the form of the Natal Rock and Surf Angling Association (NRSAA), founded in the mid-1980s. The NRSAA gradually lost its relevance during the 1990s, but from the 2000s it was deemed necessary to organise yet again (Interview Max, April, 2011). The result was the foundation of the KwaZulu-Natal Subsistence Fishermen’s Forum (KZNSFF) in 2004. KZNSFF represents the fishermen by coordinating public and legal action (KZNSFF, 2005).

The fieldwork conducted as part of this research was undertaken prior to, during, and after the FIFA World Cup 2010. Hence, the mobilisation and representation of fishermen during this time is partially to be understood in the context of this important sporting event and therefore it should be of interest to discuss the global football tournament within a political economic framework.
Indian arrival in the Colony of Natal

In 1843 the British annexed Natal, which had been the scene of increasing pressure and conflict between the Zulu kingdom of King Dingane and his brother Mpande, and the Boers, who had arrived in Natal a few years earlier (Morell et al., 1996). The British soon began experimenting with cultivating the land and found out that sugarcane was one of very few crops known at the time that grew here. Sugar turned into a booming industry and by the 1850s the British were in dire need of labour for harvesting (Morell et al., 1996; Scott, 1994). They had abolished their slave trade (in 1807) and slavery (in 1834) throughout the Empire (Tinker, 1974). The indigenous Zulu labourers were reluctant to work as cane cutters as they had their own land and were not dependent on a steady salary (Morell et al., 1996; Scott, 1994). They did not need to comply with the white planter regimes and were consequently constructed as lazy and unreliable workers (Scott, 1994). Those who were employed by the British cane planters usually did not work for extended periods due to low wages, bad treatment and long working hours (Marie, 1986). The planters therefore found an alternative source of labour in the system of indenture. Indentured labourers from India arrived in Natal from 1860. Apart from an economic depression in Natal that stopped the trade between 1866 and 1874, it continued to meet the need for labour until 1911 (Freund, 2001; Scott, 1994; Richardson, 1984).

The labourers who were shipped to Natal to work on the cane fields were usually contracted in, and transported from, India, although Chinese labourers contracted to work in the Transvaal gold mines arrived in Durban as well (Saunders, 1984; Freund, 2001). The labourers were promised employment in the Natal sugar industry. As many of them were of low caste, thereby excluded from large parts of economic and political life in India, they chose to escape a future with little or no prospect in poverty stricken late 19th Century India (Tinker, 1974; Northrup, 1995; Menon, 22/10/10, public lecture CCS).

Differences and similarities between the systems of slavery and indentured labour have been identified (Northrup, 1995; Tinker, 1974). As was common with slavery, some indentured labourers were forced or sometimes kidnapped before being contracted and shipped to work in the colonies (Northrup, 1995). They generally lived in harsh conditions characterised by

7 In Cuba Chinese indentured labourers and slaves are reported to have worked side by side (Northrup, 1995)
poor housing, malnourishment, regular outbreak of disease, and a high casualty rate (Freund, 2002; Tinker, 1974; Northrup, 1995). Indentured labourers signed up initially for three, but soon thereafter, for five-year work contracts, which could be renewed after the first term (Scott, 1994). Although the system was based on the voluntary decision of the contracted, it is recognised as an extremely exploitative system. By the end of the 19th Century many labourers owed ‘tax’ and were often manipulated or forced to renew their contract for another five years (Northrup, 1995; Tinker, 1974).

The making and breaking of a community

In the 1870s a community of some 200 free Indians settled on Salisbury Island in the Natal Bay, and laid the foundations for what would turn out to be a flourishing fishing industry in Durban and Natal (Scott et al., 1988; Scott, 1994; Govender, 2010). Salisbury Island was a small islet that was located in the bay that is now the Durban harbour. Rowing boats and seine nets were used to catch fish from the island and offshore Addington beach. The catch was then dried, distributed, and sold in the greater Durban and Natal area. When in 1900 the plague broke out in Durban, the Harbour Board moved the islanders to Fynnlands, which is located northwest of the peninsula, now known as the Bluff (Scott et al., 1988; Scott, 1994; Dray, 2009).

The Second Anglo-Boer War (1899–1902) and the First World War (1914-1918) were periods of great growth in commerce and industry for South Africa (Maylam, 1996). Segregation did take place, but without legislature. Also as there was much uncultivated land available, the conventions regarding mixed residential and working areas were relatively relaxed (Maylam, 1996; Scott, 1994).
During the 1940s and 1950s south Durban became industrialised and residential areas were increasingly segregated along racial lines when the Group Areas Act of 1950 was signed into law. In 1960 the Indian fishing community was removed from Fynnlands to make way for further industrialisation of the Durban harbour. They were removed to an already existing shack settlement on the Bayhead, close to Wentworth (Dray, 2009; Scott, 1994). Soon after (re)moval to the Bayhead, the entire shack dweller community, including the fishermen, were relocated to a newly built township designated specifically for Indians, some 15 to 20 kilometres from the city centre, harbour and beachfront, that was called Chatsworth (Freund, 2001; Maylam, 1996).

The result for the community, which was centred for a large part around the act and trade of fishing, was disastrous. The community subsequently disintegrated “since the means for their livelihood and social cohesiveness had been removed” (Scott, 1994: 245). Many fishermen no longer had close access to the harbour or beachfront, while more Indians found formal employment in the harbour and shipping industry of post Second World War Durban (Scott, 1994; Dray, 2009).
When Chatsworth was considered full in the 1970s, another Indian township, Phoenix, was established. Phoenix is now the largest Indian township of South Africa and is located some 20 kilometres northwest of the city centre and the Durban beachfront. Many fishermen who travel to Umgeni River, Blue Lagoon or the Durban beachfront to fish come from Phoenix, whereas the South Coast, the South Pier and the Durban harbour are mostly used by fishermen from Chatsworth, Wentworth and Cato Manor. Hence, the forced removal of non-whites as a result of the Group Areas Act of 1950 dispersed the Indian population and fishermen no longer necessarily lived within the close confines of each other.

**Revolt in the 1980s**

They came with massive trucks, we called them bakery wagons. And we said lock us all up. We defied them (Max, 06/04/2011, Durban)

In the early 1980s three piers were built on the Durban beachfront: ‘Dairy Beach pier’, ‘North Beach pier’, and ‘Bay of Plenty pier’ (Fig. 3). The fishermen referred to the piers by different names, namely “bench pier”; “police pier”; and “new pier”. The newly built piers replaced Patterson’s Groyne and the West Street Pier, both popular fishing sites on the Durban beachfront. Although the actual beaches were designated for white beachgoers, people of colour were allowed onto the Patterson Groyne and West Street Pier to fish (Dray, 2009; Aman, interview, June 2010). After the construction and opening of the new piers, it was generally assumed by the fishermen that access to these piers was allowed. As soon as the three longer piers were opened to the public, many fishermen took advantage of the opportunity to reach further into the water and started to fish (Fieldnotes, June, July 2010).

The fishermen were soon to find out that they were not welcome on the newly built piers as many confrontations with the police followed. This led to the organisation of fishermen into the Natal Rock and Surf Angling Association (NRSAA) in 1985. Through the Association the fishermen, at first, appealed for access only during the night between 6pm and 6am. The city council declined their request. Dozens, occasionally hundreds of fishermen, became
involved in organised resistance, claiming recognition and access to public space. Max, the first chairman of the NRSAA and an important informant and gatekeeper during the initial stages of fieldwork, told me about the Association’s origins.

Many of those people are late [dead] today. From the ‘60s we fished together. We taught each other, sometimes we fought, but on the whole, we imagine all these years, day and night fishing, so many experiences, we joked, we laughed. The basic network was there, although we did not have internet or cell phones. There was a strong bond (Max, 06/04/2011, Durban).

In the winter of 1985 and under the banner of the NRSAA, the Durban fishermen defiantly entered City Hall where the Durban city council holds its public meetings. The intrusion strategy was planned to get the attention of the politicians. The public balcony was soon filled with fishermen, and some even had to remain outside as there were more fishermen present than could possibly fit inside the hall. It also drew the attention of the press and the success was partly indicated in the photographs that were taken by journalists present. It was a strategy that had worked before and was to be utilised thereafter (Max, April 2011, Durban; Aman, June 2010; Cato Manor).

Figure 3: The Golden Mile with the three beachfront piers. On the bottom (left) is the Bay of Plenty pier, to its right is the North Beach pier, and to the right of that is Dairy Beach pier. In the far end (center of the picture) North and South Pier (SvG Aug. 2010)

8 I refer to the informants of this research by their first names as this was the informal way we referred to each other. See Chapter 4 (Methodology) too.
On 15th August 1985, president P.W. Botha delivered his infamous Rubicon speech in Durban. The international community anticipated a move towards the long awaited dismantling of Apartheid and the freeing of Nelson Mandela. Broadcasters all over the world decided to air the speech live to some 300 million people, adding to the sense of expectation and urgency (Daran et al, 1986; Harvey, 2001). However, Botha declined to announce any relaxation of the apartheid regime. It effectively intensified an era in which South Africa was internationally boycotted. The Chase Manhattan Bank was the first to call in a loan to the South African government, and many other American and European banks would follow suit. This led to a plunging South African Rand as a result of an instant debt of $13 billion to be paid by December 1985, resulting in growing national upheaval and organised collective resistance (Bond, 2012; Arnold, 1992; Prinsloo, 1997).

Led by the NRSAA, the fishermen saw the opportunity to utilise the Rubicon speech to their own benefit. Over a hundred fishermen gathered on the Bay of Plenty pier and Dairy Beach pier and defied the authorities by occupying and fishing off the newly built piers. This action resulted in a confrontation with the police, but perhaps more importantly, it led to front-page coverage in local newspaper the Daily News. When I asked Max about the event he told me:

> The international press, the whole world was waiting to see change, waiting for us to install democracy. And there was our opportunity to highlight the injustice that was done upon the Indian fishermen. (...) We played the racial card quite rightly, and quite justifiably (Max, 06/04/2011, Durban).

The fishermen’s struggle in the winter of 1985 had been successful. At first the municipality allowed night fishing between 6pm and 6am. In 1986 the municipality relented and granted access to the Dairy Beach pier and Bay of Plenty pier, withholding the North Beach pier for pedestrian purposes. Max went into exile after receiving death threats related to his interracial marriage and his position as chairperson of NRSAA. Upon his return in 1992, Max saw that the situation had quietened down as the local battle had been won. Although the NRSAA was never formally disestablished, it had gradually lost its relevance.

---

9 See Appendix B:1a-c; B:2
The KwaZulu Natal Subsistence Fishermen’s Forum

The KwaZulu-Natal Subsistence Fishermen’s Forum (KZNSFF) was established in 2004 in response to the denial of access to certain fishing sites in the Harbour (Dray, 2009). The forum aimed to maintain a democratic character and depended fully on external funding to guarantee its future existence, which rendered it somewhat vulnerable considering the size of the organisation. The forum served to represent the Durban and KZN fishermen in the public, political, and, where needed, juridical domain. The liaison with representatives of political parties, ministries, Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs), ‘potential’ funders, and the media was done by some of the committee members of the forum and the chairperson, Essop Mohammed. It were also mostly the leaders of the KZNSFF that participated in the debates published by letters to editor sections in local newspapers, and which are elaborated on in Chapter 7.

The Forum found a strong ally in the South Durban Community Environmental Alliance (SDCEA) where Desmond d’Sa is coordinator. Desmond also serves as spokesperson for KZNSFF and as a well-known figure in Durban and South Africa’s civil society movements, he achieves regular press coverage through the many projects he and SDCEA are involved in. SDCEA aims to:

unite communities to ensure environmental justice is practised in the South Durban region by adding value to the initiatives of individual member community organisations, and to create a common strategic position by constructive participation in development proposals by all levels of government (Constitution of SDCEA, 2004: 1).

SDCEA, and through its coordinator the KZNSFF as well, has frequent encounters with politicians on local, national and even international levels, as well as with representatives of the media.

Through the network and alliances of Desmond d’Sa the KZNSFF became part of the Durban Social Forum (DSF). In April 2010, the DSF was founded by various civil society groups, and aimed to voice ‘outstanding issues’ with the municipality (Fieldnotes, May, June, 2010).

10 See Appendix i:1a-e
The timing of erecting the Forum was not coincidental. The critical cause that catalysed this grouping of civil society organisations and NGOs was the World Cup and the expectation of opportunities it would provide to represent their particular or collective issues.

Most of the participants in the DSF had engaged in (post)apartheid activism related to issues of social-economic and political and social-economic equality, climate justice, and the protection of cultural heritage. The core participants in the initial set up phase of the Durban Social Forum were the shack dwellers movement Abahlali baseMondjolo [Shack Dwellers]; the Anti-Privatisation Forum; the Black Consciousness Movement; the Centre for Civil Society; the Early Morning Market Support Group; Ecopeace; SDCEA; the Socialist Party of Anzania; the Wentworth Development Forum; and Streetnet. Durban’s fishermen were represented by the KZNNSFF, who also anticipated the opportunity to articulate their issues to a larger audience during the World Cup (Fieldnotes, May, 2010).

The first major event organised by DSF was a public protest through the streets of Durban on 16 June 2010: Youth Day, a holiday in South Africa and an important marker of resistance in South African history. It is of great symbolic value as it commemorates the beginning of the Soweto uprising of 1976 when protesters and police clashed heavily, as the students rejected apartheid education.

Contested Issues

Although this research is mainly concerned with issues related to the enclosure of the beachfront piers, many other sites and issues of concern to the fishermen need addressing here as a background to the issue under investigation.

The Durban Beachfront

Snake Park pier is a fishing site that is located closest to the three beachfront piers and it is here where I gained access to the fishermen and conducted many interviews (see Chapter 4). It is much shorter and narrower than the three main beachfront piers. It has no facilities such as bait boards or water taps, and garbage bins are scarce. The main concern amongst the fishermen regarding Snake Park pier is that the sand pumping scheme that was introduced to widen the Durban beaches, rendered the waters shallow. The intervention is not only argued
to result in less available fish stock, but also in heavy sprays that occasionally flush the pier during high tide and stormy weather. Together with Battery Beach Pier, Sunkist Pier and Blue Lagoon, Snake Park is one of the four sites along the Durban coastline that are officially designated as piers open to fishermen. Although open to fishermen, Battery beach pier has been under construction since 2009 and is per this writing (September, 2011) still not accessible to the public. Sunkist pier has been shortened and in low tide does not reach the water, rendering it only occasionally suitable to fish off. Another site popular with fishermen (but not focus of this is study) is the Blue Lagoon, located at the tip of the Umgeni River. Plans have been developed for the construction of a pedestrian pier and many fear that in the long run Blue Lagoon too will no longer be accessible to fishermen (Fieldnotes, June - July, 2010).

Figure 4: Battery Beach pier: one of the four officially designated piers for fishing along the Durban coastline. It is expected to be under construction until 2012 (SvG, Aug. 2010)

**Durban Harbour**

In 2004 many fishing sites in the Durban harbour were closed to fishermen due to security regulations in the wake of events on 11 September 2001, which was the incentive to establish the KZNSFF as discussed earlier. To date, most fishing sites in the harbour area remain closed. A small pier running some 100 meters into the shallow waters from the Port Natal Maritime Museum, remains open and provided some space for fishermen to fish. From 2007 till now, many fishermen claim to have been harassed by the South African Police Services (SAPS) in the Harbour (Dray, 2009). Many felt intimidated by state officials and have been
fined for fishing in prohibited places (Hauck et al, 2002b; Ngwenya, 2009 video). On regular occasions tackle and rods have been confiscated, often also attracting fines of several hundred rands\textsuperscript{11} (Dray, 2009).  

**South Pier**

From the 1930s, Durban-based fishermen increasingly began to fish individually with rods and lines. The South Pier on the south side of the harbour mouth was especially popular\textsuperscript{12}. South Pier was also a place where racial segregation during apartheid years was maintained. The end of South Pier remained reserved for white fishermen only (Dray, 2009). Whites tended to utilise the end of the pier, where access to the deeper waters was guaranteed, and game fish such as (white) shark and barracuda were often caught. The non-white, mostly Indian fishermen on South Pier were forced to fish the shallower waters. As a result, species such as blacktail, stumpnose bream, and pompano were popular dishes in many family homes.

In 2007 the South Pier was closed to the fishermen, officially for an upgrade, which took about three years and involved the widening and heightening of the concrete structure. When the construction of the pier was finished in early 2010, it was presumed that access would be allowed again and fishermen increasingly returned to the South Pier to fish. This resulted in repeated confrontations with SAPS and many fishermen claimed to have been harassed and fined, and their equipment confiscated.

One instance of state interference on 9 August 2010 led to a curious conclusion. Under the direction of KZNSFF, a gathering was organised on South Pier whereby fishermen planned to ‘occupy the Pier’. They were soon confronted by private security and SAPS officers. The SAPS superintendent asked everyone to leave the pier, threatening them with prosecution under the National Key Points Act of 1980 (Fieldnotes, 09/08/2010, Durban).

\textsuperscript{11} See also the forum on www.sealine.co.za for more accounts.

\textsuperscript{12} The South Pier was constructed in 1893 - and later several times refurbished - in order to protect the entrance of the harbour. A result of the first lengthening of the South Pier resulted in a drop of fish stock in the harbour, adding to a sense of urgency to move away from subsistence fishing as a main source of income for many fishermen (Dray 2009).
The ‘National Key Points Act’ of 1980 states: “[i]f it appears to the Minister [of Defense] at any time that any place or area is so important that its loss, damage, disruption or immobilization may prejudice the Republic, or whenever he considers it necessary or expedient for the safety of the Republic or in the public interest, he may declare that place or area a National Key Point” (the Republic of South Africa, 2007). The fishermen did not consider this a very convincing argument, as the pier was accessible for the public by foot, car and even by train. The National Key Points Act was implemented to prevent acts of terrorism. To be refused access on such grounds thus contributed to a sense of being criminalised.

The South Pier remains closed to fishermen and members of the general public. A small beach south of the pier, also referred to as ‘the Bluff head’, is open to fishermen, but does not bring with it the opportunities that the hundreds of metres long South Pier offers. With the closing of South Pier, the Durban harbour, the Bay of Plenty and Dairy Beach piers, fishermen are increasingly pushed to the periphery of Durban. Facilities once provided on the more spacious beachfront piers, are often lacking on the fishing sites currently allocated to them.

**Licensing**

In 1998 the Marine Living Resources Act (MLRA) was signed into law by then president Nelson Mandela. The contribution of the small-scale commercial fisheries sector to food security, poverty alleviation and rural development had “been systematically neglected by fisheries managers over the years in favour of the commercial fisheries sector” (Sowman, 2006: 60). Prior to 1998, all fishermen except for recreational or commercial fishermen were deemed poachers, and the responsibility of the law enforcement (Hauck et al, 2002b). In contrast, the MLRA recognised the subsistence fisheries sector alongside the recreational and commercial sectors.

Along with the recognition (and legal protection) of subsistence fishermen, one of the intentions of the MLRA is the protection of marine resources. At the time, these were considered under heavy pressure from commercial fishing and pollution, and remain so up
until today (Sowman, 2006). Under the MLRA, possessing a license was made a requirement in order to fish legally in South African waters. The license fees are collected in the Marine Living Resources Fund, which is managed by Ezemvelo KwaZulu-Natal Wildlife, and are appropriated for the purpose of management and research (EKZNW, interview, October 2010).

The formal recognition of subsistence fishermen, together with a tightening grip of management over marine resources, promised to improve conditions for the fishermen. However, this was not realised (Sowman, 2006). While subsistence fishermen are formally recognised, throughout my entire fieldwork period I did not encounter a single fishermen with a subsistence permit. The collapse of line fish stock has resulted in a change of policy by local government. Subsistence fishermen in need of access to line fish are now required to obtain a recreational license and “comply with recreational permit restrictions” (Sowman, 2006: 66).

In addition, the definition of a ‘subsistence fisherman’ has frequently been criticised for being too vague and exclusionary (Dray, 2009; Sowman, 2006; Branch et al., 2002). The MLRA formally recognised the subsistence fishermen, albeit in order to know what a ‘subsistence fisherman’ is, one needs an unambiguous definition. The definition presented in the Act of 1998 states:

Subsistence fisher means a natural person who regularly catches fish for personal consumption or for the consumption of his or her dependants, including one who engages from time to time on the local sale or barter of excess catch, but does not include a person who engages on a substantial scale in the scale of fish on a commercial basis (MLRA, 1998: 10, def.55, as quoted in: Branch et al., 2002: 476).

As becomes clear, this definition is vague enough to be meaningless. After all, what do such statements as “from time to time”, and “substantial scale” mean? Marine Coastal Management (MCM), and the Subsistence Fisheries Task Group (SFTG), which is appointed by the Chief Director of MCM, agreed upon the following alternative definition:
Subsistence fishers are poor people who personally harvest marine resources as a source of food or to sell them to meet the basic needs of food security; they operate on or near to the shore or in estuaries, live in close proximity to the resource, consume or sell the resources locally, use low-technology gear (often as part of a long-standing community-based or cultural practice), and the kinds of resources they harvest generate only sufficient returns to meet the basis needs of food security (Branch et al., 2002: 475).

Despite its intentions, the MLRA has not as yet managed to contribute to “balancing economic efficiency, social equity and ecological sustainability” as subsistence-fishing licenses have not been given out in the greater Durban area (Sowman, 2006:71). The current situation, then, is that although fishermen may engage in (small-scale) commercial behaviour by selling their catch, they are not granted with licenses that legally allow them to do so and thereby are not protected under the MLRA.

A proposal on the restructuring of fishing permit fees was gazetted in January 2010. All “interested and affected parties” were invited to comment on the proposal (notice 54, 2010, no. 32898 Marine Living Resources Act, 1998). Among other changes in fees, it was proposed to raise the yearly recreational angling license fee from R69 to R200 (a rise of 289%), the crayfish license fee from R75 to R500 (a rise of 566%), and the bait license fee from R85 to R500 (a rise of 488%). These increases were met with a national outcry from fishermen, representatives of civil society and academia (Louwe, 14/02/10). The Act was declined. However, this too, like the unmade promises of the MLRA of 1998, may have contributed to a collective sense of distrust towards the authorities.

The FIFA World Cup 2010

On 15 May 2004 South Africa was awarded the hosting of the FIFA World Cup 2010. The tournament ran from 11 June until 11 July 2010 and saw 32 international squads (six from the

---

13 Some parts of South Africa, particularly in KZN, have witnessed successful implementation of co-management systems. One such example is the community of Thonga reed fishermen in Kosi Bay (Sowman, 2006; Hauck et al., 2002a).

14 Through a survey based research, Hauck et al., (2002b: 468) in 2002 showed that “[l]ess than half the respondents (..) reported having a [good] relationship with management authority in their area (..) [while] participants from most of the focus groups in the Eastern Cape and KZN reported a [bad] relationship with the relevant management authority.”

The ANC-led government aimed to establish South Africa as capable of hosting a ‘world class’ event (Alegi, 2010; Ginsberg, 2010). The organising and hosting of the event was viewed as an opportunity for South Africa to (re)present itself as an attractive tourism destination, with a safe, secure and commercially interesting investment climate (Alegi, 2010). Together with the necessary upgrading of stadiums and infrastructure, this improved image would result in an increasing job market and economic sustainability in the long term, it was reasoned by South Africa’s leaders (Alegi, 2010; Ginsberg, 2010).

Durban hosted eight matches, including a semi-final in the ‘state-of-the-art’ R3.2 billion Moses Mabhida stadium. The stadium’s construction costs were initially estimated at R1.6 billion, but doubled during the years of construction (Desai et al., 2010). The legitimacy of the project was regularly questioned in the media (Nord et al., 2010). The Moses Mabhida stadium was built a mere few hundred metres away from the 54 000 seat ABSA stadium, home-ground to Durban’s rugby squad ‘the Sharks’. According to some, the ABSA stadium could easily have been extended to a 60 000 capacity. It was argued that pressure from FIFA to provide a 60.000 (or more) seat stadium, combined with ambitions to prove a world class standard, resulted in the construction of a ‘white elephant’ (Tanner, 2010 video; Bond, 08/06/10). The central question, then, running throughout the debates was ‘Who was to benefit from the World Cup’ (Jones, 2006). Civil society groups and academics raised their concerns by stating that the billions would better be off invested in education, housing, and

15 City manager Mike Sutcliff suggested that Durban would make a bid for the 2020 Olympics and has stated that the Moses Mabhida stadium has been built “according to the Olympic code, as well as for the World Cup” (see appendix H.3). It may explain the investment in the Moses Mabhida stadium. I had the privilege of attending the Netherlands-Slovakia match. I noticed the lowest five rows of the brand new stadium being out of use. When seated on the front row, the view was blocked by the commercial advertising around the field that is typical for football matches. Judging from the infrastructure and the shape of the seating inside, I realised the stadium was built for the purpose of athletics, rather than primarily those of football.
sport facilities accessible for the marginalised and most vulnerable in South-African society (Desai et al., 2010)

**Political Economic Interests**

Danny Jordaan, head of the organising committee, emphasised how important the World Cup was going to be for the poor and the marginalised, and how the event gave them hope (Ginsberg, 2010). Jacob Zuma, then president of South Africa, was particularly concerned with utilising the event as a nation-building instrument as well as the promotion of a positive picture of the African continent (van der Merwe, 2010). During a national radio broadcast Zuma represented the voice of the (South-African) nation by stating:

> [t]he whole continent has been waiting to receive the World Cup. We should not disappoint them. Take care of the visitors, and make the rest of Africa proud. (…) We must show the visitors how we are and display who we are (Zuma, 12/05/10, SAFM).

The advertising industry opportunistically established associative linkages between particular brands and the football tournament. For example, the noisy vuvuzela was rigorously exploited as part of a marketing campaign by telecom provider MTN and during the hundred days approaching the World Cup, national and official FIFA radio broadcaster SAFM counted the days, while urging their viewers and listeners to: “feel it, it is here!”.

The idea that global events such as the FIFA World Cup are increasingly commercialised, striving to immerse the public in a value-laden and branded environment of consumer experiences, is not new, of course (Slack, 2004; Ngonyama, 2004). However, it is important to recognise some of the consequences of the overlap between political and commercial strategies as it can be hypothesised that FIFA’s partners, e.g. MTN and SABC, became political actors during the FIFA World Cup.

Their strategies were, like those of the government, directed towards a nation building process, ultimately seeking to contribute to and benefit from the (temporary) sense of pride and community as facilitated by the World Cup (Alegi, 2010; Nauright, 2004; Ginsberg, 2010). Their commercial interests were arguably to be served by tying a common sense of
belonging to a specific brand. It could therefore be argued that partners in the commercial sector, consciously or unconsciously, teamed up with South Africa’s national government to build the South African nation.

This is significant in the context of this research for at least one important reason. From political as well as commercial sectors in society, South Africans received messages stressing the promises and benefits of the World Cup, thereby unifying them as a nation. The event was to be understood as a blessing for all, rather than a curse for some. Corporations and political leaders worked to establish a relationship between being an accepted member of the nation and support for the World Cup. However, the reality is that, through nationalistic representations the interests of the political and economic dominant classes were to be secured, as is perhaps usually the case (Guha et al., 1988; McLeod, 2000; Anderson, 1983).

In the context of commercial and political pressure to relate positively to the event, several groups from civil society aimed to utilise the globally broadcast event to gain voice by communicating their concerns on current affairs - mostly related to service delivery (Nord et al., 2010). President Zuma tried to mobilise such action groups at the last minute, when he uttered: “when there are visitors in a house, you don’t start fighting. The World Cup is just four weeks, then we can go back to our issues”. He urged the nation to stand together as South Africans and support the World Cup and Bafana Bafana [South African national football team](Zuma, 16/05/2010, SAFM).

The position of FIFA

In a contract between FIFA and the national government and local municipalities of the host cities, it was stated that no advertising, except that of the official sponsors, was to be allowed within a one kilometre radius of the stadiums, a measure to protect the value of sponsor deals that were made with the world’s largest multinationals\(^\text{16}\) (eThekwini Municipality, 2010 FIFA World Cup South Africa By-Laws, p, 25). FIFA organises “the Fifa World Cup, and various other World Cup competitions” and its mission is to “develop the game, touch the

\(^{16}\) FIFA’s ‘partners’, ‘sponsors’, and ‘supporters’ during the period of the World Cup 2010 were: Adidas, Coca-Cola, Emirates, Hyundai-Kia Motors, Sony, Visa, Budweiser, Castrol, Continental Tyre Group AG, McDonalds, Mahindra Satyam, MTN Group Seara, Yingli Solar, British Petroleum, First National Bank, Neo Africa, the Passenger Agency of South Africa, Shanduka-Agreko, and Telkom (Arranke et al., 2010)
world, build a better future” (www.fifa.com, 2011). It is able to do so by taking the economic surplus from the competitions it organises, primarily by means of selling advertising rights. FIFA therefore requires the smooth running of the World Cup as the advertising rights are secured by the host country.

While it is possible that Jordaan might have been serious and sincere in his personal commitment to the marginalised and unemployed who were also to benefit from the World Cup, Durban’s informal street traders, usually very active on the commercially attractive beachfront\(^\text{17}\), were forbidden to trade there during the event. This right was secured for the privileged partners of FIFA, or the (not so) privileged middle class who had to pay R40 000 for a small vending stand within the confines of the FIFA fanfest on the Durban beachfront (Fieldnotes, 18/06/2010, Durban).

FIFA’s right to appoint the use of space on the Durban beachfront went further than economics alone. Halfway through the event, a small group of protesters were arrested for handing out flyers that addressed current threats in relation to xenophobic violence (Bond, 06/07/10). In the contract signed by Zuma, Jordaan and Sepp Blatter, who was the president of FIFA at the time, it is stated: “No Person shall, during the Term erect, maintain, distribute or display a Sign or a Billboard at a controlled Access site or within an Exclusion Zone” (eThekwini Municipality 2010 FIFA World Cup South Africa By-Laws, p, 26). Patrick Bond, one of the protesters who were arrested, reported about the incident in his weekly column in The Mercury and explained that he and his colleagues were accused of loitering and ambush marketing\(^\text{18}\) and were detained and questioned for several hours (Bond, 06/07/10).

My concern here is not so much with the interference of FIFA in what would otherwise be nationally or locally controlled issues. Rather, the contracts signed by national and local

---

\(^\text{17}\) Outside the FIFA regulated ‘fanparks’, it was where such major corporate businesses like ‘Famous Brands’, the mother company of fast-food chains like Wimpy’s, Steers, and Debonair’s Pizza, which all have permanent establishments on the beachfront, who flourished during the World Cup. From 2009 ‘Famous Brands’ had invested in powerful marketing strategies, and several months after the World Cup announced their largest profit ever of R235 million (Shapiro, 02/08/10).

\(^\text{18}\) The lack of good humour by FIFA regarding the matter of ‘ambush marketing’ became infamously clear when two Dutch women wearing orange dresses, showing a miniscule ‘Bavaria’ logo, were arrested for ambush marketing and remained detained for several days. It took diplomatic pressure from the Dutch minister of state Maxime Verhagen, to have the women released on bail.
governance and FIFA contributes to formalising hegemonic ideas that celebrate the World Cup. The football association seeks to optimise the value of advertising space, while not (explicitly) entering the arena of politics. In Swiss fashion, FIFA wants to remain ‘neutral’, but it should be clear that the association in this context has to be understood as a political-economic player with more than a significant degree of power in the construction and maintenance of hegemonic ideas in relation to the World Cup. FIFA protects itself through the contracts as signed in 2004 and is thereby thus also supported by the South African state.

**Conclusion**

In this chapter I presented the background as relevant to the issues of the fishermen and my research in particular. A brief overview of Durban’s long and rich fishing history is presented and it is argued that the fishermen have had to adapt and resist exclusionary policies and practices throughout the 20th Century. The exclusions resulted in the establishment of the representative bodies of the NRSAA and the KZNSFF, which represented the fishermen in a public, political and juridical domain in the 1980s and 2000s. Hence, the fishermen and their efforts to organise and engage with other publics cannot be understood as ‘without history’.

The World Cup, however, appears to give rise to particular positions in understanding the recent exclusion. The football tournament can be argued as working largely to the benefit of the middle class and corporate business, while it remains unclear how people like the fishermen were to benefit from the event. If anything, many fishermen relate the enclosure of the beachfront piers to the preparations of the World Cup, as I discuss in detail in Chapter 5. Regardless of the role in the fishermen’s exclusion from the central beachfront piers, the World Cup was also perceived as an opportunity to widely communicate issues of concern by the fishermen. Before I discuss the organisation of public action and the applied strategies as part thereof, I discuss a theoretical framework in which these processes are to be understood and elaborated.
CHAPTER 3

Theoretical Framework

Introduction
This study is located in the constructionist\(^{19}\) paradigm and falls within the theoretical field of Cultural Studies. Cultural Studies is concerned with culture as a system of shared meaning and ultimately “a terrain of contestation and struggle” (Tomaselli, 1987; Kincheloe et al., 2000: 284; Barker, 2000; Hall 1997; Hartley, 2003). The field of Cultural Studies draws on a variety of theoretical paradigms, ranging from neo-Marxism to postcolonialism. What they have in common is that they all theorise (relations of) power: “the glue that holds the social together, [and] the coercive force which subordinates one set of people to another” (Barker, 2000: 10).

The Cultural Studies project is fundamentally political in itself, in that it is concerned with transformation by contributing to “change and to representations of and ‘for’ marginalized (sic) social groups” (Barker, 2000: 5). Its emphasis on power distinguishes it from other social sciences. If, as has been argued, anthropology and sociology are generally more interested in the understanding of a particular cultural manifestation or types of social organization, Cultural Studies is more concerned with the workings and critique of “systems of relations of power” that constitute culture and society (Frow et al., 2000: 330).

This chapter sets out the theoretical framework that informs this study. It begins with a historical contextualisation of anthropological usages of the concept of culture. My personal background in anthropology as an undergraduate student has implicitly influenced the design and interests of this research. Also critiqued, therefore, are anthropological usages of the concept of culture for their a-historical approach and for insufficiently allowing attention to relations of power.

---

\(^{19}\) ‘Constructionism’ is often used synonymously with ‘post-structuralism’ (Hall, 1997).
In contrast to most anthropological perspectives, the field of Cultural Studies directs attention to relations of power. Central to both Cultural Studies and this study in particular is the notion of culture as a contested field of shared social meaning (Hall, 1997; Hannerz, 1992; Geertz, 1973, Jackson, 1989). The concept of representation, understood as a process of meaning construction, is of particular value here (Hall, 1997). As one of the aims of this study is to probe contestation in processes of meaning construction, the concepts of hegemony and discourse, central ideas in the Cultural Studies project, become useful (Barker, 2000; Storey, 1997; Hall, 1997). Towards the end of this chapter the concepts of counter-public as well as the concept of a Social Movement Organisation (SMO) are introduced. Particularly ideas on SMOs are relevant as the fishermen have a long history of political mobilisation and organisation in a quest to ultimately alter power relations and foster change in their benefit (Benford et al., 2000; Brechner et al., 2000; Snow, 2005; Tilly, 2002). The combined use of these notions enables culture to be understood as a contested field of shared meaning. I argue that meaning is the result of processes of contestation between different publics and counter-publics, which occurs to a significant extent in what is also referred to as the public sphere (Habermas, 1989; Dahlgren et al., 1991; Dahlberg, 2007; Calhoun 1997; Fraser, 1991).

**Notions of Culture**

Tylor (1924) is the author of arguably the most frequently referenced definition of “culture” in the social sciences, which was developed within the naturalist paradigm. In Tylor’s definition, culture is “that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society” (Tylor, 1924: 1). This definition is considered a landmark particularly in anthropology, but it has been severely critiqued\(^\text{20}\) as “too inclusive to serve much analytical purpose, nor providing any means for distinguishing the cultural from other elements in society, such as the political or economic” (Jackson, 1989: 26).

\(^{20}\) Tylor understood cultures in an evolutionary framework, whereby each culture passed through stages of savagery and barbarism before evolving into a “civilised” (read Western) culture (Tylor, 1924). The decreasing importance of this Darwinian scheme can in great part be ascribed to the American anthropologist Franz Boas, who most notably moved away from cultural evolutionism to a more cultural relativist approach (Eriksen, 2001:13-14). Boas (1911) argued against an ethnocentric and teleological approach whereby “a culture” was understood as an organism climbing the evolutionary ladder. Rather, every culture was to be understood in its own particulars.
Similarly, Tylor’s definition has been critiqued as reifying the concept of culture. Culture is seen as an identifiable “whole” whereby “members of society” learn their behaviour from their peers (Tylor, 1924; Jackson, 1989). Tylor’s descriptive and holistic definition does not allow for an understanding or explanation of cultural change. In the 19th Century it might have been relatively easy for Western anthropologists to understand primitive societies as a bounded entity. However, in an era of rapid globalizing movement this approach proves increasingly difficult to sustain (Jackson, 1989: 26-28).

The nature/nurture debate discussed the naturalist approach as opposed to a culturalist approach, which holds the assumption that “human beings respond to their surroundings by way of their culture” (Hannerz, 1992: 16). Culture, rather than the individual, is viewed as having agency. It is argued that culturalist arguments often lead to explanations in which the “victim is blamed” (Hannerz, 1969: 179-181). Moreover, it “seeks to explain ideas and practices with respect to culture, rather than seeing culture as something to be explained” (Jackson, 1989: 27). However, anthropological culturalist arguments did result in a renewed interest in collective and individual agency in Cultural Studies, most notably between the 1950s and 1970s, which was an era of structural and Marxist dominance in the field of the social sciences (Hall, 1980).

Claude Levi-Strauss is the theorist who is arguably most identified with the structuralist turn in the anthropological discipline. His ambition was to find those underlying structures through which cultural manifestations, or social organisations acquired or produced meaning (Levi-Strauss, 1972, 1984, 1993; Hall, 1997; Ortner, 1984). The problem with structural lines of argument, however, is that historical change becomes difficult to explain, in part due to the lack of attention to individual and collective forms of agency (Ortner, 1984; Storey, 1997: 46).

21 A widely known, although much criticised culturalist argument by Oscar Lewis (2010) is referred to as the ‘culture of poverty’ theory. The argument runs that people in a situation of structural poverty are made into subjects by their culture (of poverty), while being unable to escape, or alter their situation (Lewis, 2010). The theory explains structural deprivation in terms of reproducing culture by its members (Bourgois, 2003: 16-17).
Interpretive anthropology argued against the a-humanist structuralist movement by recognizing human and individual agency as a significant force in history. Culture is studied by Clifford Geertz as a text that was to be understood in a context of time and space. Rather than just a description of cultural manifestations, interpretative anthropology is more interested in how people make sense of their worlds (Geertz, 1973; Ortner, 1999). Geertz offers his understanding as follows: “[b]elieving, with Max Weber, that man is an animal suspended in webs of significance he himself has spun, I take culture to be those webs, and the analysis of it to be therefore not an experimental science in search of law but an interpretative one in search of meaning” (Geertz, 1973: 5).

Consistent with this approach, Geertz treats cultural events such as the ‘Balinese cockfight’ as a text, through which he aims to analyse and understand (at least part of) Balinese culture. Geertz concludes that the cockfight is not about “cocks that are fighting”, but should rather be understood as “a dramatization of status concerns”, ‘as it is really the men that are fighting’ (Geertz, 1973). Geertz’ textual approach to culture relates to the semiotic approach of cultural texts in the broad Cultural Studies project. Roland Barthes, for example, analysed “texts” in the popular public sphere for their underlying (ideological) meaning (Barthes, 1972, 1975)

Geertz explains “cultural patterns, that is, systems, or complexes of symbols” as models for and of reality (Geertz, 1973: 92-93). In other words, the system of symbols, webs of meaning if you like, are representations of social worlds. Similarly, social actors use those cultural patterns as models for constructing their own lived experiences. These cultural patterns, then, are seen as reservoirs to which people contribute, but also draw from in order to make sense of their own lives. This is an important contribution of Geertz to the development of the concept of culture as it recognises culture as never fixed, while allowing agency for the subjects that help shape the culture.

Despite his contributions, Geertz’s approach has been critiqued for being too subjective, a-historical, and lacking an approach to resistance and relations of power. Thompson (1990:131) points out that the model of interpretative anthropology produces “interpretations of interpretations”. The ethnographic writing is the scholars’ interpretation of the way the
subjects interpret a particular set of symbols, as in the case of the Balinese cockfight. The difficulties in determining how much the interpretations of the researcher coincide with the interpretations of the subject(s) have been pointed out (Thompson, 1990: 135). Geertz’s interest seems to lie “in the meaning rather than the divergent and conflicting meanings that cultural phenomena may have for individuals situated in different circumstances and endowed with differing resources and opportunities” (Thompson, 1990: 135).

Second, Geertz’s conceptualisation of culture as text has been critiqued as idealist “separating cultural products from their historical production and from the relations of power and domination in which they are necessarily enmeshed” (Sewell Jr., 1999:36). While I would suggest caution in relation to the second critique, for Geertz understands the cockfight as a performance in relation to power structures within the Balinese village where he conducted fieldwork, his approach lacks a historical framework.

This leads to the third important critique on Geertz’ notion of culture. It is argued that Geertz does not sufficiently attend to structures of power in the understanding of cultural change (Sewell Jr., 1999). The idea of resistance and contestation of cultural processes of meaning making seems to be absent from Geertz’s definitions and analysis of culture (Ortner, 1999; Sewell Jr., 1999; Thompson, 1990; Roseberry, 1982; Asad, 1980). Geertz’s project was more concerned in establishing the intrinsic meaning of the cultural event through the study of the symbolic quality of the event as text.

**Cultural Studies Perspective on Culture: A Map of Meaning**

Cultural Studies draws from all of the above although arguably least from the naturalist approach. It is argued that both culturalist and structuralist theory have been fundamental to the development of the field (Hall, 1980). Culturalism ultimately resulted in a heightened attention to human agency, while structuralist theory still reminds us that “men [sic] make history (..) on the basis of conditions which are not of their making” (Storey, 1997: 42; Marx,

---

22 In a debate on Geertz’ working definition of religion Talal Asad (1982:252) poses an important argument against Geertz’ work. He suggests rather than studying the social meaning of religious systems of symbols, one should “begin by asking what are the historical conditions (..) necessary for the existence of particular religious practices and discourses?”. Asad urges Geertz to scrutinise “how does power create religion?” (Asad, 1982: 252).
By themselves, however, they are inadequate for the study of culture (Hall, 1980). Furthermore, it has been pointed out that later work in Cultural Studies has not typically engaged much with Geertzian, or interpretative working definitions of culture as they do not seem to allow for a study of culture within a framework of relations of power (Ortner, 1999: 2). In spite of this, the idea of “webs of meaning” corresponds with the discursive approach to the study of culture (Hall, 1997; Jackson, 1989; Foucault, 1980). Moving away from the anthropological concepts of culture, I discuss the Cultural Studies approach, which is typically concerned with power relations (Barker, 2000; Storey, 1997).

The theoretical field of Cultural Studies understands culture as inherently political and “the actual grounded terrain of practices, representations, languages and customs of any specific society (...) [and] the contradictory forms of common sense which have taken root in and helped to shape popular life” (Hall, 1996: 439). To understand the cultural involves a shift “to the domain of cultural politics where meanings are negotiated and relations of dominance and subordination are defined and contested” (Jackson, 1989: 2). Cultural Studies theorist Barker (2000: 65) adds that the Cultural Studies project “asks questions about which meanings are put in to circulation, by whom, for what purposes and in whose interests”. The processes of individual and collective understanding, as well as the (public) discursive negotiation of meaning are of interest and form the core of this particular research. This conception of culture, not only as a map of meaning (Hall, 1997), but also as a domain of struggle, “where contradictions are contested and resolved” (Jackson, 1989: 1) informs this study, and relates to what Thompson (1990: 7) has referred to as “meaning in the service of power”, a phrase I will come back to below.

**Representation and Meaning Construction**
To conceive culture as a “map of meaning” raises the question of how such mapping or meaning construction is to be understood within the Cultural Studies approach (Hall, 1997; Jackson, 1989). The process of meaning construction is referred to as representation (Hall, 1997). Hall identifies two systems of representation, namely a conceptual ‘map’ on the one hand, and a language, or system of signs on the other, that enables meaning to be communicated. Representation refers to processes of building relationships between a
conceptual map of the material world, and the system of signs that refers to the material world (Hall, 1997: 17-19, 61). The system of signs is referred to as language and is used here in a broad sense. “Any sound, word, image, or object which functions as a sign, and is organised with other signs into a system which is capable of carrying and expressing meaning is, from this point of view, `a language’” (Hall, 1997: 19). This way, dress, for example, can be understood as a language.

The process of meaning construction, which I call representation relates to culture in terms of a shared conceptual map and a shared language. The two representational systems enable people not only to communicate, but also to roughly interpret the world in the same way (Hall, 1997: 18). Importantly, culture is recognised as political in the sense that meaning is constantly negotiated and so contested. Representation, the process whereby meaning is constructed, must therefore be seen in a context of power relations (Foucault, 1980; Hall, 1997).

The Study of Representation

Two approaches are generally employed in the study of representation: the semiotic approach and the discursive approach (Barker, 2000; Hall, 1997). The semiotic approach recognises that cultural products deploy signs in order to be meaningful. It studies the systems of signs as a language and is interested in relations of meaning (Hall, 1997). A discursive approach is interested in relations of power that constitute meaning. It allows for an approach whereby the lived realities are not studied a-historically, while never claiming to arrive at ‘a final meaning’ of cultural practice (Hall, 1997:42). Rather, cultural practice is studied as meaningful within discourse. It is argued that the representation and practise relation acquire meaning, as they are constituted within discourse. Hence, meaning outside of discourse is impossible (Foucault, 1980; Laclau et al., 1985).

Foucault’s project was concerned with the study of power in modern society, and was particularly interested in how it establishes and authorises meaning or “truth” through discourse (Foucault, 1980, 1982; Hall, 1997; Barker, 2000). Hall (1997) draws on Foucault’s

---

23 for approach see: Hall, 1973; Barthes, 1972, 1975; Tomaselli, 1996
(1980) concepts of “discourse”, “knowledge”, and “power” in relation to “the subject” to theorise representation. Discourse is theorised as producing knowledge through language and social practice (Hall, 1992: 291). It is understood as “a group of statements which provide a language for talking about … a particular kind of knowledge about a topic” (Hall, 1992: 201). In other words, discourse is a way of representing reality. However, Foucault (1980) recognised that some people have more power to make particular ideas appear as “truth”. His position can be argued to be a constructionist approach, whereby he acknowledged the existence of the material world but argued that meaning did not occur outside of relations of power, or discourse (Foucault, 1980; Rouse, 1994).

In Foucault’s view, then, discourses rather than individuals give meaning to the world (Hall, 1997: 45). They determine the “sayable” and “thinkable”, and “unsayable” and “unthinkable” (Hall, 1997: 44-45). Hence, discourse does not only determine what appears to be true, it also determines what is not true as it includes and excludes ideas and positions. Moreover, discourse determines what can be said, but also who can speak, and where and when s/he can speak it (Hall, 1973, 1997; Barker, 2000). Discourse is political and exclusionary in nature, then, as it discriminates in who can participate in processes of attributing meaning to the world.

Foucault argued that the subject chooses a discourse, and a position within that discourse from which s/he speaks (Foucault, 1980). Foucault’s theorising on discourse does therefore not render the subject without agency. Although some may be more powerful than others, there are always multiple discourses from which the subject can choose to draw, rendering the subject an agent in the moment of choice. Discourse then does not only attribute meaning to the practise or object of representation, it also constitutes the subject that holds the discursive position. Foucault allows for the existence of a variety of discourses, and positions within discourses that are to be taken in by the agent (Foucault, 1980; Hall, 1997). Hence, Foucault noted that power should not be solely seen as “negative, repressing what it seeks to control … it is also productive” (Hall, 1997: 50).

The assumption of discourses as inherently political and exclusionary is fundamental to the idea that discourses always change and are never fixed. Discourses compete with other
discourses, while contesting ideas within the same discourse also result in change. Moreover, the fact that some people are more authorised than others to participate in (public) processes of meaning-making, also implies resistance and struggle. However, when resistance to or within discourse is unsuccessful and a particular discourse, a way of representing a shared and lived experience, becomes dominant it turns into “a common sense” (Hall, 1997, Gramsci, 1971; Crehan, 2002) or what Foucault calls a “regime of truth” (Foucault, 1980).

This understanding of discourse informs Edward Said’s (1978) work on “Orientalism”, an account that analyses dominant discourses, and their relation to Western power. Said argues that Western processes of representation have produced a common sense of ‘the Orient’ based on powerful Western discourses. He argues that from as early as the 14th Century, “Orientalism” was established as an academic discipline throughout Europe (p. 50). Consistent with Foucault, Said argued the relation between power and knowledge to be crucial in the establishment of meaning and knowledge in society (1978, p3, 94). Western discourses of the Orient were dominant (hegemonic) as a consequence of being legitimated by Western academia with their power to produce knowledge (or “truth”) (Said, 1978). The phenomenon of Orientalism as a powerful discourse is consistent with Foucault’s concept of “regimes of truth” (Foucault, 1980: 131) and Gramsci’s concept of hegemony.

**Misrepresentation: Stigmatisation and the Stereotypical Other**

The point has been made above that discourses are productive but also exclusionary in nature. These exclusionary forces are most evident in processes of “othering” (Pickering, 2001). The concepts of the “stigma” and the “stereotype” are relevant here as they refer to ways of “othering” as exclusionary techniques that result in social fixation or exclusion of a people (Pickering, 2001; Elias et al., 1994; Goffman, 1963).

Goffman (1963:3) argues that a stigma can be understood as “an attribute that is deeply discrediting” but continues by stating that “it should be seen as a language of relationships, not attributes”. A stigma is effective as a social exclusionary mechanism and results in the fixation of unequal power relations (Elias et al., 1994; Goffman, 1963). One of the strategies according to Elias (1994) is that particular emphasis is placed on the negative attributes of the
stigmatised, while juxtaposing those attributes with the (dominantly perceived) positive attributes of the stigmatising group.

This perspective on stigmatisation corresponds with what is also referred to as ‘stereotypical dualism’ (Hall, 1992; Hulme, 1986). Hall understands a stereotype as “a one-sided description which results from the collapsing of complex differences” after which the “exaggerated simplification is … attached to a subject or place” (Hall, 1992: 308). This simplifying the world by means of stereotyping is often combined with ‘stereotypical dualism’ (Hall, 1992; Hulme, 1986). Not only is the stereotyped subject (re)presented in simplified manner, it is also juxtaposed with its opposite – “its mirror image” (Hall, 1992: 308). The object of the stereotype is to fix or establish unequal relations of power and characterises “the representation of subordinated social groups and is one of the means by which they are categorised and kept in their place” (Dyer, 1997: 12).

Pickering (2001), too, offers a critical understanding of the concept of stereotyping. In the constructionist paradigm in which this study is located, the assumption of ‘objective (media) discourse’ is difficult to sustain (Hall, 1997; Pickering, 2001). However, Pickering establishes a relation between the study of stereotypes in constructionist fashion, showing how they “relate to conceptions of what is held to be ‘natural’ or ‘normal’ and how they create and sustain a common sense of the proper limits of what is accepted as legitimate and right” (Pickering, 2001: xiv). A critical notion of the stereotype, thus, relates to Foucault’s understanding of the in- and exclusionary nature of discourse (Foucault, 1980; Hall, 1997).

Pickering argues for the analytical concept of the stereotype to be used alongside with what is generally considered its conceptual successor, the concept of ‘the Other’ (Pickering, 2001; Fabian, 1983). The stereotype is useful in analysing processes of social boundary making, while the concept of ‘the Other’ allows for broader analysis of the object of the stereotyping processes (Pickering, 2001). Moreover, the concept of ‘the Other’ compliments the stereotype concept by “grounding [stereotypes] more firmly in the structures and relations of power which give them their binding force” (Pickering, 2001: 69).
On this note, he reminds us that those who are “othered” are unequally positioned in relation to those who do the “othering” (Pickering, 2001: 73). Stereotyping and processes of “othering” are thus not neutral processes but are deeply political as the boundaries that are drawn and maintained on the basis of reductive terms used in the stereotypes fix people in place and structures of asymmetrical power relations (Pickering, 2001; Thompson, 1990). The study of processes of “othering” often lead to a focus on meaning construction in the mediated public sphere as “[t]he symbolically constructed Other and the patterns of social exclusion and incorporation entailed by it are distributed in sign and language, discourse and representation” (Pickering, 2001: 72). In this study too, it is pertinent to probe how people understand and chose to engage with public conceptions positioning the research population as ‘the other’ (Pickering, 2001). The concept of stigma and othering are useful to the analysis on which I elaborate in chapters below.

**Hegemony: Consent to Domination**

The possibility of transforming power relations is central to the project of understanding representation as a process of meaning construction. The concept of hegemony is useful in explaining issues of transformation, or the lack thereof. Gramsci’s conceptions of “common sense”, “resistance”, and the questions of “intellectuals” are of particular relevance to my study (Gramsci, 1971). Here I consider these concepts and explain how his conceptualisations are of use here.

---

24 While imprisoned for the best part of fascist pre-WWII Italy, Antonio Gramsci developed ‘his’ concept of hegemony (Gramsci, 1971; Crehan, 2002). The former leader of the Italian Communist Party saw capitalism as an exploitative system that oppressed the working classes (Davis, 2004). His project was concerned with the question why and how “the subaltern” came to accept, or in the terms of Gramsci seemed to “consent to” a system, which thrived on the exploitation of the working classes (Gramsci, 1971). In other words, why, and contrary to what Marx predicted, do subordinated classes in capitalist society not overturn the power of the dominant and exploiting capitalist classes through revolt? The central question to his intellectual endeavours dealt with the relation between consent and coercion, to which he referred as hegemony and domination (Crehan, 2002: 101; Gramsci, 1971; Hall, 1997; Mitchell, 2000). Gramsci (1971), then, was particularly interested in the study of cultural change, something social scientists only seemed to pick up on several decades later (Crehan, 2002: 71). He saw culture as the result of power structures and realised that in order to understand humanity, one needs to explain culture, rather than have culture explain humanity. Gramsci never treated culture “as an autonomous domain” determined by, or a ‘reflection of economic relations’, but saw it as the “result of historical processes” (Crehan, 2002: 72; Hartley, 2003:89). Heavily influenced by Marx, relations of class take a central position in his theorisations (Hall, 1997: 48; Crehan, 2002: 72).
Gramsci developed the concept of hegemony to theorise “when and under what conditions people consent to rule by a dominant group (..), when they resist that domination (..)” and how “dominant groups work to make consent to the prevailing order seem natural” (Mitchell, 2000: 51). He understood hegemony in dialectical relation with domination (Kurtz, 1996:106). While domination implies force, hegemony refers to a much more subtle process in which

... the leadership uses intellectual devices to infuse its ideas of morality to gain the support of those who resist or may be neutral, to retain the support of those who consent to its rule, and to establish alliances as widely as possible to enable the creation of an ethical-political relationship with the people (Gramsci, 1971:207).

I arrive at a paradox when describing hegemony as “the key concept in understanding the very unity existing in a concrete social formation” (Laclau et al., 1985: 7) but also as requiring “continual ideological work” as hegemony is “both contested and consented to” (Mitchell, 2000: 53). The idea of hegemony contains within itself the idea of resistance, as well as well as that of consent (Davis, 2004: 46). The consent amongst the subordinated classes therefore constantly needs to be “re-won and renegotiated” as it is continuously contested (Barker, 2000: 351).

Spivak (1988) posed the question whether the subaltern can speak. Gramsci dealt with similar questions some six decades earlier. Although he argued that the subaltern were perhaps ‘able to speak’, it was of no use as they, by definition, “cannot possess conceptions which are elaborated, systematic and politically organized and centralized in their albeit contradictory development” (Gramsci, 1985: 189). In other words, the subaltern conceptions of the world are by definition incapable of threatening the dominant common sense conceptions of the world, as one of the characteristics of subaltern thought for Gramsci is its “incoherence and contradictoriness” (1971:189).
In order for the subaltern classes to form a serious threat to the dominant classes and ‘their’ common sense, they have to produce intellectuals who have to provide the “incoherent jumble” with “coherence and intellectual rigour” (Crehan, 2002: 5). The intellectuals are, therefore, both “the producers and the product of class-for-itself” (Crehan, 2002: 161). The role of the leadership then becomes crucial in Gramsci’s understanding of subaltern culture and the struggle over hegemony in modern capitalist society.

Gramsci (1971) distinguished between two types of intellectuals, which he referred to as “organic” or “traditional”. “Organic” refers to the organic nature of the relation between the intellectual and the class-culture from which s/he arises and is (and remains) attached to (Gramsci, 1971: 3-23). Their function lies in “directing the ideas and aspirations of the class to which they organically belong” (Gramsci, 1971: 3). Gramsci did not see the organic intellectual as a human individual agent per se but could also be an institution or organisation, as long as it represented the interests of the class from which the intellectual itself had arisen (Gramsci, 1971). The “traditional intellectual”, or “professional intellectual” also arises out of a particular class (culture) but comes to stand independent from particular social class groups and has acquired a certain authority and autonomy that is based on formal and institutional structures (Gramsci, 1971:3-23; Crehan, 2002).

It becomes clear that Gramsci put the intellectual, whether organic (aligned to a particular class) or traditional (aligned to established institutions), central to a process of constructing meaning in society. Hence, intellectuals in the Gramscian sense are “those whose thoughts are considered to have a certain weight and authority … and have in society a responsibility to produce knowledge [and] instil that knowledge into others” (Crehan, 2002: 131).

---

25 According to Gramsci (1971), the dominated classes have two possible strategies at their disposal to rise from their subordinated position in society, namely a “war of position” and a “war of manoeuvre”. A “war of position” refers to a durable period of “passive resistance” which is to be deployed in “situations in which power is concentrated in diverse institutional centres and deployed in complex and productive relations throughout the social according to multiple and hybrid logics: (Smith, 1998: 165; Gramsci, 1971: 206, 229, 236-239). A war of manoeuvre refers to more open, physical forms of conflict that are usually a costly affair for both parties, and regularly “[demand] enormous sacrifices by infinite masses of people” (Gramsci, 1971: 238). The repressive apparatus of the state is bound to be better equipped to successfully bring the stand-off to a rapid end. It is suggested that the war of manoeuvre is most likely to succeed in those situations “in which power is heavily concentrated in a singular state apparatus” (Smith, 1998: 165).
Neo-Gramscian Perspectives

Gramsci’s concept of hegemony has been extremely influential in the social sciences and humanities (Barker, 2000: 351; Crehan, 2002; Laclau et al., 1985; Smith, 1998; Williams, 1977), has been deployed in many (empirical) research contexts (Hall, 1988; Morley, 1980; Comaroff et al., 1991), but has also been critiqued (Scott, 1990).

The concept of hegemony was applied to explain and critique the domination and exploitation of one class over another. Unlike Marx, Gramsci recognized a multiplicity of classes rather than just the bourgeoisie (dominant) and proletariat (subaltern) (Hall, 1992; Gramsci, 1971). He considered class structure the most significant set of power relations in society (Hall, 1992; Kurtz, 1996). Radical democrats Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe (1985) critique the class reductionism in Gramscian and Marxist thought for not recognising other “essential historical and social relationships that characterize the human condition” such as gender, nationality and ethnicity (Kurtz, 1996: 117; Laclau et al., 1985).

Cultural Studies, informed by neo-Marxist theory and critique, departed from the class determinism prevalent in Gramsci’s work (Barker, 2000: 351). Feminism and postcolonial theory were crucial in the widening of the conceptual grid (Hall, 1997; Barker, 2000). The shift from Gramsci’s class reductionist interpretation of hegemony did not result in a unitary definition of hegemony. According to John Comaroff and Jean Comaroff (1991: 19) “hegemony” has proven “to be good to think with; as a relatively empty sign, it has been able to serve diverse analytical purposes and positions”.

Raymond Williams (1977), whose work has been formative within Cultural Studies, is generally recognized to have developed the most influential, post-Gramscian working definition of the hegemony concept in the social sciences (Crehan, 2002). He agreed with Gramsci that hegemony is a process of continued struggle that is “continually to be renewed, recreated, defended, and modified. It is also continually resisted, limited, altered, challenged by pressures not all its own” (Williams, 1977: 112). He saw hegemony as something closely related to Gramsci’s concept of “common sense”, as “a lived experience”, and “a reality beyond which it is very difficult (..) to move” (Williams, 1977: 100).
This conception of hegemony relates closely to Thompson’s (1990) ‘critical conception’ of ideology, as well as Foucault’s (1980) “regimes of truth”. The concept of ideology, central to the field of Cultural Studies, has been defined and debated numerously (Barker, 2000; Hall, 2007; Thompson, 1990; Tomaselli et al., 1989). Thompson argued a neutral conception of ideology as “systems of thought or “symbolic systems”, which is more commonly held in anthropology, and argued instead for a focus on the “interrelations of meaning and power” (Thompson, 1990: 5-6). Hence, to Thompson (1990:7) ideology refers to “meaning in the service of power” that serves “to establish and sustain relations of power which are systematically asymmetrical” or “relations of domination”.

Thompson (1990) distinguished between five modes through which ideology can work. First is the mode of “legitimation” which he argues presents relations of domination as legitimate (p.61-62). Second, the mode of “dissimulation” is used in verbal and written language. It frames reality in such a way that it conceals relations of domination (p.62-64). Thompson uses the example of the concentration camp, which through the ideological mode of dissimulation is also referred to as a “rehabilitation centre” (p.62). Third, the mode of “unification” embraces individuals as part of a collective identity on a symbolic level. The unification conceals internal relations of power as in the example of the nation (p.64-65). Fourth, through “fragmentation” groups who are (perceived to be) threatening to dominant powers are divided so as to prevent them from “mounting an effective challenge to dominant groups” (p.65). Thompson notes that fragmentation can occur through “differentiation”, whereby differences between people or groups are emphasised, or by expurgation, whereby a “common enemy” is constructed (p.65). Fifth, the ideological mode of “reification” represents a social-historical phenomenon without regard to social-historical context and presents it as “unchanging” or “ever-occurring” (p.65-66). Thompson’s account of modes of ideology proves valuable in investigating relations of power in this study.

**The Public Sphere, Counterpublics and Social Movements Organisation**

The development of the idea of the public sphere is commonly attributed to Jürgen Habermas (Calhoun, 1997; Dahlgren, 1991; Curran, 1991; Fraser, 1997). In “The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere” Habermas (1989) considered the transformation of 19th
Century Europe and recognised the emergence of a social space to which he referred as “the bourgeois public sphere” (Habermas, 1989; Dahlgren, 1991). By this he meant “a new social space or field between the state and civil society” which “offered the possibility for citizens to engage in discussion on the state’s exercise of power” (Dahlgren, 1991:3). Access to this bourgeois public sphere was limited to only those literate, or those who owned property – both characteristics of the bourgeoisie (Dahlgren, 1991).

Although the concept is very useful here, it has long been subject of intense debate (Dahlberg, 2007; Dahlgren, 1991; Calhoun, 1997; Fraser 1997; Keane, 1984). Habermas’s early formulations lack validity and have been critiqued for, firstly, not sufficiently allowing to reflect on power relations such as those related to gender. Secondly, for neglecting the possibility of alternative public spheres. And, thirdly, for simplifying and rationalising the process of meaning production (Dahlberg, 2007; Dahlgren, 1991; Calhoun, 1997; Fraser, 1997). As a consequence, other conceptions have been proposed such as the idea of “multiple spheres” in which “inter-discursive contestation” related to “collective action frame articulation” and, hence, the development of “oppositional”, or “counter-hegemonic” discourse can be accounted for (Benford et al., 2000; Foucault, 1980; Hall, 1997, Gramsci, 1971; Fraser, 1997; Dahlberg, 2007; Snow, 2005).

The Public Sphere: A Critical Conception

Fraser (2008:76) argues for a concept of the public sphere to contribute to a critical theory of democracy that interrogates who has access to the public sphere, to what degree, authorised by who and what, and how public participation is used to contribute to larger processes of meaning construction. She defines the public sphere as

(…) a theatre in modern societies in which political participation in enacted through the medium of talk. It is the space in which citizens deliberate about their common affairs, hence, an institutionalized arena of discursive interaction (…) it is a site for the production and circulation of discourses that can in principle be critical of the state (Fraser, 1997:70).

Fraser considers issues of access to, and participation in the public sphere. She addresses “representation” and offers two possible interpretations (Fraser, 2008). Firstly, she identifies
representation as a political act whereby a constituency or particular public and their interests are “represented” in the political arena. Here she points attention to the denial of access of particular publics to certain arenas (Fraser, 2008). Secondly, she understands representation in terms of symbolic construction of knowledge consistent with the constructionist position described earlier. She refers to “misframing” as a political act whereby false representations are deliberately offered in public arena’s and are aimed at exclusion.

[T]he term calls attention to the patterning of the broader space within which bounded polities are embedded and, so, to the question of who is included, and who is excluded, from the circle of those entitled to participate within them. [Representation] correlates with political injustices of misframing which arise (...) when the partitioning of political space blocks some who are poor or despised from challenging the forces that oppress them. (...) When political space is unjustly framed, the result is the denial of the political voice of those whose are cast outside the universe of those who ‘count’. Thus, representation concerns the intersection of symbolic framing and democratic voice. (Fraser, 2008: 147).

This conceptualisation of the public sphere is useful in the analysis of (un)equal power relations and to this study in particular. It problematises the construction of meaning and allows for multiple and interacting discourses (Fraser, 1997). Fraser views the public sphere as profoundly political and locates the workings of democracy here. She studies the public sphere by applying discourse theory, and aims to scrutinise asymmetrical relations of power, domination and exploitation on the levels of class, and ethnicity, but perhaps mostly those that relate to gender (Fraser, 1997, 2008). For her, a discourse theory can be helpful in the study of unequal power relations by accounting for the articulation and changing of (collective) identities. A discursive approach allows for an understanding of the construction and maintenance but also the contestation to dominant discourse(s).

(1) [It] can help us understand how people’s identities are fashioned and altered over time, (2) (...) it can help us understand how, under conditions of inequality, social groups in the sense of collective agents are formed and unformed, (3) ([it] can illuminate how the cultural hegemony of dominant groups in society is secured and contested, (4) it can shed light on the prospects for emancipatory social change and political practice: (Fraser, 1997: 152).
Dahlberg (2007: 55) presents a similar approach to the public sphere and argues it to be important to take into account those relations of power that fix “the boundaries of ‘legitimate’ public sphere deliberation”. He argues for an agonistic position whereby the public sphere is conceptualised “as a site and means of political struggle and conflict: a contested terrain where exclusion and domination as well as solidarity and resistance are reproduced” (56). Like the radical democratic approach offered by Fraser, this agonistic perspective uses post-Marxist discourse theory, which enables it to critically account for relations of power in public processes of meaning construction (Dahlberg, 2007). Like Fraser, Dahlberg argues that marginalised groups are often excluded from the public sphere through control of ownership.

Dahlberg argues that this can also result in the rise of discursive arenas that are accessed and controlled particularly for the purposes of those excluded groups. Growing networks of these marginalised groups that are excluded from the dominant domain can ultimately result in the articulation of oppositional discourses that potentially contest dominant discourse in the mainstream public sphere. Dahlberg (2007:57) refers to this process to as “the formation of counter-publics”. This theorising is useful in informing this study’s probing of the organisation of public action by a subordinated group.

**Counterpublics and Social Movement Organisations**

While a counterpublic is constructed in the same way as a public by the address to “an indefinite stranger” (Warner, 2002:120), it differs from a ‘regular’ public on account of its subordinate position. Individuals can belong to several publics, including to a dominant public and counterpublic at the same time (Warner 2002). The idea of a counterpublic in the particular context of this study is consistent with the notion of Social Movement Organisations (SMOs) (Benford et al., 2000; Warner, 2002; Tilly, 2002; Snow, 2005). SMOs are generally understood to be organised and collective actions that address and challenge the state on issues of concern to a particular population (Tilly, 2002). It is argued that this commonly involves a withdrawal of consent to the state by the movement, thereby possibly

---

26 In his argument Dahlberg (2007) focuses particularly on the Internet as a public sphere.
altering the dominant constellation of social power dynamics (Brechner et al., 2000). Hence, SMOs ultimately seek to promote or resist change (Goldberg, 1991).

SMOs as “signifying agents engaged in the promotion and maintenance of meaning for protagonists, antagonists, and bystanders” (Snow, 2005: 284), then, not only withdraw their consent to the current social order, they do so by providing an alternative through the articulation and elaboration of meaningful frames (Benford et al., 2000; Snow, 2005). This understanding of SMO framing is useful in this study and thus presented here.

Social movement adherents (...) frame, or assign meaning to and interpret relevant events and conditions in ways that are intended to mobilize (sic) potential adherents and constituents, to garner bystander support, and to demobilize (sic) antagonists (Snow et al., 1988: 198).

Framing is discussed in relation to “frame articulation”, “frame elaboration”, and “masterframing” (Snow, 2005; Benford et al., 2000). The term “frame articulation” is used to refer to those processes that involve the “connection and coordination of events, experiences, and strands of one or more ideologies so that they hang together in a relatively integrated and meaningful fashion” (Snow, 2005: 400). The role of SMOs leadership is particularly important in articulating an action frame (Benford et al., 2000; Snow, 2005; Edwards et al., 2005; Morris et al., 2005). “Frame elaboration” refers to the processes through which the framing as articulated in the context of the SMO is communicated in the broader public sphere (Snow, 2005: 400). The outcome of processes of frame articulation and frame elaboration is a collective action frame (Benford et al., 2000; Snow, 2005). If several SMOs attempt to organise action together, a “masterframe” is needed. Whereas collective action frames are generally confined to the issues of a particular group, masterframes function as a kind of meta-narrative that ties all issues and interests of different movements together in one frame (Benford et al., 2000: 618).

For successful SMO and collective action frames and masterframes to gain prominence, sufficient access to a variety of resources is needed (Snow, 2005; Edwards et al., 2005; Tilly, 2002). Edwards et al., (2005) distinguish five different resources, namely, moral, cultural, social-organisational, material, and human resources. Firstly, moral resources can be
understood in such terms of solidarity, sympathetic support, legitimacy, and celebrity and relate to a degree of goodwill with regards to the SMO or their issues, amongst bystanders (Cress et al., 1996; Edwards et al., 2005; Gamson, 2005: 249-250). Secondly, cultural resources, vital to successful SMOs and framing activities, relate to a variety of cultural products and artefacts. Specialised knowledge on how to write press releases, surf the web, design a poster or chair a meeting can all be understood as cultural resources. Third, access to social-organisational resources also leads to further access to other kinds of resources (Edwards et al., 2005:127). Three different kinds of social-organisational resources are identified: infrastructures, social networks, and organisations (Edwards et al., 2005). The material resources include financial and physical capital. Access to financial credit, venues, computers and printers are examples of material resources. Fifth, human resources refer to labour, particular skills, experience, expertise, but also leadership can be classified as a human resource (Edwards et al., 2005).

The degree of access to resources determines to a degree how SMOs can strategise public action successfully. At the same time, strategising public action occurs in the context of a “discursive opportunity structure ... the playing field in which framing contests occur” (Gamson, 2005: 249; Koopmans et al., 2004). It is argued that the discursive opportunity structure is never fixed and “provides advantages and disadvantages in an uneven way to the various contestants in framing contests” (Gamson, 2005: 249). In strategising public action to the “discursive opportunity structure”, it is argued that SMOs need to face at least four common dilemmas.

First, the “depth of challenge” dilemma addresses the articulation of a collective action frame in such as way that it enhances the possibilities of mobilisation (Gamson, 2005: 249-251). It is important not to enable rivals or adversaries to disregard the collective action framing as faulty or irrelevant, which can occur when a frame challenges hegemonic ideas and practices. Moreover, the “depth of challenge” dilemma also attends to the difficulties in uniting a collective under a single frame. When the “depth of challenge” is taken to an extreme, one runs the risk of fragmenting the organisation from the inside out, as conflict occurs regarding the direction of articulating particular issues (Gamson, 2005). A collective action frame, then,
is to be strategically articulated while attending to its possible effects in the public sphere as well as to the SMO itself.

Second, the “access dilemma” refers to difficulties that relate to establishing and maintaining “media standing”, which refers to a presence in the press and the media more generally (Gamson, 2005: 251). To acquire “standing” is important as it works against merely being defined and discussed by others (Gamson, 2005:251). “Standing” refers to representatives being directly quoted and the voice on behalf of the movement is expressed. Direct quotation legitimises and authorises the speaker and the group on behalf of which the speaker is quoted. The dilemma, then, relates to the challenge to obtain standing, as opposed to mere coverage. At the same time, standing of a representative of a particular movement has consequences for the internal relations of power of the SMO. Hence, the media agent does not only legitimises the existence and issues of the group, but also attributes authority to the subject quoted.

Third, “the need for validation” dilemma deals with the risk of mere coverage becoming an end in itself “rather than a means to gaining standing and greater prominence for one’s preferred frame” (Gamson, 2005: 252). It is argued that the prominence of a collective action frame is necessary for successful SMOs (Gamson, 2005). Media coverage alone is not sufficient but requires strategic intervention through such instruments as press releases and interviews by the leadership of the movement.

Fourth, “the weak control” dilemma relates to authority of the leadership and the control of members’ contributions to the public framing (Gamson, 2005: 253-254). In the successful elaboration of a collective action frame it is of crucial importance that a degree of coherency and cohesiveness is communicated.

Additionally, Tilly (2002) points our attention to four grounding rules for successful SMOs and presents them in a model referred to as ‘WUNC’. In order to be effective, Tilly argues, SMOs need to communicate that they are, firstly, “Worthy” people and fight for a “Worthy” cause. Secondly, that they are “United” and speak with one voice. Thirdly, that they are “Numerous” and represent a significant base in society. And, fourthly, that they are individually “Committed” to a common cause (Tilly, 2002: 88-89, 120-121). This theorising
is significant in the discussion on successful SMO in the below, and relates to Thompson’s (1990) theorising on modes of ideology and the use of rhetoric in persuading an audience to accept what should count as “truth” (Richardson, 2007).

**Conclusion**

This chapter has concluded with a conceptualisation of the public sphere as: “a complex field of multiple contesting publics, including both dominant and counter-publics of various forms” (Dahlberg, 2007:60). A critical conception of the public sphere allows one to probe processes of articulating (collective) identity, the formation of counterpublics, the development of oppositional frames and discourses, and the contestation of discursive boundaries of the mainstream public sphere. This is significant in this study, which deals with the public processes of negotiating and contesting dominant meaning by a relatively marginalised group.

The final section of this chapter ties the framework as a whole together. The idea of the public sphere as a complex field of contesting (counter-) publics, at times organised and active as SMOs, coincides with the Cultural Studies working definition of culture as a contested “map of meaning”. The process of meaning construction is referred to as representation and happens in discursive fields occupied by contesting publics and counter-publics. It is noted that representation does not only refer to the participation in public processes of meaning construction, it also addresses issues of denial of access to particular discursive arenas through the power of ownership and control, and through strategies of misrepresentation. Moreover, the idea of hegemony and the role of the leadership are relevant here and are dealt with when discussing the formation of a counterpublic and the articulation of collective action frames in chapter five and six.
CHAPTER 4

A Politicised Identity in a Struggle for Representation

Introduction

This study seeks to explore how the fishermen understand and negotiate their exclusion from the beachfront piers. In order to acquire an understanding of this, a qualitative approach using primarily ethnographic methodology was applied. Participant observation proved especially useful in establishing the fishermen’s understandings and worldviews. I recorded interviews and introduced the camera during the KZNSFF meetings and several public protests. I accompanied the fishermen to sites where they, under the banner of the KZNSFF, prepared and carried out public action in the form of protests and marches. Public protest was not the only way in which the fishermen negotiated their exclusion however. A key discursive arena included the local press in which the fishermen and other members of the public frequently engaged in debate regarding fishermen’s access to the beachfront. In order to analyse these contestations, a textual approach is elaborated upon below.

Participant observation

Participant observation is an ethnographic method whereby the researcher observes and participates in a specific socio-cultural field (Spradley, 1980; Hammersley et al., 2007; Bryman, 2004). It is argued that participation, in addition to mere observation, is important as it offers an organic way of “learning culture” through immersing in a socio-cultural context (Spradley, 1980). However, it has been argued to be impossible and undesirable to fully take on the native’s point of view and merge completely into a community to become a “full participant” (Hammersley et al., 2007; Spradley, 1980). To fully participate implies the researcher is, like the participants with whom he or she is working, restricted to certain types
of social behaviour (Hammersley et al., 2007). It limits the range of potential topics to be discussed and taboos are to be avoided as this can increase the risk of being excluded from the social setting under study. When the researcher has a clear researcher identity, research subjects may be more willing and open to discuss taboos. In conducting participant observation I therefore positioned myself as a student engaged in research. It enabled me to conduct informal interviews with many of the fishermen, which were particularly directed towards issues that related to their exclusion.

My reliance on participant observation is also of a theoretical nature. Spivak (1988) points out the role of political leaders and the difficulties for the subaltern to represent themselves in relation to a lack of sources of power. Chapter 3 discussed Foucault’s (1980) theories on historical processes of knowledge construction. Conceptions of truth and knowledge are not fixed, and in order to understand them one has to look at the structures of power within which knowledge is established. The work of both theorists directed part of this research towards the internal relations of power amongst the fishermen. By means of participant observation I was able to observe processes in which the collective issues for the fishermen were defined by the leadership.

**Access**

This research has a particular focus on fishermen formerly fishing off the Bay of Plenty and Dairy Beach piers in Durban. As shown in Chapter 2, the exclusion of fishermen from public space concerns not only the beachfront of Durban. However, I limit myself to the issues of exclusion related to the central beachfront piers as a consequence of limitations of time, finance, but also the requirement of this dissertation. Not having had to divide my time between three or more sites along the Durban coastline, allowed me to spend more time on the central Durban beachfront. It facilitated the familiarisation with, and integration into, a particular social environment.

In addition to the beachfront piers, I entered a diverse range of related research sites by frequently attending the meetings organised by the KZNSFF. Some of these were held in Chatsworth or Phoenix, two former townships where most fishermen reside. Other meetings
were held on the beachfront, usually in front of Snake Park pier or Bay of Plenty pier. As discussed in Chapters 2 and 5, the KZNSFF became involved in the organisation of a protest march during the first week of the World Cup. I was present at six out of in total eight DSF meetings in the lead up to 16 June.

The many visits to the beachfront as well as the KZNSFF meetings led to increased access to the private homes of several of my informants who mostly resided in Chatsworth, Cato Manor, Durban central and Phoenix. Higher levels of access increase opportunities for the (field) researcher to acquire necessary, relevant and various data (Serber, 2001; Hammersley et al., 2007). I eventually managed to build many trust-based relationships with recreational and subsistence beachfront fishermen, which is arguably crucial in conducting successful ethnographic approach (Whyte. 2001). What further contributed to the (political) significance of my presence and spurred access amongst the fishermen was the introduction of a camera. The camera caught people’s attention, especially when the fishermen found out that it was potentially to be utilized in their interests. I thereby managed to access the social and private environment of many fishermen. However, it went hand in hand with my identity as a researcher and cameraman ‘working for the fishermen’ as my presence was assumed to potentially be of benefit to the fishermen’s cause.

**Sampling**

Before and during the process of acquiring access as a participant observant, I was forced to consider criteria along which to select potential informants and (informal) interviewees. I applied three types of sampling: snowball; criterion; and opportunistic (Quinn-Patton, 2001).

---

27 The process of gaining access in relation to my study is illustrative of how a (field) researcher can become tied up with the political activities and interests of a subject community. Late April 2010 I contacted Max by email, introducing myself while adding that I intended to use a camera. The next day, early in the morning, I received a call from Max, who invited me to come along to a meeting on the beachfront an hour later. They were to meet a municipal official on the beachfront promenade, and talk about the newly installed light poles on the beachfront piers and the ecological light pollution it had as a result. Max introduced me to Desmond and the present municipal official as: “Stewart” (a name that would more or less stick throughout the research period), while he added: “he is from University”. I had instantly become a political actor and source of power for the leadership of the fishermen. My identity as “from University” was arguably used in effort to add a degree of legitimacy to this aspect of the fishermen’s struggle. For a university delegate (Max did not say whether I was a student or staff) to be concerned with their issues and point of view was to further stress the importance of their arguments.

28 I come back to the camera and how it was to my researcher position later this chapter.
My access to the fishermen was in part facilitated through introduction by two postgraduate students (Dray, 2009; Ngwenya, 2009 video). They had conducted previous research amongst the fishermen and introduced me to the leadership of the KZNSFF. Through snowball sampling I soon achieved significant degree of access, which led me to consider another sampling technique.

Criterion sampling is a form of sampling that “meets predetermined criterion of importance” and further specifies research samples, leading to “information rich cases” (Quinn Patton, 2001: 112). While on Snake Park pier, I decided to focus on fishermen who appeared to visit the pier more often. Additionally, from the beginning of the research I aimed to acquire access to KZNSFF meetings. It was in the domain of KZNSFF that the issues were defined and where public action was strategised and discussed. Any active member of KZNSFF was therefore of particular interest in the context of this research.

Opportunistic sampling was applied, which “takes advantage of whatever unfolds as it unfolds” and “often involves on-the-spot decisions about sampling” (Quinn Patton, 2001: 114). It would often happen that I came to talk to people who were not part of the research population but were nonetheless interesting in the context of the research. Through all three sampling techniques I managed to acquire access to information-rich informants and interviewees (Quinn Patton, 2001: 106-107). On its own terms, the approach to sampling led to further access into the social structures in which the fishermen engage.

In informal interviews (Hammersely et al., 2007; Spradley, 1979; Whyte, 2001). The interviews were “flexibly structured” (Whyte, 2001: 163) and were consistent with the ethnographic approach, in which interviews are likened to a conversation (Spradley, 1979: 58). In ethnographic interviews, the ethnographer does not enter the conversation with a pre-defined list of questions but rather aims to direct the conversation to themes of particular interest in the context of the research (Hammersley et

29 When shad migrate to KwaZulu-Natal in the winter months, Snake Park attracts fishers from all over Durban and the North and South Coast. These occasional fishers did not constitute part of the research population as I assumed it to be unlikely that these more opportunistic fishermen would engage in organised forms of resistance and representation in relation to the closure of the beachfront piers.
al., 2007: 112-113). Such an approach offers the potential to uncover themes that are relevant to the informant, possibly unanticipated by the researcher (Hammersley et al., 2007; Spradley, 1979, 1980).

Often my conversations with fishermen led to topics related to the closing off the piers, the bad condition of Snake Park pier, the stigmatization of the fishermen and the representation of fishermen in the media or political domain. At times the conversation would turn political. My presence in the encounter should not be ignored, here, as my identity in the field had become associated with the struggle. On many occasions this provided an opening for me to pose questions or direct the conversation towards their understandings and ideas about how to negotiate their exclusion.

**The writing and interpretation of ethnographic fieldnotes**

In inductive ethnographic research it is common for the themes to be derived from the field. These themes can arise through its use by participants. Alternatively, the themes are ‘observer-identified’ and “construed (..) by the ethnographer rather than the members themselves” (Hammersley et al., 2007: 178). In deductive research, an approach maintained in this study, questions, possible themes and concepts are determined before entering the field. The ethnographer focuses particularly on events related to a theoretical framework and research design (Sanjek, 1990: 387; Hammersley et al., 2007: 178).

Ethnography is a discipline of writing, and part of the analysis of fieldnotes takes place as part of writing (Hammersley et al., 2007: 208; Atkinson, 1990) Richardson et al (2005) state that they “consider[s] writing a method of inquiry, a way of finding out about yourself and your topic” (2005: 923). These perspectives fit well with a reflexive and constructionist approach to data generation, whereby data is not dealt with as objectively given. Rather, especially in social scientific or ethnographic research, data is generated in part through the subjectivity of the researcher, who should continuously reflect on his or her position in the field and the consequences for the data retrieved (Pink, 2001; Ruby, 2000)
**Visual methods**

As part of an ethnographic approach, I used visual means to generate data. At first, I proposed to use the video camera for “audiovisual note taking” (Pink, 2001: 87). In addition to human observation and note taking, an audiovisual record offers advantages as it provides the possibility of reviewing recorded material. As a camera with sound recording abilities captures the audiovisual, not only verbal utterings, but also non-verbal language becomes available for later observation (Jenssen, 2009; Collier et al., 1986; Barbash et al., 1997). For the researcher it can be helpful to reclaim experiences, thereby bringing back memories or contributing to the written fieldnotes by giving the researcher access to misheard or unseen events - for example in the background of the picture (Ruby, 2000: 54).

I was able to introduce the camera in the first week of research when attending a KZNSFF meeting on the beachfront. The KZNSFF leadership aimed to mobilise fishermen and organise them for further public action. Desmond introduced me to about 40 fishermen. As I held the camera, Desmond said: “Oh ya, that guy with the camera is Stewart. He is from university and is here to help us with the filming on the piers and other places”. Within the first two weeks of my fieldwork period, I had been established as “the cameraman”. It became part of my identity in the field and I was not to get rid of it throughout the entire research period.

My initial approach reminded perhaps of approaches by (visual) anthropologists such as Margaret Mead or the Collier brothers. Mead (1975) recognised some pitfalls in the aim to collect ‘objective data’ through photos or film. However, she ‘solved the problem’ by proposing to run film continuously, without any cuts or zooms (Mead, 1975: 9-10; Pink, 2001). This way, objective material could be distilled from a socio-cultural environment and became available for the use of the social scientist[^30].

[^30]: Anthropologists and Collier and Collier see a (photo- or video-) camera as an extension of the researcher that should lead to “holistic and accurate information” (Collier et al., 1986: 5). John Collier was a trained photographer and assumed an anthropological photograph to ‘contain visual data’ that is to be analysed and interpreted by an anthropologist (Ruby, 2000: 53; Collier et al., 1986: 148). He made it himself very difficult when arguing that films are essentially sequenced photographs, which makes it not only difficult, but also extremely time-consuming to analyse moving audiovisual data (Collier et al., 1986: 148). Collier and Collier (1986) further claimed that useful anthropological and objective data was to be retrieved by the researcher working within a specified theoretical framework, using certain (audio-visual) means – preferably photo cameras - to access and record data. The theoretical perspective would focus the researchers’ attention, who on
Ruby (2000) has critiqued these visual anthropological approaches when he stated that he knew of “no scholarly literature dealing with the uses of image technology that does not suffer from a naive belief in the objective quality of photographed data” (Ruby, 2000:53). Indeed, I have found the ‘fly on the wall perspective’ extremely difficult to maintain. The camera and the researcher had become part of the context under study (Barbash et al., 1986: 57).

The Camera and a Politicised Researcher Identity
When Desmond introduced me on 6 May 2010 as “Stewart … [who] is here to help us” I came to recognise the political nature of my presence. I had not discussed my role as a researcher other than that I was conducting research, that I was interested in the fishermen and their political efforts, and that I was making a documentary on the side, but was introduced as ‘working for’ and ‘at the disposal of’ the fishermen. As soon as Desmond and Essop had finished their talk on that particular meeting at the beachfront, one fisherman, whom I later came to know as Ned, grabbed another fisherman by the arm and instructed him to tell me about his most recent encounter with the police. It occurred to me that the research population recognised the role of the media in their struggle for space.

The performance and positions within KZNSFF of the leadership may have also been influenced by the presence of the camera. I attended several public meetings in central Durban, Chatsworth, and Phoenix (see appendix XX) where Desmond, rather than chairman Essop, or vice-chairman Sewsunker, was usually the main speaker. To have a camera pointed in his direction during these meetings, may have further legitimised his position of authority in the context of the KZNSFF meetings

31 Branch et al (2002) show that less than 5% of fishermen in KwaZulu-Natal have enjoyed education past their matric year of secondary school. Most fishermen are not likely to have had access to resources such as a semi-professional HDV camera. It is shown that KwaZulu-Natal shows high numbers of unemployed fishermen (50%) and pensioners (25%) (Branch et al, 2002). On top of that, many beachfront fishermen would probably identify a young white male like myself as a surfer, rather than part of the fishermen. As is touched upon in Chapters 2 and 5, the surfers constitute a stakeholder group of the Durban beachfront that is often referred to by fishermen in their articulation of the causes of fishermen’s exclusion from the beachfront. A white, educated,
The presence of the camera may not only have empowered the leadership. It occurred to me at a later stage that by carrying a camera I must have also communicated, even for those who did not know me, that I was interested in the fishermen as a group and reckoned them to be worthy of attention. It must have been a welcome message as many fishermen, and particularly the representatives of the KZNSFF, understood the importance of participating in public processes of representation – a topic I come back to in detail throughout the coming chapters. The prevailing constructions in the media were understood as the cause of their negative image in Durban. My identity as a researcher and cameraman became a potential (re)source of power in the public representation of the fishermen. It may explain why the fishermen regularly notified me on upcoming meetings or particular important dates, and may have wished to remain associated with me. The introduction of the camera and the development of my politicised researcher identity, then, had consequences that I had not anticipated in advance. Rather than an additional method to ‘access the data’ needed, I realised that the audiovisual approach triggered a process that created knowledge of a different order (Jenssen, 2009; Tomaselli, 1996).

**The Bay of Plenty: A Documentary Appendix**

I produced a documentary from editing the recorded footage, which accompanies this thesis (see Appendix J). As one of the challenges for the fishermen is to find channels to articulate their issues into the public sphere, it is appropriate for them to have access to the DVD. The film can be watched at any stage together with the reading of this thesis, although a reading of this dissertation would supply and audience which much contextual information that could potentially enrich the viewer’s experience. Throughout this dissertation I make reference to the film and have supplied time codes, which lead to the specific scenes of interest.

---

young male with access to professional video equipment proclaiming to be interested in the exclusion of fishermen from the Durban beachfront was perhaps unexpected, but nonetheless a welcome message to most of the research population.
Discourse Analysis & Document Collection

Throughout the research period I collected two sets of documents that were used for internal and public distribution. The internally distributed documents consisted of such items as pamphlets and (two-)yearly budget reports of the KZNSFF, and have in part been included in the appendices. My focus here, however, is particularly with the public documents that are concerned with, or constructed by the fishermen. I focus mainly on mainstream newspapers and have collected reports by journalists that discussed the issue of access for fishermen to the beachfront piers but also published letters to editors, which are commonly written by members of the broader public. Chapter 7 offers a textual analysis these letters. A total of eighteen letters appeared in the Daily News, The Mercury, and the Sunday Tribune between 1 May and 30 August 2010 and were all concerned with the fishermen’s exclusion. Hence, in addition to the public protests, the letters’ section in corporate daily and Sunday press is understood as an alternative arena where the fishermen took the opportunity to negotiate their exclusion. I was in need of an alternative method to analyse the data in the context of this study and reasoned it suitable to apply a textual analysis.

The textual method as applied to the letters in Chapter 7 draws from an argumentative discourse analysis approach (Richardson, 2007). A close reading of these letters is done, discussing the arguments and counter-arguments made. I further attend to rhetorical strategies deployed persuading the audience to accept a particular account of reality as “truth” (Richardson, 2007). Following Aristotle’s model of the rhetorical triangle, Richardson (2007: 156-157) distinguishes three types of rhetoric: forensic; epideictic; and deliberative.

Forensic rhetoric critiques past actions and uses the accounts of the (alleged) actions to inform the required stance in the present and future (Richardson, 2007: 157). Epideictic rhetoric is concerned with the present and addresses the innate nature of a person or group, which can be defined as “goodness” or “badness” (Richardson, 2007: 157). Deliberative rhetoric addresses the future and attempts to “urge an audience to do or not do something

---

32 Copies of The Post, which aims particularly at an Indian readership in Durban, were also collected. No articles or letters to editor were, much to my surprise, published during the research period. However, freesheet ‘community’ weeklies did carry stories on the topic.

33 see also chapter 4 Methodology. Refers to a relation between arguer, audience, and argument.
based in the expediency or the harmfulness of a proposed course of action” (Richardson, 2007: 157).

However, these three types of rhetoric cannot by themselves ensure that a particular argument is persuasive or not. The (potential) success and effectiveness of the arguments is linked to the three “modes of persuasion” to which Richardson (2007: 159) refers as ethos, pathos, and logos.

Ethos refers to the character of the arguer or defendant (p.159). The arguer might seek to position him or herself as trustworthy and believable by establishing a particular social position – through referring to education, (academic or royal) title, or personal first hand experience with a particular issue (Richardson, 2007). Similarly, the arguer can choose to de-legitimise the defendant by positioning him or her as incapable, or not trustworthy.

Pathos refers to a mode that prepares the audience emotionally so that they are more likely to accept the arguments offered by the arguer (Richardson, 2007). Richardson mentions stimulating fear, or waking a sense of pity or anger in order to successfully convince an audience (Richardson, 2007: 160-161).

Thirdly, the mode of logos relates to logic and refers to persuasion through rational argument (Richardson, 2007: 161-165). This is broken down to both inductive and deductive logic. Inductive logic, which is particularly used as we come to see in Chapter 7, includes such strategies as “symptomatic argumentation”34 (Richardson, 2007: 162-163). It uses such terms as “characteristic”; “typical of”; “illustrative”; and “evidence of”, and persuades the audience to accept the argument by taking an individual example and explaining it as a characteristic feature of a group: “a pattern or trend” (Richardson, 2007: 162).

To complement and expand on Richardson’s approach on argumentative discourse analysis, I apply Thompson’s (1990: 61-67) “modes of ideology” (see Chapter 3) to the letters to editor section. I attend to ideological strategies applied by the letter writers to claim legitimacy or

34 Symptomatic argumentation shows overlap with the concept of the “stereotype” as used by Hall (1992) and Pickering (2001).
de-legitimise the position of the other speaker through “universalisation” or “rationalisation” (p.61). Particular attention is paid to processes of othering in which strategies of unification and fragmentation proved particularly relevant as they seek to effect stigma and stereotypes. Strategies of unification can work through “standardization” and the “symbolization of unity” as a collective identity may as such be constructed irrespective of internal difference and division (p.64-65). Similarly, through fragmentation, particular individuals and groups are set apart from the whole. “Differentiation” is one such fragmenting strategy and emphasises the differences between the dominant group and the excluded. Further, the differences amongst the excluded group are emphasised so to “disunite them and prevent them from constituting an effective challenge to existing relations … of power” (p.65). Through the fragmenting strategy of “expurgating the other” the excluded group is turned into a common enemy, which needs to be kept in place in order to render them ineffective in potential challenges to dominant power. Hence, expurgation of the other overlaps with strategies of unification, as not only the enemy (the other) is constructed, but also the entity to which that enemy is a threat (the self) (p.65).

**Conclusion**

The objective to explore the ways in which the fishermen understand and negotiated their exclusion directed me to a qualitative approach that leans mostly on ethnographic methods. By means of participant observation, and ethnographic interviews in particular, I generated much data related to the various ways in which the fishermen explained and understood their categorical exclusion. Visual methods proved valuable too, in that they made available interview and visual records of events for later observation. Moreover, it arguably enhanced my access in the social environment of many fishermen.

As one of the sites where fishermen negotiate their exclusion is recognised in the letters to editor section of local mainstream press, I discussed a textual approach, drawing from an argumentative discourse analysis approach by Richardson and following his model, direct particular attention to the use of rhetorical strategies in persuading an audience to accept a particular account of reality as “truth”. I attend to strategies of othering through the use of stereotypes, thereby attempting to sustain or alter relations of power.
CHAPTER 5

SOCIAL MOVEMENT ORGANISATION:

HETEROGENEITY AND COLLECTIVE FRAME ARTICULATION

... collective action frames not only perform an interpretive function in the sense of providing answers to the question “What is going in here?”, but they also are decidedly more agentic and contentious in the sense of calling for action that problematizes (sic) and challenges existing authoritative views and framings of reality (Snow, 2005: 385).

Introduction

The beachfront piers in central Durban have been accessible to fishermen, at least during part of the day, since 1986 (Interview Max, Aman, June 2010). Its significance for the fishermen related to the fishing activity itself, as well as to the relationships between the fishermen that were established and a sense of identity that was acquired. The beachfront piers are an important space and many fishermen respond emotionally when confronted about the enclosure of their favourite fishing spots. As mentioned before, this study is not concerned with the enclosure and exclusion as such, but rather with the ways in which the fishermen understand and publicly negotiate these events. It explores how the fishermen perceive and explain the enclosure of the beachfront piers, whether they chose resistance, and if so, how? This chapter specifically investigates the fishermen’s perspectives on their changing environment, and on the internal discursive struggles that exist amongst them.

The chapter consists of three main sections. First, the fishermen that use the Durban beachfront are a heterogeneous group. They inhabit a variety of class positions, racial identities, and religious affiliations. Second, the beachfront fishermen articulate different positions, to which I refer as “frames” (Goffman, 1974; Benford, 2000; Snow, 2005), and offer at times contesting explanations for their categorical exclusion. Third, the role of the KZNSFF leadership is considered in relation to the articulation of a collective action frame
(Dahlberg, 2007; Snow, 2005; Benford et al., 2000). I argue that it was in the interest of the leadership to position the fishermen as a strong and cohesive counterpublic or movement (Warner, 2002; Tilly, 2002). The KZNSFF leadership are considered as intellectuals in the Gramscian sense (see Chapter 3) in that they were seeking to articulate, control and define a collective action frame (Benford et al., 2000; Dahlberg, 2007; Thompson, 1990; Gramsci, 1971; Snow, 2005; Stephen, 2005).

**Social differentiation amongst the fishermen on Snake Park Pier**

When I entered the field in April 2010, the Bay of Plenty and Dairy Beach pier were already closed to the fishing public. Some fishermen who used to fish on the beachfront piers would visit Snake Park pier instead. While the Bay of Plenty and Dairy Beach pier are located close to the city centre of Durban, Snake Park is located further north. At night the three main beachfront piers are lit by the light poles on the actual piers themselves and by the street lightning on the promenade. Yet from the Bay of Plenty pier, Snake Park pier is hardly visible. This pier is unlit, and without street lightning Snake Park pier is dark and unattractive to visitors, especially at night.

Although an inferior fishing site according to many fishermen, Snake Park proved a fertile site for research. It was here where I first realised how diverse a group the Durban beachfront fishermen are. Within the first weeks of fieldwork, I asked Ricky on Snake Park pier whether “they were biting” and we began a conversation. I explained that I was a student doing research on the organisation of protest by civil society groupings during the upcoming World Cup. Before adding that I was particularly interested in the fishermen, he pre-empted my question by suggesting that the situation was not as bad as some fishermen would try to make me believe.

> Most of the guys will tell you how they live off their catch, feeding their family an’ all, but actually they just do it for the love of it. It’s a hobby, that’s it, it’s a hobby (Ricky, May 2010, Durban).

Such moments made me realise early on that any degree of coherence in attitudes among the fishermen was not to be taken for granted. Indeed, I came to recognise that the fishermen
were diverse on many levels (Branch et al., 2002; Clark et al., 2002). A significant level related to class and the different degrees of dependency on their catches were signalled in how they identified themselves - either as “recreational” or as “subsistence” fishermen.

Recreational, subsistence and “in between” fishermen

Those fishermen who explained fishing as a hobby more than anything else usually described themselves as recreational fishermen or otherwise as sport fishermen or anglers. Aman and his brother Lovie, for example, took pride in identifying themselves as sport fishermen or anglers and made it clear that they never sold their fish, but rather consumed it themselves or shared it with family or friends when the catch was particularly good. In this way they positioned themselves as recreational rather than subsistence fishermen, not to be confused with the economically less viable fishermen who fished for their economic benefit. To argue that they never sold their became an important distinguishing feature for fishermen like Aman and Lovie, in contrast to those fishermen who did sell their catch. This indicates a degree of class differentiation amongst the fishermen, a topic I come back to in this and following chapters.

The category of “subsistence fishermen” indicates a significant degree of economic dependency by the fishermen on their catch, although the degree of such dependency varied, too. Bob, for example, often fished with his wife and daughter and were mostly dependent on the revenues of their catch. A second set of subsistence fishermen are partially dependent on this and can be illustrated by Clarence’s situation. Fishing was his main source of income when he was without employment. (He previously worked as a carpenter in Pretoria and Johannesburg, and later acquired his income by means of private carpentry jobs.) While in between jobs, he earns most of his income by means of fishing, hence, his economic dependency on fishing had a less permanent character. Both categories of fishermen operate

---

35 As indicated in Chapter 2, all Durban fishermen are either not licensed, or licensed with recreational licenses, which do not allow for commercial activities with regards to the catch. The category of “small-scale commercial” fishermen as defined under the MLRA of 1998 does, then, have little purpose in daily discourse amongst the fishermen.

36 Although I do not have the statistical data to prove it, I would argue that the category of subsistence or commercial fishermen showed the highest numbers of female participation. The incentive to fish is of an economic nature, rather than one related to pleasure, and may help to explain why certain females chose to enter an environment that is mostly dominated by males.
as “small scale commercial” fishermen (as described in Chapter 2). The fish they catch is sold and so has commercial value, hence so little of it is consumed by them.

Between the two broad categories of “recreational” and “subsistence fishermen” is a third variant of “in-between” fishermen. While they may indentify themselves as recreational, in fact they may also fish for “subsistence”, or “small scale-scale commercial” benefits. Sabir, for example, was a driver at a major car sales and repair centre in Durban. He has three daughters, the oldest of which was a student in her final year of secondary school and hoping to study further. Sabir earned R3.200\(^{37}\) a month, which he explained was enough to get by with, but not to meet to the ambitions of his children who want to attend college or university. He visited Snake Park pier to relax, to get away from daily pressure, and perhaps share a few glasses of brandy in the evenings. The fish he caught he would usually sell for some extra cash, or consume with his family (fieldnotes, 07/06/2010, Durban).

While Ricky may have been right in his comment that many beachfront fishermen have other formal sources of income, the point remains that there is a significant proportion of fishermen who supplement their household incomes or acquire their entire income by means of fishing (Branch et al., 2002; Hauck et al., 2002). This diverse group of recreational or subsistence fishermen engage in varying degrees in commercial activities in selling their catch. These lines of difference extend to processes of “othering” amongst the fishermen that are largely based on different class positions (Fabian, 1983, 1990; Pickering, 2001; Hall, 1997).

**Framing amongst the Fishermen**

My observations and interviews led me to identify a variety of understandings and explanations with regards to the enclosure of the beachfront, furthering my argument that the fishermen are not to be regarded as a homogenous group. This heterogeneity implicitly introduces challenges for the leadership of the KZNSFF to form a coherent counter-public and articulate an appropriate and coherent collective action frame (Stephen, 2005; Dahlberg, 2007; Warner, 2002; Snow, 2005; Benford et al., 2000). Before considering the role of the

---

\(^{37}\) At the time of research the Rand/Dollar ratio was 1/0,15 and the Rand/Euro ratio was 1/0,1.
leadership, however, I first discuss the various understandings that I recognised amongst the fishermen. In differing degrees the beachfront fishermen attributed their exclusion from the piers to the state, to stigmatising tendencies in local media, to class-based interests related to tourism or surfers who were treated as superior to fishermen’s interests, to the FIFA World Cup 2010, and to those fishermen who behaved irresponsibly while fishing on the piers.

**The state as an agent of exclusion**

Many fishermen recognised the state to be a key agent in their exclusion from the Durban coastline. One politician specifically linked to the marginalisation of Durban fishermen was then city manager Michael Sutcliffe. This can be particularly accounted for by the two notice boards that stand in front of each of the three main beachfront piers (see Figures 5.1 and 5.2). One board stipulates that fishing is confined to Snake Park pier and Battery Beach pier. The second board that stands next to it states that entry to the pier is at one’s own risk, and that fishing, as well as the possession of fishing equipment is prohibited. At the bottom it includes the phrase: “BY ORDER: CITY MANAGER”. From this inclusion many fishermen appear to have deduced that the decision is initiated and enforced by the city manager personally, rather than in his capacity as executor of policies designed and approved by the city council - the product of prevailing bureaucratic procedures. The city manager was consequently perceived as a bully who was determined to get rid of the fishermen. This is illustrated by Bob’s account:

> [H]ere comes a man who denies our basic right to survival. … Since he became the city manager he has closed off the piers to us. But prior to that we had other city managers, like Mr. Lipschitz and the guys before him, they never ever contemplated closing the piers. But now one man has taken the onus onto him without consulting with relevant authorities, without consulting with the councillors, without consulting with the fishermen. He just decides to close the pier on his own, which is so unjust and so unfair against us who eke a living out of fishing (Bob, October 2010, Phoenix).

---

38 Mike Lipschitz was mayor of Durban from 1993 until 1996, when he was killed. Mayor Obed Malaba replaced Lipschitz. Malaba was replaced by James Nxumalo in 2011.
Legislature related to quotas, permits and licenses under the MLRA of 1998, and the closing of the harbour and South Pier due to security regulations, were identified in chapter two. In this context, however, the closing of the beachfront piers is perceived by the fishermen to be a measure designed to further exclude them from public spaces in Durban. The enclosure of large parts of the Durban coastline and the consequent exclusion of fishermen is perceived to be a measure with criminalising consequences. Vice-chairman of the KZNSFF, Sewsunker explained these effects:

If we fish in these places it becomes illegal. If we invade these places it becomes illegal. If we catch a fish in these places, where at the present moment certain species are banned, it’s illegal. If all this becomes an illegal issue, then we become criminals. We will just become innocent criminals, not criminals, but we will be innocent criminals. In other words, we haven’t committed a crime. We haven’t killed anyone. We haven’t robbed from anyone. We haven’t taken anyone’s privilege away. We haven’t infringed anyone’s rights, and yet we are criminals (Sewsunker, October 2010, Phoenix).
Max expressed similar ideas and referred to those fishermen who depend on their catches and who enter the illegal fishing spots at night, making it more difficult for the authorities to control their access. One popular spot was North Pier, opposite the harbour mouth of South Pier. It was commonly known amongst the beachfront fishermen that North Pier is a good fishing spot. In the first few months after the closing of the beachfront piers, several fishermen regularly entered North Pier by either bypassing or bribing the private security personnel. This resulted in an increase of SAPS routine checks on the pier, and to the arrest of several fishermen during the research period. Whereas the enclosure of parts of the coastline served to exclude the fishermen, the treatment of transgressions by law enforcement agencies was further excluding and criminalising them.

The whole of eThekwini municipality is against us, we got all the law against us: the metro police, the law enforcement. But it is so biased, it’s so sad to see a surfer going on with his big board on the pier, his kayak or whatever, and the police do nothing to stop them. And in fact, they are not supposed to jump off the pier because it’s a hazard to jump off the pier, but they do not adhere to it. And here we come, we poor fishermen come with our rods on the pier, there comes the police force, the security, the law enforcement, they come and surround us, and harass us and they practically tell us we are not allowed to be fishing there. When we in turn ask them as to why are we not allowed there, they say: “listen here, this is instructions from Mr. Mike Sutcliffe. If you got any queries or any questions, you go and see him”. So you are practically telling us ya’ll have been sent by Mike Sutcliffe to harass us (Bob, October 2010, Phoenix).
The state, then, is understood by many fishermen to be a key agent in their exclusion from certain spaces along the coastline. The exclusion itself is understood to be formalised through changing legislature that leads to the enclosure of (formerly) public space. The categorical denial of access is enforced by at times reportedly aggressive law enforcement agencies. Their treatment is perceived to be unfair and out of proportion, and interpreted as a force with criminalising consequences.

**Stigmatising discourse in local media**

In addition to the state as an agent of exclusion, some fishermen recognised another force with stigmatising and, hence, exclusionary effects. The “letters to editor” sections of several local newspapers turned out to be important sites of contestation between contesting publics, a topic I come back to in detail in Chapter 7. It is of particular importance here to note that several fishermen recognised these discursive arenas whereby particular publics represented the issue of the fishermen in certain, often stereotyping and stigmatising ways. In response to a letter in *the Daily News* that critiqued the fishermen for inappropriate behaviour, Aman proclaimed:

> Yes, drug taking and drinking alcohol in public place also take place. Yes! But it is not only the fishermen’s. It is also with the surfers! The surfers also stand on the pier and smoke drugs with some of the fishermen. It is not all the fishermen. He mustn’t say *[fishermen]*. Don’t generalise. (...) I mean lawyers come there, doctors, magistrates, prosecutors, judges they come and fish there. Are they coming and smoking drugs there? No, there are a few. There are a few. But surfers also consume alcohol and go and surf. Not only the fishermen?! No, he mustn’t generalise (Aman, 05/07/2010, Durban).

Lovie agreed with the failure of the author of the letter to recognise a degree of heterogeneity amongst the fishermen. He added:
Stewart, they are making it that the surfers are 100% innocent in whatever they do. You know, that they are surfing, they don’t have other vices, you understand? Everybody that is in a sport, they got their vices. They [surfers] smoke dagga, they smoke mandrax, they are drinking beers, they are littering the pier with the cans, they are even littering the water with the beer bottles and cans. I mean, we are Muslims and we don’t take alcohol. They can’t point their fingers that we are taking drugs because of a hand full of guys. It’s wrong (Lovie, 05/07/2010, Durban).

Aman and Lovie both responded to the letter with reference to their class positions and religious affiliations. Aman argued against the generalisations of the author that apparently equated the fishermen with irresponsible alcohol consuming litterers, by stating that amongst the fishermen are also highly qualified and educated people. He simultaneously recognised that “there are a few” who behaved in questionable ways, but dissociated himself from them by identifying himself with the more professional ranks of “doctors and magistrates”. Lovie responded in a similar style and mentioned his religious affiliation to argue his piety. He too, distinguished between the fishermen, thereby “othering” a “handful of guys” who were at least in part to blame, not only for the littering and drugs and alcohol (ab)use on the pier, but also for the closing of the beachfront piers at large.

While fishermen like Aman and Lovie were generally aware of letters to editors, or news reporting in local newspapers, by no means were all fishermen in Durban aware of this. When I asked about this press coverage on Snake Park pier, only a few seemed aware of it and did not recognise the local media as a particularly important channel of communication. When I mentioned letters in the newspapers criticising the beachfront fishermen for irresponsible public behaviour, the response was usually one of disinterest. That many fishermen on Snake Park pier did not seem to read newspapers other than freely distributed community newspapers, may have contributed to the lack of awareness and interest in this site of contestation.

**A difference in class position: A Conflict With Surfers**

Some fishermen recognised that in local newspapers they were addressed or framed by a particular public that used the media to offer negative representations of the fishermen.
Members of this public were perceived by many fishermen as agents in their exclusion, particularly the surfers.

A small minority understood the surfers as the single most important agents in the enclosure of public space and exclusion of the fishermen. Max articulated his understanding of the fishermen’s ban from the beachfront piers in response to a question by Richard Lapper, foreign correspondent for the *Financial Times*. In response to the question whether the World Cup had exacerbated the issues, he responded as follows.

> The World Cup is definitely part of it. They’re using it as an excuse, as an excuse to finally get rid of us on behalf of the surfers. The surfers have hoodwinked the city council. They have hoodwinked the city council (Max, June 2010, Durban).

Max (discussed in Chapter 2) claims to know surfers who try to manipulate the local government by representing the issue in the press and by lobbying individual members of the council. Max is one of a few fishermen who viewed the surfers as the determining agents of exclusion. The majority, however, seems to be frustrated but less clear in their formulation as to how the surfers are agents in the enclosure and exclusion of fishermen. Bob frames the exclusion of fishermen from the beachfront piers in terms of conflicting interests with surfers, but also acknowledges the interests of the surfers and their right to use the same space that was denied to the fishermen. He describes the situation in terms of race and class differentiation and discrimination:

> I don’t want to make this a racist issue, but in fact, 90% of the surfers are white. I am sorry to say that. As I am saying that I do not wish to indulge in the race card. But the fact of the matter, the crux of the matter is that 90% of the surfers are white. Now, regarding the fishing, 90% of the fishermen are Indian. So, if you look at it now, based on the facts that we are paying a license every year to fish on the pier, we pay for bait license for pumping bait, fishing license, the pier now is closed for us, but it is open for the surfers. That is blatant discrimination against us, whereas they do it for fun, we do it for a living. We do not hold it against them because we have been with them all these years, but now you are depriving us and giving them the upper hand over us, whereas they’re supposed to be harassed because they are not contributing any way to use the sea, whereas we must pay to use the sea, pay for everything, and we get a raw deal (Bob, October 2010, Phoenix)
This account of the situation was repeated by several fishermen. One cause of contention, as identified above, was that the fishermen were perceived and treated as disobedient, particularly by law enforcement agencies, while surfers who were perceived by the fishermen to ignore the law were perceived as upstanding citizens. Reference was made to how surfers ignore the bylaws regarding the use of the piers by jumping off the end, enabling them to immediately start surfing rather than first having to swim past the breakers. Bylaw 13.2 states:

No person shall on or from any pier or groyne enter the water, (a) whether by jumping, diving or otherwise, (b) have in his possession any surfcraft, kneelboard, bodyboard or similar device or thing or any bicycle, other vehicle or any skateboard or rollerskates (City of Durban, 2010).

The lack of enforcement in relation to the surfers is explained by many fishermen as a form of preferential treatment and exemplifies the frustration related to their categorical denial of access.

The conflicts between fishermen and surfers that occurred until the enclosure of the main beachfront piers may at first have seemed to be centred on a struggle for space. However, after the closure of the piers, many fishermen still framed the ban in terms of surfers being the agents of their exclusion. In the framing of the exclusion of fishermen from the Durban beachfront, common reference was made to the race-class positions of surfers in relation to many fishermen. An argument frequently articulated by fishermen is that they are economically (in varying degrees) dependent on their access to good fishing spots, while also paying license fees. For the surfers to still be able to access the piers, without being economically dependent on their access, nor paying license fees, is particularly frustrating for many fishermen. The race-class dimensions of the exclusion of fishermen become apparent when concluding that surfers in Durban are largely white. The fact that surfers are understood to be central in the fishermen’s exclusion, then, should perhaps not solely be seen in the

39 Conflict between the two publics over the use of space seems inevitable when one looks over the last railing of one of the main beachfront piers. The piers reach past the braking of the waves. It is here where many surfers take a breather and wait for the next wave to ride. Uncompromisingly, it is also where the fishermen cast their rods. It has happened that surfers have been hit, or hooked by baited fishing lines. Some surfers resorted to cutting lines by pulling them alongside the rough edges of their boards.
context of a struggle over space, but also as a struggle of class, and perhaps even post-apartheid race positions.\footnote{It has been pointed out that post-apartheid anxieties related to “black” ANC rule exist amongst the Indian population in Durban and KZN (John-Naidu, 2005). The post-apartheid dimension of this race-class constructed conflict becomes apparent when noted that the position of the researcher here, a foreigner albeit white young male, did not result in the identification of the researcher as part of the surfer community.}

In this context, the significance of the ban is that it ultimately results in the formalisation of a sense of inferior citizenship amongst fishermen. The degree to which many fishermen refer to Durban’s surfers in their debates, expressing their frustration with the categorical denial of access to public space, is then not only a cry for access to space that is of recreational or commercial importance. It is also a call for equal citizenship, and a form of resistance in their refusal to accept the fact that a lower class position equals the increased likelihood of being excluded from public space.

**The FIFA World Cup 2010 and Elite Interests**

The beachfront is a place of intense competitive economic activity much of which relates to the tourism industry in Durban. The fact that Durban was a host city of the FIFA World Cup 2010 intensified the potential economic interests and activities. A proportion of beachfront fishermen assumed a relationship between the closure of the two piers and the economic interests of powerful stakeholders that were privileged during the FIFA World Cup 2010. Others understood the World Cup to be an excuse used by local authorities to ban the fishermen from using this centrally located space on the Durban beachfront once and for all. One frequent fisherman expressed this opinion as follows:

> You can see it for yourself what they are doing for the people in South Africa and this great World Cup, which we appreciate that we won. But at the same token, they cannot starve our people, by not allowing fishermen to fish of these piers. (…) They are preparing this place for the World Cup. The work on the whole beachfront they started from last year October. From last year October they started closing all the piers that fishermen use to sustain their families (Fieldnotes, June 2010, Durban)

During the World Cup-related upgrade of the beachfront, the bait boards and water taps, convenient if not necessary facilities for fishermen, were removed. The beachfront and its
piers were upgraded in preparation for the World Cup but the interests of the fishermen were disregarded, as evidenced by the removal of the fishing facilities and the ban against fishermen after the completion of the upgrade.

Rather than viewing the football tournament itself as solely responsible for pier closure, some fishermen argued that other interests were at play. Max was convinced that the World Cup was used as an excuse and ultimately served to privilege long term interests of stakeholders in the hospitality and tourism industry that were located on the Durban beachfront. According to Max, the local authorities had therefore given in to the demands of surfers to get rid of the fishermen. He understood the beachfront to be an important economic centre in Durban and he argued that the World Cup in Durban was a convenient excuse for the authorities to rid themselves of the unwanted fishermen in Durban (Max, May and June 2010, Durban).

As is discussed in Chapter 2, the FIFA World Cup was presented by governmental and FIFA officials as beneficial also to the most poor and marginalised of the people of South Africa (Ginsberg, 2010; Alegi, 2010). However, for many fishermen this proved hard to believe. Before and during the event several newspaper articles, letters to editors and texts in the Backchat section in the Daily Mail presented the fishermen to be a threat to a safe and tourist friendly beachfront. Together with the banning of fishing off the beachfront piers, it contributed to a sentiment of further marginalisation and a formalisation of inferior citizenship that was in the end justified by the FIFA World Cup. It convinced some fishermen to publicly argue that fishing in Durban was a tourist attraction. Such public discursive strategies are the topic of the next chapter on public processes of negotiation.

**Internal division class differentiation: Fishermen blame Fishermen**

Some fishermen argued that the fishermen themselves should take responsibility for their removal from the piers. Particularly the older fishermen, with usually slightly higher class positions than younger fishermen and with a history of several decades of fishing in Durban, occasionally expressed frustration with their fellow fishermen. Gibson for example, who is a recreational fisherman well into his sixties, offered his account. He once took me by the arm and told me in private:
You have to know Stewart, there is another side that you need to hear as well. This was a violent place. People have been stabbed here. And why? For fishing! Just for fishing! It used to be bad here on the pier. Drugs and alcohol was used and sometimes fights happened. They only tell you half of the story. It’s important to hear the other half. You will see it for yourself when the shad season comes, it will get busy, and they start pushing and shouting, and you will see how they behave. You can prepare for that (Gibson, 05/06/2010, Durban).

Several other fishermen confirmed the misbehaviour of some. In private contexts, fishermen like Gibson, but also Lovie and Aman would disassociate themselves from what they referred to as “bad elements” who ruined it for the rest of the group. Their behaviour was constructed as opportunist as they would only come to the beachfront during shad season, did not respect bag limits or quotas, cut their bait on the floor of the piers without using bait boards, engaged in the (ab)use of drugs and alcohol and gave the fishermen in general a bad name. Lovie was especially eager to dissociate himself from these fishermen by emphasising the cleanliness of his style of fishing.

Stuart, you have seen my tackle and rods, you wouldn’t believe they are over twenty, thirty years old? We are clean fishermen, we keep it clean. We take a bait board, and newspaper, and we never so much as even touch our rod after putting bait on. First we wipe our hands with a cloth. In fact, we do not even use sardine. Because it smells. It stinks. You come home and your hands are all smelly of sardine. We don’t like that. We prefer to fish with crackers. Yes, we fish with crackers. But there are some bad elements. Throwing packages in the water, littering the place. Because of the few bad elements we have to suffer. (Lovie, 05/07/2010, Durban).

Such fishermen were not only blamed for the bad reputation of the Durban fishermen at large, but were often also accused for not participating in the struggle set out by the KZNSFF. A perceived lack of unity, then, was another source of frustration not only for actively participating fishermen like Aman and Lovie, but also for the leadership of the KZNSFF. These fishermen who did not participate in the struggle were blamed for the irresponsible behaviour, ultimately leading to the exclusion from the beachfront of all fishermen.
The ways in which the fishermen understand and articulate their spatial exclusion, then, are various and overlapping. It introduces the challenges of the KZNSFF leaders in the formation of a counter-public with a coherent, potentially oppositional discourse. Processes of frame articulation become pertinent which renders especially the role of the leadership of interest and is discussed below.

The formation of a counter-public and the articulation of a collective action frame

The articulation of a collective action frame as part of the KZNSFF activities is the focus of discussion in this final section of the chapter (Warner, 2002; Benford et al., 2000; Dahlberg, 2007; Snow, 2005). Such articulation relates to processes of internal discursive contestation, as certain frames explain the enclosure and exclusion of fishermen in different manner and propose different solutions to others (Dahlberg, 2007). As it is argued that SMOs need to apply consistent and coherent framing in order to be effective, this internal variety needs to be overcome. It becomes the responsibility of the leadership to take control over these divisions and to establish a coherent “collective action frame” (Gamson, 2005; Benford et al., 2000). In order to do so, the leadership had to ignore and exclude some frames, while others were to be preferred and maintained (Morris et al., 2005; Snow, 2005; Gamson, 2005). The KZNSFF meetings, then, can be understood as a “discursive field” (Snow, 2005:402) where contests over meaning occur.

The KZNSFF leadership

Within KZNSFF there are a few people in particular who have played a significant role in the mobilisation and organisation of fishermen in Durban. Essop was chairperson and was usually present at marches and meetings. As a fisherman, however, he had used the South Coast and the South Pier, claiming never to have fished off the beachfront piers. Although Essop was the chairperson of the organisation that represents fishermen all over KwaZulu-Natal, he is not known amongst many fishermen on the Durban beachfront. Some beachfront fishermen have critiqued KZNSFF for focusing too much on issues related to the South Pier and Durban Harbour and not being present enough on the beachfront (‘Eyes’, July 2010, Durban).
Max, another important leader and former chairperson of NRSAA, was a well-known fisherman at the beachfront. After his return from Australia in 1992, he continued to be associated with the struggle of the fishermen, albeit in a less public and provocative manner than before. From the establishment of KZNSFF in 2004 he was a committee member and contributed to the organisation of protest related to fishermen’s exclusion from the harbour and beachfront. He was well known amongst the beachfront fishermen as he regularly fished off Snake Park pier, as well as the beachfront piers before their closing in 2009.

Desmond was the coordinator of the KZNSFF and is a charismatic speaker. His primary capacity is as coordinator of the SDCEA, an active civil society organisation providing an infrastructure that supports the organising, publicising and funding of particular kinds of events. Desmond was often at the centre of organising KZNSFF meetings during this period. He opened and closed the meetings, his contributions usually lasted longest and decisions were often made with Desmond as chair. He often intervened in decision-making processes, bringing his own experiences and agenda to bear. Members of the ‘audience’ were mostly stimulated to contribute and participate in public acts of speech, but it was undeniably Desmond who controlled and directed the content of what was said. When I discuss the frame articulation as it took place amongst the fishermen, the role of Desmond and the KZNSFF leadership is important, then, as it is argued that the “leadership defines grievances and social reality to motivate collective action” (Morris et al., 2005: 183).

**Negotiating the Articulation a Collective Action Frame**

The first KZNSFF meeting I attended was on 5 May of 2010. I joined approximately 40 fishermen on the beachfront in front of Snake Park pier where Desmond addressed the fishermen and framed the World Cup as an opportunity to gain public attention.

---

41 For examples of such meetings see the Bay of Plenty appendix (tt: 10:05:00 / 13:50:00 / 21:18:00)
We don’t have a better opportunity than this World Cup. Yes they are crushing us, but we have the opportunity to rectify it. Because the whole world, they’re bringing, is coming to our country thinking everything is nice for them. We need to say: these are the problems that’s happening here. This is what they are doing to us (Desmond, 06/05/2010, Durban).

Desmond introduced the World Cup as an opportunity to do this. Knowing the importance of the media in a successful SMO, he anticipated the presence of international journalists, and assumed them to be interested in stories on the fishermen struggle in Durban. Not only did he anticipate media coverage through direct encounters with journalists, the strategy was also to engage in public action, which could in itself be picked up by media:

We’re going to plan some programs of action. It’s gonna happen in the next couple of weeks. The World Cup is around the corner, fortunately. We got no other chance. And we are going to mobilise all the Phoenix fishermen, Chatsworth fishermen, Wentworth fishermen, Clairwood fishermen, South Coast, North Coast, all over. Including other people to work with us and fight this thing (Desmond, 05/06/2010, Durban).

Towards the end of the meeting Desmond stressed the importance of cohesiveness amongst the fishermen in order to be able to successfully (re)present oneself as a (counter)public with a strong and potentially effective oppositional discourse. Hence, he understood the importance of communicating a sense of “unity” (Tilly, 2002).

Guys I just want to close this meeting off with a proper thing to say this here. Because I have been around too much, and you know, it sickens me when we are always fighting amongst ourselves. We need to understand this whole thing of the pushing us, the poor people out of the city centre. … If we accept what they are doing to us, don’t think it is gonna change after July (Desmond, 06/05/2010, Durban).

Desmond stressed the importance of cohesiveness in the face of the power of the state, which is not only greater than that of the fishermen, but also to benefit others, rather than the fishermen. He framed the state as an agent of exclusion and stressed the idea that they had to fight, or in other words, withdraw consent to the present order in order to effectively facilitate change (Brechner et al., 2000; Tilly, 2002).
The next KZNSFF meeting was held on 12 May 2010 in a church on Point Road, and was used to announce and define a strategy of mass organisation and protest which was to include the beachfront and Durban fishermen.

We are having a meeting at UKZN, where a number of groups, street traders, Early Morning Market, all those groups are coming together. Because we realised that day, the fishermen’s fight can’t happen on its own. It’s gonna fail if it goes on its own. If it goes a collective, where there is ten thousand people, Mike Sutcliffe will be kicked. Zuma and them, will be running to us and talk to us, because they realise that there is a lot people involved in this. So that’s gonna take place on the 16th of June (Desmond, 12/05/2010, Durban).

The formation of what would come to be known as the Durban Social Forum (DSF), as well as the DSF march, is discussed in detail in the next chapter. The point to make here is that through Desmond, KZNSFF and a group of beachfront fishermen were required to identify with fishermen elsewhere. Desmond thereby in effect initiated a process that can be referred to as “the formation of a counterpublic” (Warner, 2002; Dahlberg, 2007). Moreover, Desmond then asked to identify with other groups who wished to withdraw their consent to the current order and state of affairs (Brechner et al., 2000; Tilly, 2002). The influence of Desmond is substantial here, in that it was his resource in the form of a social network that brought him to include the fishermen in a struggle that was ultimately concerned with social (and environmental) justice for the working classes. Whether it was the street trader movement, the early morning market support group, or the shackdwellers movement “Abahlali baseMondjolo”, all participant groups were concerned with issues of exclusion, and spoke from a position of subordination (Warner, 2002)42.

Additional to establishing alignments with potential allies, Desmond was an influential agent in directing the processes of (collective) frame articulation (Morris et al., 2005). On numerous occasions he was asked to offer explanations for the exclusion of fishermen from

---

42 The fact that the alignment with other civil society groups was instigated by Desmond was perhaps partly reason for the relatively unsuccessful Durban Social Forum march for the fishermen. As said, I come back to the march in detail, but not many beachfront fishermen found a basis of “common experience of exclusion and domination” with the other groups that were participating in the march (Dahlberg, 2007: 56).
the coastline in general and beachfront piers in particular. On one occasion Bob asked Desmond about the reasons for closing the piers, to which Desmond replied:

Well bru, it’s very simple. Think of it, all the street traders are moved, they moved the snake park, they moved everything off here. It’s clear that it’s only for the rich. You don’t exist; it’s simple as that. And it’s happening all over. We got to defend our space. It’s sad that the police don’t see the interests of the poor people (Desmond, 06/05/2010, Durban).

The first thing to note is perhaps that Desmond positioned himself as an authority amongst the fishermen to whom questions were directed as he arguably most experienced in organising such meetings and was thus considered authoritative within the context of KZNSFF. Further to this, in his response to Bob, Desmond provided a rather one-dimensional explanation of the enclosure of the piers, and framed it particularly in terms of class inequality and referred to the state, most notably city manager Michael Sutcliffe, as a key agent of the categorical exclusion of fishermen. Especially telling, with regards to Desmond’s relatively powerful position in the articulation of a collective action frame, is the encounter as described below, which happened during that first meeting on the beachfront on 5 May 2010. One fisherman argued that had the fishermen themselves been more responsible with regards to the piers, they would not have been excluded from the beachfront today.

Anonymous fisherman: I represent this place a long time and I know about this place. See you all are delegates [reservists] of here. If we ever get back this place again, you all are like reserves. You put the bait over board. You put it in the water. And if that thing had happened, we would not have a problem. Because, early in the morning when you leave the pier, the pier is filthy. (..) If we all be like reserves, and we behave in that way there, then we never have a problem.
Desmond: “Look, my thinking is this here. For any action, they have to talk to people first. If they wanted to do any action, close the piers off, they should have discussed it. They never discussed it with you. If they did not discuss it with you, it means that they had an intention. So, if they had an intention, no matter what you’ve done, they would have pushed you off. So I think that we have to be careful how we deal with this issue and not divide in the struggle. Let’s not worry about all the housekeeping issues first. Let’s ask them the reasons why they have stopped us. Ask them the reasons why, and take it from there. If one of the reasons is housekeeping, then they must talk to us and tell us that there. (…) Certainly from what I see, in harbour and all over, the tourist that is coming from Europe and the US is going to get treated better than you and me, and whether we like it or not, and whether we throw bait on the floor, no matter what the situation, they still want to lock you out of here.

The above description indicates the way in which the leadership of Desmond influences and directs the processes whereby the reasons for, and solutions to their collective exclusion are discussed. The fisherman who addressed the gathering expressed his dismay about some of the behaviour as displayed by part of the fishing public, and explained it as the most important reason for their exclusion. When confronted with this during his address, Desmond refused to deal with the issue, dismissing it as “housekeeping” and stressed not to be divided in the struggle. He effectively ignored and excluded that particular strand, so to ultimately strengthen (in his view) the collective action frame of the KZNSFF and fishermen at large.

Rather than accepting any responsibility on the part of the fishermen, Desmond constructed the state as the singular agent of the fishermen’s exclusion and mostly interested in protecting the interests that relate to tourism and recreation in the context of the World Cup. Perhaps interesting to note here as well, is that Desmond did not allow that the fishermen could co-exist with tourists. Aman, for example, was particularly feisty in his efforts to prove that fishing was a tourist attraction. Desmond largely excluded these arguments (in favour of those related to) emphasising instead marginalisation, exclusion, and class division.

Desmond often reiterated that he was not “in politics”, so as to distance himself from local and national government officials who were to blame for the issues that were addressed. His distancing from formal politics is understandable, but should perhaps not be taken literally. Desmond, and the KZNSFF became involved in a deeply political process that not only had
implications for relations amongst the fishermen themselves, but (potentially) also on a level of local and national politics.

**Conclusion**

As the fishermen constitute a heterogeneous group, the leadership was concerned to construct a cohesive identity and coherent collective action frame. This chapter discussed the variety of understandings in relation to their exclusion amongst the fishermen. It pays particular attention to the role of the KZNSFF leadership in defining the issues, which occurred through the in- and exclusion of particular discourses. As we come to see in the coming two chapters, KZNSFF attempted to maintain a social justice discourse in defining and negotiating their issues.
CHAPTER 6

Preparing Public Protest: The Development of a Masterframe and Action Without Leadership

“If the telos of politics is power and its logic the aggregation of interests, the telos of civil society is reaching new understanding through the public use of reason” (Heller, 2009:124).

Introduction

In the morning of 16 June 2010 about 50 fishermen representing the KZNSFF, 20 other social movements and NGOs gathered at Botha’s Garden, a small park in Durban, in preparation for a public protest march through the city centre. Waiting for the march to start moving towards the City Hall, I got to talk to a small group who I had met previously on Snake Park pier. We conversed about the likelihood of the Durban municipality re-opening the beachfront piers to fishermen. Most of them were pessimistic, upon which the 12 year-old son of a fisherman by the name of Paan exclaimed; “You know, the problem is we are not represented” (Fieldnotes, 16/06/2010, Durban).

This line of thought of a 12 year-old coincides with the argument made that “there is little evidence of an increased capacity of subordinated groups to have an effective role in shaping public policy” since the advent of democracy in South Africa (Heller, 209:124). Civil society is argued to be increasingly subordinated to political power, which renders it no longer capable to fulfil its core functions to:
(1) provide a space in which citizens can meaningfully practice democracy on a day-to-day basis; (2) anchor the legitimacy of political practices and institutions in vigorous public debate; and (3) serve as a countervailing force to the power-driven logic of political society. (Heller, 2009:124-125)

This chapter discusses the fishermen’s public efforts under the banner of KZNSFF to present their position and contest their exclusion. In other words, it discusses their attempts to contribute to cultural signifying processes in a quest to ultimately define what counts as “truth” (Benford et al., 2000; Snow, 2005; Hall, 1982; 1997). First, I discuss a march that was held on 16 June 2010 and organised under the banner of the DSF of which KZNSFF had become part. This action is examined in terms of availability to moral, cultural, social-organisational, material, and human resources. As the DSF consisted of several SMOs and NGOs, the DSF had to articulate a “masterframe” which was to form the basis for a coalition of the different parties (Edwards et al., 2005; Snow, 2005: 390-391). Strategic considerations in framing their collective issues, particularly in the context of the then approaching FIFA World Cup 2010, are addressed in Chapter 3.

The second part of this chapter focuses on the smaller protest held on the beachfront by several fishermen and without the coordination of the KZNSFF or DSF on 21 August. This protest is assessed in terms of availability to resources. The four dilemmas in terms of the discursive opportunity structure (Koopmans et al., 2004) guide the rest of discussion. The chapter concludes by comparing the two protests and it addresses how each of these events may or may not have contributed to the increasing prominence of a “collective action frame”; which arguably is the ultimate aim for a Social Movement Organisation (Gamson, 2005; Snow, 2005; Benford et al., 2000).

The Durban Social Forum: (the formation of) a Social Movement

In anticipation of the FIFA World Cup 2010 several civil society groups and NGOs joined to organise a public protest during the upcoming tournament. One of these civil society groups was SDCEA, and through its coordinator Desmond, the KZNSFF in the person of its chairman Essop was involved from the beginning of the planning of the march. The

43 For further pitfalls and opportunities for SMOs see Brechner et al., 2000:30-31
collective, which after a few preparatory meetings named itself the Durban Social Forum (DSF)\textsuperscript{44}, decided to organise a march five days into the World Cup. Within two months the DSF grew to a collective of more than twenty social movements and NGOs\textsuperscript{45}. As discussed in Chapter 3, it has been argued that for social movements to be effective, a variety of resources are needed (Snow, 2005; Edwards et al., 2005; Cress et al., 1996).

**Moral Resources**

Solidarity, sympathetic support, legitimacy, and celebrity are important moral resources for successful SMOs (Cress et al., 1996; Edwards et al., 2005). Frequent negative accounts of the fishermen occur in the media and the general public seems to consent to, if not favour the enclosure and exclusion of the fishermen to which they are opposed (see appendix C1-18; D1-9). The DSF on the other hand, constituted a masterframe which was centred on the neglect of the working classes, unemployed, and those generally marginalised. It is arguably commonly accepted in South Africa that major challenges of socio-economic nature need to be conquered. The divide between the rich and poor is one of the biggest in the world and job creation is an important theme that is continuously referred to in times of elections (Bond, 2010b; Heller, 2009). Rather than KZNSFF operating in isolation, the framing of the DSF then was much more likely to receive support from the broader public and it was perhaps more suitable to establish networks of solidarity and acquire a sense of legitimacy to its issues and actions (Edwards et al., 2005; Hunt et al., 2005).

**Cultural Resources**

A second set of resources to which access is vital, is referred to as “cultural resources” and concerns a variety of cultural products and artefacts (Edwards et al., 2005). Specialised knowledge such as how to write a press release, organise a march, surf the web, design a poster or chair a meeting can all be understood as cultural resources (Edward et al., 2005). The coming together of a variety of parties in the DSF resulted in the centralisation of such specialised knowledge as how to write a press release, organise a march, surf the web, design a poster or chair a meeting. Parties like Streetnet contributed much from experience in

\textsuperscript{44} The DSF was to continue with action after the 16 June. On the 25 June, 2010 it organised a march against xenophobic attacks. At the time of this writing (2011) the DSF still exists, and frequently participates in the organisation of public protest.

\textsuperscript{45} See bottom appendix J:1 for a comprehensive list of all DSF partners
previous protests, and representatives of the Centre for Civil Society, under the direction of Patrick Bond, contributed expertise by writing press releases and memorandums. Many of the parties that collectively made up the DSF had extensive experience with public protest and political engagement, and the organisation of all those resources in one unit was a significant strength for the DSF.

Although many fishermen and committee members of KZNSFF had much to learn during this process of preparation for the DSF march, it was usually Desmond alone who represented the fishermen. Desmond too, possesses many relevant cultural resources as he has extensive experience in mobilising constituencies, engaging with the press, and the logistics of organising mass protest. From a strategic point of view, it was perhaps a pity then, that apart from a few visits by Essop, no other fishermen or KZNSFF representatives participated and potentially acquired some of the cultural resources that were relevant to the organisation of mass protest.

**Social-Organisational Resources**

Thirdly, access to “social-organisational resources” is crucial as it can lead to further access of other kinds of resources (Edwards et al., 2005:127). Three different kinds of social-organisational resources can be distinguished: infrastructures, social networks, and organisations (Edwards et al., 2005). Infrastructure refers to public and civil infrastructure and bureaucratic processes. One particular issue of concern during the preparation of the march was whether the DSF would be allowed to march through Dr. Pixley Ka Seme Street (formerly West Street), a thoroughfare through Durban that runs past the City Hall. Although it was a match day (Spain vs. Switzerland), the police approved the march and access to that particular infrastructure was thereby granted. The growth of DSF to a large collective of social movements and NGOs was in part due to their extensive and diverse social networks of organisations such as Streetnet, SDCEA and the CCS have large and diverse social networks. DSF also had access to formal organisations such as local and national media, political parties, but also copy shops and event equipment hire companies.
Material Resources

SMOs also need a significant degree of access to material resources, or in other words financial and physical capital (Edwards et al., 2005). In order to attract supporters to the DSF protest march several thousand pamphlets were printed and distributed. A mobile sound system was rented and used from a vehicle in front of the march to inform bystanders of the causes and lead the chanting of resistance songs. The march cost R15,000 and was paid for by CCS, Streetnet, and the Social Movements Indaba (Fieldwork, 2010). Furthermore, the preparatory meetings for the march were held either in the Streetnet offices in central Durban, or in a seminar room of CCS on the UKZN campus. The organisers and helpers had access to computers and were able to design pamphlets, write press releases, stay in contact between meetings through email, and write and circulate minutes of previous meetings. The significant degree of access to financial and physical capital by the DSF facilitated a coordinated process of preparation (Taylor et al., 2005).

Human Resources

The fifth type identified as crucial to successful SMOs are human resources (Edwards et al., 2005). Labour, particular skills, experience, expertise but also leadership are understood as such. The description above makes it clear that the collective combined a great deal of (shared) experience and that certain individuals had valuable skills to offer, such as the writing of press releases (for which access to cultural resources and eventually social-organisational resources are also needed) and depend on a degree of sophistication. The participants involved in the preparations for the DSF march tended to take up leadership roles in their particular organisations and constituencies. Desmond not only directed SDCEA, but also positioned himself as a leader of the KZNSFF. He and many other leaders came together in the DSF to contribute with their experience, skills, and visions. Hence, as a result of the collective of civil society groups with different backgrounds and histories, the DSF had access to a large variety of human resources.

46 see Appendix J:1; J:2
Strategising protest during the FIFA World Cup 2010

Much strategic effort was put into the organisation of the DSF march. Desmond chaired most of the preparatory DSF meetings and thereby facilitated a process of articulating a “masterframe” amongst the DSF partners (Snow, 2005: 390). I discuss the articulation of this masterframe, while paying particular attention to strategic and tactic considerations made (Taylor et al., 2005; Gamson, 2005). To understand this strategic decision-making, I consider four common dilemmas in the organisation of social movement action in the context of a “discursive opportunity structure” (Koopmans et al., 2004; Gamson, 2005).

The Depth of Challenge Dilemma

As identified in Chapter 3, the first of four dilemmas is referred to as “the depth of challenge dilemma” (Gamson, 2005: 249-251). It addresses the balancing of articulating a collective action frame in such a way that it increases “[mobilisation] potential” while not allowing rivals or adversaries to isolate the statements by dismissing them as irrelevant (Gamson, 2005: 249-251). The latter can occur when a frame challenges hegemonic ideas and practices. For example, there was much discussion in the DSF as to how to approach the World Cup. Some participants reasoned that the football tournament should not have been held in South Africa, a critique that was mostly directed towards government expenditure in relation to hosting the event. Others argued that the World Cup itself had great potential and that the people of (South) Africa also deserved the right to host the event. It was further strategically reasoned by some of the participants that the World Cup was too popular to be criticised and it was anticipated that a critique on the event itself would serve to ostracise and marginalise the organisation and its message. It was decided then, that the World Cup was not to be argued against, rather attention be directed to the position of FIFA and the implementation of FIFA related policies.

Similarly, it was strategically decided to hold the march on Youth Day, a public holiday. It was expected that potentially high numbers of people would show up, as the majority of the workforce would not be at work. Youth organisations such as Youth in Action and Abahlali

---

47 The FIFA World Cup 2010 was the first World Cup to be held on the African continent.
baseMondolo were invited to join the march, a strategic inclusion that used the opportunity to establish networks of solidarity based on the strategic organisation and framing of issues. This choice is indicative of how strategic decision-making can influence the framing of a SMO, as in this case where emphasis was given to youth related issues. Moreover, Youth Day commemorates the Soweto Uprising, an event associated with the struggle under apartheid, and arguably a history to which a majority of South Africans relate. It aimed to mobilise this moment in history and thereby to establish greater solidarity with members of the broader public.

There was another reason why it was strategic to hold the march on the 16 June that relates to the “the depth of challenge dilemma” (Gamson, 2005: 249). On that same date Spain and Switzerland were to play a first round match against each other in the Moses Mabhida stadium in Durban. As Spain was the 2008 European champion and one of the favourite teams to win the World Cup in South Africa, it was anticipated that it would attract much media attention. The Swiss were also significant due to FIFA holding office in Zurich, Switzerland. While taking the popularity of the World Cup into account, the match was to be utilised in the framing of the issues with FIFA, without actually interrupting the match itself as that would potentially ostracise the movement and damage solidarity based relations with the broader public (Hunt et al., 2005).

The Access Dilemma

“The access dilemma” refers to difficulties that relate to establishing and maintaining “media standing” (Gamson, 2005: 251). During the preparation of the march it soon became clear that media coverage was more or less guaranteed (as they had social-organisational resources with the media), but to ensure coverage that framed the protesters as “agents” (Gamson, 2005: 251), was more difficult. Two coordinators were appointed (of whom Desmond was one) to speak on several occasions during the march on behalf of the DSF. They could therefore actively control the articulation of the masterframe. However, some collective action frames, like those articulated by (representatives of) the KZNSFF, seem to fit less well with the DSF masterframe. As we come to see below, the KZNSFF “collective action frame”

48 Abahlali baseMondjolo is not a youth group as such but represents and is represented by a large group of young activists. See also the documentary “Dear Mandela” (2011) by Dara Kell and Christopher Nizza.
was attributed little coverage. It was in “standing” limited to comments by Essop in the *Daily News*, and seemed to be ignored in favour of other, perhaps more fitting frames that fitted within the masterframe as articulated by the DSF (Benford et al, 2000; Snow, 2005). The striking by stadium stewards, for example, were repeatedly mentioned by different media.

**The Need for Validation Dilemma**

The mass media are of crucial importance to SMOs as they can validate the collective action frame. The need for validation dilemma deals with the “danger that mere coverage becomes an end in itself rather than a means to gaining standing and greater prominence for one’s preferred frame” (Gamson, 2005: 252). In the preparation for the DSF march, the participants stressed the importance of a well-planned and thought out press campaign. As the DSF consisted of several parties, it was important that all parties agreed with communication under the umbrella of the DSF. Hence, all press releases as well as the memorandum were written collectively over a period of several days. Additions or revisions were made, after which the revised document was circulated again by email until every party agreed on its content. As the coverage in the media was considered very important, the content of the DSF directed communication was carefully crafted and internally discussed. If anything, the content was designed to lead to more coverage and the coverage itself never seemed to be preferred over actual content.

**The Weak Control Dilemma**

“The weak control dilemma” relates to the lack of an authority structure that can be used to control the members’ contributions to the public framing (Gamson, 2005: 253-254). Many partners with different backgrounds joined together in the DSF march and the challenge was to articulate a coherent (master)frame that would bind the groups together (Snow, 2005). It would have been undesirable to DSF for representatives of a particular social movement to mobilise the opportunity of the march and media attention to communicate their own issues outside of the framing of the DSF. In the preparatory phase of the march certain parties were excluded from participation exactly for this reason. The South African Communist Party (SACP), for example, was not invited to participate in the DSF as the political faction was expected to attempt to mobilise the march for their particular benefit.
After meticulous strategising, the masterframe of the DSF was articulated in terms of the marginalisation of the working classes in South Africa. It was argued that they were neglected and needed the protection of government to secure their rights to education, economic participation and ultimately equal citizenship. That the national government had agreed with the terms set by FIFA was interpreted as a further sign of government’s neglect of the needs of the working and most vulnerable classes in South Africa. The DSF argued that the World Cup, as a consequence of the demands of FIFA and consequent policies designed by the South African government, resulted in the further exclusion of such groups as street and market traders, shack dwellers, and indeed Durban’s subsistence fishermen (Bond, 2010).

Handing over of the memorandum
After the march through the city centre, it was planned to allow representatives of the particular groups and movements to address the crowd. The memorandum that was carefully drafted in the weeks before was to be read out and presented to government officials. Desmond was assigned the task of reading out the demands as formulated in the memorandum. It was an important moment as the deputy mayor and a representative of the premier were present to accept the memorandum and were directly addressed by Desmond. The section on the fishermen demanded:

> the end of municipal harassment of Durban fisherfolk, the imposition of more reasonable fishing license fees, and a recommitment to cleaning the harbour and beaches of pollution of all sorts (DSF Memorandum, see appendix J:1).

I have argued in Chapters 2 and 5 that the “municipal harassment” and “rise of license fees” were common strands of contestation amongst the fishermen in Durban. The request in the memorandum on behalf of the fishermen was an understandable one and fitted the larger discourse maintained by the DSF of social (and environmental) justice and equality of citizenship. However, the fishermen had argued that the re-opening of the Durban fishing sites was of central concern to the beachfront, as well as to the harbour and South Pier fishermen. Regardless of this goal, the fishermen’s struggle was formulated in abstract terms of social and environmental equality. While the demand to open fishing piers in Durban was
articulated on some of placards and banners, the request was excluded from the memorandum of demand, which was potentially a key document in the collective framing of activities.

When the memorandum was handed over to the first government official something peculiar occurred. Cyril Xaba, a special advisor to premier Zweli Mkhize, signed and was given the opportunity to acknowledge the memorandum and possibly respond to critique and the demands. Xaba began with 49:


Although the organisation of the DSF march had anticipated the World Cup to be an opportunity to hold the authorities to their promises and responsibilities, it showed that during this march provincial government official Xaba sought to elude the issues by ignoring the memorandum and trying to distract attention from the issues of the march. Perhaps surprisingly, for Xaba to react the way he did was not picked up as a sign of disrespect towards the particular civil society groups by the media. All the more surprising was that he seemed to be getting away with his behaviour, until a coordinator of the DSF march intercepted by taking his microphone away and publicly asked him (again) to respond and acknowledge the memorandum.

He then began to address in Zulu, thereby effectively excluding the Indian section of the march from his address. He positioned himself clumsily as a democrat and simultaneously implied that the reasons for the DSF march were “detestful” (sic).

(..) but we still can provide space for all those who want to come and express their views. So those views will be defended, no matter how detestful (sic) they may be. We’ll still defend those views. So that is South Africa (Xaba, Durban, 16/06/2010).

In handing over the memorandum, the DSF were attempting to engage with powerful political officials on local and regional level in a serious manner, but Xaba responded by

49 see also Appendix Z (tt: 29:13:00)
clowning. It is pertinent to note is that until the point of writing (August, 2011) the DSF is yet to receive a response from the Durban municipality and the KZN premier’s office. The handing over of the memorandum and the response (or lack thereof) by the government officials adds to the argument that civil society in South Africa is often demobilised by political society (Heller, 2009).

**The DSF March in the Media**

In addition to the actual protest, the march was strategically designed to attract the attention of the media. As argued before, without coverage by the media a protest becomes a “nonevent” (Gamson, 2005:252). In discussing how the DSF march was represented in local, national, and international press it was demonstrated that the KZNSFF leadership exercised control over the public articulation of the collective issues of Durban’s fishermen and that the particularities of the fishermen’s issues were not always distinguishable in the larger DSF narrative that called for equality, justice and citizens’ rights.

The coverage of the march in the mainstream media included several local and national media. The march was covered by the Durban based *Daily News* and *The Mercury*. The nationally-distributed *Mail & Guardian* and national television broadcasters SABC and eTV also covered the event (see appendix XX). The television coverage demonstrates how the issues that specifically related to the fishermen, submerged in the DSF defined and controlled “masterframe” (Hunt et al., 2005; Snow, 2005). On the 7 O’clock primetime evening E-news program, the DSF march was later that day covered and described as follows:
Anchorman: Not everybody is feeling the World Cup’s spirit. Lobby groups and NGO’s staged a protest in Durban today against what they are calling World Cup profiteering. The Social Movement Forum [sic] says the poor will not benefit from the spectacle. Security workers, previously employed at Moses Mabhida stadium, joined the march in solidarity.

Reporter: Hardly swept away by soccer fever, these people from various Durban communities are anything but elated about the World Cup. The protesters are all unhappy with what they claim is “World Cup Profiteering”. They say the World Cup won’t really benefit any of them: the people who need basic necessities such as housing and jobs. The Social Movement Forum (sic) is unhappy about government’s massive spending on World Cup’s stadia and other infrastructure. They say the money could have been better spent on building houses or stimulating the economy. The money made from the tournament will only enrich FIFA and multinational corporations, they say (Enews, 16/06/2010).

The DSF march successfully drew attention to the issue of marginalisation of some groups in particular, and the interests of the working classes more generally achieved media coverage at a national level as in the example given above. However, as is evident in the eTV coverage, the fishermen were not mentioned. Only the story of the security workers at Moses Mabhida stadium in Durban received explicit attention. That they were a focus can be partially attributed to the coverage earlier in the daily corporate press and that they should continue to be a focus is consistent with the idea of a ‘running story’ in current newsroom practices or continuity as a news value. (Harcup et al., 2001). Although they had not participated in the preparation of the march, they were invited for strategic reasons to join the march and captured much of the attention during the primetime eTV news report.

The DSF leadership regarded the march as successful as most dominant local and national media picked up on the event. However, it was only in the publication of the Daily News that the plight of the fishermen was explicitly mentioned. A local reporter had spoken to Essop and presented his contribution as follows:

50 see appendix J:6-J10
51 see appendix A:4
Chairman of KZN Subsistence Fisher's Forum Essop Mohamed said: Some people were tired of falling by the wayside. We are marching against oppression. (..) ‘They let FIFA come here and do what they want, but they won't let us fish,’ he said, referring to a city ruling to bar fishing in certain areas along the beachfront (Daily News, 17/06/2010).

Two things are of particular significance here. Firstly, the issues of the fishermen in Durban are not positioned as hostile to FIFA, although he does establish a relation between the two. I would argue that this was strategic, as it would have appeared inconsistent with the “masterframe” developed by the DSF at large to have done otherwise. Secondly, it is significant to note that it was Essop, the chairman of the KZNSFF rather than any of the other fishermen, who was interviewed and given the opportunity to provide his interpretation and view on the matter. Essop established “standing” in the media, which is an important source of power for SMOs as it provides the opportunity to increase the prominence of its preferred frame(s), thereby also sustaining his own position of authority in the context of the KZNSFF (Snow, 2005; Gamson, 2005).

The Durban based newspaper The Mercury also covered the event, although without referring to the fishermen’s issues. The march was framed in terms of (lacking) service delivery. The mentioned groups in the article were the Wentworth Development Forum, and the street traders who complained about a trading embargo during the tournament. The representative of the Wentworth Development Forum and Socialist Party of AZAnia was quoted as saying: “If the city can spend so much money on FIFA, what has been stopping them from spending that on education, housing and health?” (The Mercury, 17/06/2010). The issue of recreational and subsistence fishermen’s demands for access to public space may have been suited to the story on service delivery and unemployment as constructed by The Mercury. However, The Mercury offered no “standing” or any coverage at all that explicitly mentioned the fishermen and their issues.

---

52 see appendix J:8
The nationally distributed weekly, *Mail & Guardian*[^53], also covered the event. It framed the event in terms of FIFA and World Cup related expenditure on the part of government. In an article titled “Thousands protest against World Cup spending” it seemed to legitimate the aims and claims of the march and DSF.

Ever since it was awarded the staging rights, South Africa’s government has faced accusations it should not be spending hundreds of millions of dollars on stadiums when about 40% of the population lives on less than $2 a day (M&G, 16/06/2010).

The key argument identifies the expenditure in relation to stadiums and infrastructure. It asks whether it should not have been spent on proper housing and anti-poverty policies in South Africa. While the DSF was successful in having its core arguments covered by a national newspaper, the issues of the fishermen were not referred to.

The DSF march was not particularly effective in promoting the KZNSFF collective action frame. The carefully planned march resulted in coverage by local and national key players in the media but the fishermen were, apart from the *Daily News* article, not explicitly mentioned. The little attention that was paid to the fishermen was controlled by the leadership of KZNSFF.

**A Public Protest Without Leadership**

On 21 August 2010, a smaller protest was organised by Bob, a fisherman from Phoenix. Bob has a long history of about 25 years of fishing from the Durban beachfront. He is known to many regular fishermen there and has a large social network of fishermen and non-fishermen in his residential area in Phoenix. The protest differed from the DSF march in that it allowed more room for the individual fishermen to publicly articulate their issues. The protest was not directed or coordinated by the DSF or KZNSFF and did not have a centralised narrative or argument. This set-up led to an unsuccessful protest. The lack of coordination led to incoherent framing. Moreover, the lack of (social-organisational and material) resources resulted in the participation of relatively few fishermen in a protest that was not covered by the media.

[^53]: See Appendix J:10
A background to the protest

The final match of the World Cup was played on 11 July 2010 between Spain and the Netherlands, and marked the end of the first FIFA World Cup on African soil. In spite of attempts to engage with politics and the broader public during the event, many fishermen I talked to had little faith that any of the three piers would be opened officially to the fishermen. In the weeks after the tournament, the beachfront fishermen increasingly defied the ban and decided to enter the Bay of Plenty and Dairy beach piers at night. They continued to fish on Snake Park pier during the day, but when evening fell more and more fishermen went to the longer beachfront piers. By about ten days after the end of the World Cup, more than 100 fishermen were fishing off the Bay of Plenty and Dairy Beach piers regularly at night⁵⁴. On many occasions during this time of occupation, many fishermen expressed the conviction that they had a right to access the piers at night as the World Cup was over. Not only fishermen entered the piers, but they were regularly accompanied by their wives and children. The number of people on the piers also attracted the attention of several street traders selling peanuts, crisps, and cold drinks. It turned the piers into a bustling place where fishermen, their families, street salesmen and other members of the general public intermingled.

Two and a half weeks after the World Cup on 28 July 2010, the METRO police ushered nearly 200 fishermen off the Bay of Plenty and Dairy Beach piers, threatening them with arrests and fines. The following day the METRO placed gates in front of all three piers and guarded them with two to four police officers. After the police secured the piers for another few days, a private security company took over these duties.

Strategising Protest without Resources

Against this background of repressive measures by the local government authorities to civil disobedience, several fishermen organised a protest at the beachfront on the 21 August 2010.

⁵⁴ North Beach “Police” Pier remained quiet, although it was used. North Beach pier has never been open to fishermen and most fishermen know this and decided not to enter this pier even when publicly defying the authorities by fishing on the two other piers. See also the Bay of Plenty (appendix Z) for two scenes during this period tt: 39:20:00 / 43:30:00
Rather than the KZNSFF leadership in the persons of Desmond (coordinator), Essop (chairman), Sewsunker (vice-chairman), or Max (committee member), it was Bob who organised the protest. As becomes evident in the analysis below, a different constellation of resources compared to those of the DSF, rendered this protest unsuccessful in achieving change or increasing the prominence of a collective action frame. The legacy of apartheid is implicated in them lacking “not only income and property, but cultural and social capital as well that permeate social practices and govern social interactions” (Heller, 2009: 131). Using the same framing of analysis as the discussion on the DSF march, I elaborate on the availability for the small group of fishermen to moral, cultural, social-organisation, material, and human resources.

**Moral Resources**
As discussed in Chapter 2, the fishermen had been engaged in public negotiations concerning issues related to licensing and access. Yet although many protests have been organised over the years, the fact remains that more fishing sites have closed since the establishing of the KZNSFF than were (re-)opened. Throughout my research period many fishermen appeared reluctant or no longer willing to participate in KZNSFF activities.  

This sense of apathy was not only a challenge for KZNSFF in the context of mobilising constituencies for the DSF march, but also for Bob, who took on the responsibility of organising a public protest. As argued earlier, the fishermen do not constitute a homogenous grouping and it would prove hard to mobilise a significant amount of participants. In addition, the fishermen’s reputation is poor as they have been portrayed in the hegemonic public sphere provided by the mainstream press as irresponsible and an undesirable entity on the Durban beachfront.

**Cultural Resources**
The lack of preparation done in advance of this protest can be explained in terms of lack of access to cultural resources. The idea of writing a press release and distributing it to media houses was not entertained. Bob neither had a computer (material resource) nor the

---

55 It would make for relevant future research to identify the reasons for this sense of fatigue that seemed prevalent amongst certain sections of the fishermen in Durban.
knowledge (cultural resource) of how to formally construct a press release. As compared with the preparations for the DSF march, this protest was not organised with a clear view on what the organisation of public protest entails, in part due to a lack of access to cultural resources.

**Social-Organisational Resources**

As knowledge on how to coordinate and organise a public protest was insufficient, there was no attempt to establish alignments (based on solidarity) with other organisations. The only social-organisational resource accessed were the social networks among the constituencies of fishermen, particularly those residing in Phoenix. A freelance journalist from *The Phoenix Sun*, a community paper published in Phoenix, was informed by telephone.

I also served as a social-organisation resource, which several fishermen accessed. By the time of this protest many fishermen knew me and viewed me in the role of a camera journalist. As argued in Chapter 4 my researcher position acquired a political dimension as I was actively sought by many fishermen of the KZNSFF on the grounds that the presence of a camera could prevent aggressive intervention by the police. Furthermore, if the police forces were to use physical force to remove or hamper fishermen in their protest, the video material was anticipated to provide proof in relation to many claims of the aggressive manner of law enforcement. My presence with a camera for many arguably equated to coverage in the media, or at least to a broader audience.

**Material Resources**

Unlike preparations for the DSF march, no preparatory meetings were held. A venue was not needed, and probably could not have been afforded without the formal assistance of KZNSFF. There was no financial investment in flyers or other promotional material due to a lack of money. Materials used included several banners and placards, which were kept after the DSF march on the 16 June. The material resources to which this small group of fishermen had access could not be compared with those resources of the DSF. Without such resources it was very difficult to promote the event or arrange means of transport that could carry larger numbers of people, even if it had been planned for.
Human Resources

Morris and Staggenborg (2005) theorise the role of leaders in the context of SMOs and stress the importance of good leadership:

> Leaders offer frames, tactics, and organisational vehicles that allow participants to construct a collective identity and participate in collective action at various levels (...). They rely not only on their personal attractiveness and abilities, but also on previous experiences, cultural traditions, gender norms, social networks, and familiar organising forms (Morris et al., 2005:180).

This protest lacked the coordination of experienced leadership. More so than Desmond, Essop, or Max, Bob had a large network of fishermen in Phoenix and was therefore important to KZNSFF leadership. Throughout my research I noticed that Bob was manoeuvred into the position of a “bridge leader”, which is one of four ideal types of leadership as categorised by Morris and Staggenborg (2005). He was not only significant to the KZNSFF leadership due to his social network, but also for his identity as a subsistence fisherman. He was therefore given responsibilities by the KZNSFF leadership and was often involved in the organisation of protest, talking to journalists about their issues and was occasionally present during official meetings with local government or institutions like the Human Rights Watch in Durban. This time, however, Bob was alone in organising the protest and without the authority and coordination of more established and experiences leaders. He lacked the resources to make this action successful and it resulted in a badly strategised and coordinated event.

Framing Oppression: Considering the Discursive Opportunity Structure

To further understand why this protest was not particularly successful, I discuss this public action by attending to the four common dilemmas for SMOs as set out by Gamson (2005).

The Depth of Challenge Dilemma

The attempt to communicate a coordinated and coherent message did not seem to inform this protest. Many fishermen spoke or shouted their frustrations amongst each other as the bypassing audience stood at some distance from the fishermen. Bob did try to engage the passing members of the public and made statements that positioned city manager Michael
Sutcliffe as a racist bully, with the fishermen as honest people who were deprived of their income. Throughout he repeated: “apartheid is alive and kicking” (Bob, 21/08/2010, Durban). Several pedestrians stopped for a few minutes, took photos, read the signs or listened to the claims that were made. Others approached the fishermen and engaged in conversations about the reasons for their upset. However, during the two hour protest there were not more than six such encounters, some lasting longer than others.

One encounter of interest here involved a white middle-aged man who identified himself as a human rights lawyer approached the small group of fishermen. The man asked me if he could contribute by stating his point of view on camera.

**MP (Member of Public):** I should say first of all that it’s a emotive issue to say that they are being denied food. I think these are largely recreational fishermen. Because, I have been surfing off these piers for the last 35 or 40 years. And, I think, anybody who really loves the ocean has been quite appalled by the way that they treat the ocean. Obviously they are not all to blame. (…) But I am not just an observer from a distance, I am someone who has sat in the water there for years and years and years and years. And to call it racism is just stupid.

The protest had triggered the lawyer’s response on camera, which can be understood as an attempt by him to frame ‘the real story’ and thus offer an alternative explanation for the fishermen’s exclusion. The aim for SMOs is arguably to bring to prominence a collective action frame and this encounter illustrates the unsuccessful attempt by the uncoordinated group of fishermen to do so (Snow, 2005; Benford, 2000). In fact, had I not been a researcher but a camera journalist, the utterances made by the seemingly sympathetic lawyer could have resulted in the circulation, and perhaps growing prominence of the lawyer’s framing of issues, rather than the fishermen’s collective action frame (Gamson, 2005).

While I talked with the man on camera, Lovie approached us and responded to the assertions made by the Human Rights lawyer. He agreed with his account but stressed that not all fishermen engage in such behaviour and argued that he was actually a victim too of a minority of fishermen.
Lovie: No, you are right. I am a fishermen, I am fishing since I been a small kid. And we are very clean fishermen. We get some bad elements, which is a fact. I mean we also see that, ehh, littering the piers, throwing packages into the sea. Its unacceptable. But why should we suffer?

Attending to “the depth of challenge dilemma” this encounter is illustrative. The lawyer had picked up on the statements made on several placards and verbally by Bob, which framed their exclusion as racially motivated. Some 20 years after the end of apartheid and with the ANC in power, it did not seem convincing. The consequence of uttering statements that are not sufficiently strategised becomes clear. Although the lawyer sympathised with the fishermen, his response starts and is largely concerned with the argument that some fishermen have shown undesirable behaviour in public. The lawyer thereby effectively rejected the framing by the protesting fishermen and aimed to persuade Lovie, myself, as well as my potential audience with his framing of the issue.

The Access Dilemma

Without media coverage a public protest has been argued to be a “nonevent” (Gamson, 2005: 252). As is shown above, however, in this action they lacked the resources to do so. Although it was not picked up by the mainstream media, a story was covered by ‘The Phoenix Sun’. The story juxtaposed the issues as formulated by several fishermen, with a response by deputy mayor Logie Naidoo, who claimed that the enclosure of the piers was not a “personal attack on the fishermen”. It was argued by Naidoo that “[i]n most instance, [tourists] were welcomed to a stench of fish, bait and filth on the floor” (26/08/2010, Phoenix Sun: 3). Aman and two other fishermen were quoted in the article, and thus managed to establish standing in the media, and argued that those who engaged in illegal behaviour should be given fines, and should not result in the categorical banning of fishermen from the piers.

The article was published in a community paper that was only distributed in Phoenix. Although Bob managed to establish coverage and media standing through his social-organisational resources, it reached a readership that is more sympathetic towards the fishermen’s issues.

---
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The Need for Validation Dilemma

The need for validation dilemma recognises the validating role the media has but warns against seeking media attention for coverage alone (Gamson, 2005:252). As argued above, movements can be understood as “signifying agents engaged in the production and maintenance of meaning for protagonists, antagonists, and bystanders” (Snow, 2005:384) and are ultimately “embroiled in the politics of signification” (Hall, 1982). Hence, it is in the interest of the movement to engage with other publics amongst whom alternative frames of meaning may be dominant. Of all areas and surrounding suburbs of Durban, Phoenix is arguably (together with Chatsworth) the place where most support for the fishermen’s fight against their categorical exclusion can be found. As explained before, many fishermen are of Indian descent and live in these places. These are, then, perhaps not the areas that are most in need of promoting the demands and issues of fishermen. Inviting a journalist from *the Phoenix Sun* would have perhaps made it easier to establish media coverage. In order to ultimately establish change, the movement of the Durban fishermen arguably need to communicate with other, perhaps preferably dominant publics and so to effectively negotiate their exclusion.

Another encounter during the beachfront protest indicates the power of dominant frames, which can be argued to be articulated and elaborated in mainstream media (Snow, 2005; Gamson, 2005; Tilly, 2002). Two fishermen (F1 & F2) engaged with a bystander (B), who was interested in their reasons for gathering. He asked:

B: You sell the fish?
F1: Yeah, we sell the fish, for our families you know? But we got no support, no help.
B: You want to fish on that side (points to the Bay of Plenty pier)?
F1: Yeah. So all the good fishing areas they closed. But they gave rights to the tourists, but we are South African. You saw for [the World Cup] 2010. We all was safe. After 2010 you can see any policemen now? You don’t see any policemen now!
(…)
B: I read somewhere they don’t let you on the pier because the guys leave all the bait behind.
F2: There are no taps on the pier. How can you clean the pier if there are no taps on the pier?
(fieldnotes, 21/08/2010, Durban)
The man presented himself as interested and eager to find out what the reasons were for the fishermen’s upset. It did not take long, however, before he provided what perhaps appeared to him to be the main reason for the enclosure of the piers to the fishermen. In doing so, he stressed the legitimacy of the argument, which is perhaps more commonly held amongst the more dominant, middle classes in Durban, and explains the fishermen as responsible for their own exclusion. It is worth noting, here, that it was a newspaper that had apparently provided him with the particular framing of the situation that explained the removal of fishermen from most of the Durban beachfront. In the next chapter I discuss and analyse fishermen’s representation in the local mainstream newspapers in Durban.

**The Weak Control Dilemma**

The weak control dilemma is the problem area that relates to the unified image and a significant degree of cohesiveness of a group and the aim to articulate a coherent collective action frame (Gamson, 2005). As indicated earlier, this protest lacked strong leadership and no effort seemed to have been made to coordinate the ultimate message the event would communicate. The placards and banners were left over from the DSF march on 16 June, and without paying much attention to the actual wording, the majority of participants got hold of a placard and showed it to me on camera and the bypassers on the promenade. The written messages were diverse and, as explained above in relation to “the depth of challenge dilemma”, formulated without much strategising (Gamson, 2005). Some showed unsophisticated texts depicting city manager Michael Sutcliffe as the: “Brutal Sadistic Oppressor of the Downtrodden saviour of the Surfers. Discrimination against the Fisher-Folk. Apartheid is Alive and Kicking”.
For a period of about two hours the group remained on the promenade and the protest slowly grew to about 30 participants. The audience consisted of a handful of bystanders on the promenade as it seemed to have gone relatively quiet after the end of mid-term holidays as well as the World Cup. Several fishermen discussed matters amongst each other, rather than with bystanders who seemed to remain on a distance. This event, then, was not well directed, resulted in an “orgy of participation and of talk” (Morris et al., 2005:180) and was clearly not suitable to be communicated to a broader public as it lacked coherence, coordination and strategic decision-making on the articulation of issues.

Tilly offers (2002) guidelines for effective SMO communication that would explain why this protest was unsuccessful and perhaps should not even have been held. He argues that in order to effectively transmit a message, a SMO and its supporters must be Worthy; Unified; Numerous; and Committed (WUNC) and that “a visibly low value on any of them discredits the whole movement” (Tilly, 2002: 88). It is clear that there was no control over the public articulation of the issues, hence, it is doubtful whether the protest would have been readily classified as “Unified” and it certainly did not bring together “Numerous” participants or sympathisers. Although the fishermen who participated cannot be blamed for a lack of Commitment, the degree of Worthiness of their arguments was source of debate, as is discussed in the section above dealing with “the depth of challenge dilemma”.

The protest ended as disappointingly as it started. The group had moved from Snake Park pier towards the Bay of Plenty pier where the little coordinated singing, shouting and loud public debating continued. Before long the police arrived, who informed them that they were acting illegally as they did not have a permit to use the beachfront for their public actions. They were urged to disperse and before long the fishermen packed up and left. Yet again, their collective powers were inefficient to effectively legitimise their positions and presence on what was once their beloved fishing ground.
Conclusion

This chapter considered two public protests, which were used by the fishermen to negotiate their exclusion from the beachfront piers. They used the public sphere by offering different discourses that explained and argued against the enclosure of fishing sites. Both actions were characterised by differing degrees of power and coordination of the collective action frame, which rendered the actions in differing degrees effective. This chapter then argues that access to (moral, cultural, social-organisational, material and human) resources is essential in successful SMOs and the organisation of public protest (Benford et al., 2000; Edwards et al., 2005; Morris et al., 2005; Snow, 2005; Snow et al., 1996; Gamson, 2005). The withdrawal of consent (Brechner et al., 2000) and the articulation of a collective action frame (Snow et al., 2005), as was done in the context of the KZNSFF and the DSF, is ultimately directed at altering relations of power, which possibly results in increasing opportunities to facilitate change (Brechner et al., 2000). The more resources of various kinds are available, then, the more a collective action frame can be strategically articulated in such a way that it contests dominant meaning in the public sphere, is broadly legitimated, establishes lineages with other counter- and dominant publics, and so potentially fosters change.

However, the cause of not having achieved immediate change through these two public actions does not solely lie with the fishermen, or civil society in Durban. In my one-and-a-half years in South Africa I have heard many South Africans pride themselves with having the “most democratic constitution in the world”. Heller reminds us that: “the quality of a democracy is not just about its formal institutions (..), but also has to do with the capacity of its citizens (and especially the most subordinate) to engage in public life” (Heller, 2009:124). The DSF was allowed to march through the city centre and hand over a memorandum to public officials. However, it provided opportunity for government officials to argue the democratic character of South Africa, without having to take seriously the issues that were raised, not having to dignify them with a descent verbal or written response.
CHAPTER 7

Letters to Editor:

An Arena Of Contesting Publics

Whether symbolic phenomena do or do not serve to establish and sustain relations of domination is a question which can be answered only by examining the interplay of meaning and power in particular circumstances, only be examining the ways in which symbolic forms are employed, circulated and understood by individuals situated in structured social contexts (Thompson, 1990: 56).

Introduction

Around the period of the FIFA World Cup the issue of fishermen’s access to the beachfront piers gained much attention in local newspapers. During my research period (1 May until 30 August, 2010), journalists regularly covered stories on the enclosed beachfront piers as well as the (proposed) actions of fishermen or civil society to contest or resist the enclosure. Additionally, the fishermen were frequently the focus of letters to editor sections of local newspapers as well as in a section that presents sms texts called Backchat in the Daily News. In this chapter I focus on the letters to editor that were published during the period of research in the three local mainstream newspapers: the Daily News; The Mercury; and the Sunday Tribune.

---
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58 See Appendix G:1-8 for examples
59 Due to limitations of time and space, I have chosen not to elaborate on the Backchat section in the Daily News, despite the significance of the section in this context. I would argue that most arguments made in Backchat are similar to those made in the letters’ sections. As the letters to editor are more substantial, I have chosen to focus on the letters, rather than SMS texts that characterise the Backchat section.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PAPER:PAGE</th>
<th>PAR'S/LINES</th>
<th>AUTHOR NAME</th>
<th>IDENTITY</th>
<th>TITLE of Letter</th>
<th>RESPONSE TO:</th>
<th>FOCUS OF LETTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14/05/10</td>
<td>Daily News: 12</td>
<td>6 paragraphs 55 lines</td>
<td>DESMOND D’S’A</td>
<td>KZNSFF Coordinator</td>
<td>Fishermen to defy Sutcliffe ban</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Withdrawal of consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/05/10</td>
<td>The Mercury:7</td>
<td>5 paragraphs 25 lines</td>
<td>ERIC CHETTY</td>
<td>Member of public</td>
<td>What about a pay pier?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Introduce pay pier for the benefit of the public and fishermen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/05/10</td>
<td>The Mercury:17</td>
<td>3 paragraphs 17 lines</td>
<td>GRAEME BIRD</td>
<td>Surfer</td>
<td>Fishing ban of their own making</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Complaint about irresponsible behaviour of fishermen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/06/10</td>
<td>The Mercury:11</td>
<td>11 paragraphs 69 lines</td>
<td>KERRY CULLINAN</td>
<td>Member of public, surfmom</td>
<td>Fishermen abused city’s piers</td>
<td>Desmond d’Sa 14/05</td>
<td>Fishermen abused city’s piers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/06/10</td>
<td>The Mercury:11</td>
<td>8 paragraphs 58 lines</td>
<td>DESMOND D’S’A</td>
<td>KZNSFF Coordinator</td>
<td>City must have other fish to fry</td>
<td>Kerry Cullinan 02/06</td>
<td>Economic dependency of fishermen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/06/10</td>
<td>SundayTribune: 25</td>
<td>19 paragraphs 119 lines</td>
<td>JOHN EVERITT</td>
<td>Surfer</td>
<td>Fishing from piers fouls beaches</td>
<td>Eric Chetty 17/05</td>
<td>Fishermen result in deteriorating beachfront &amp; piers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/06/10</td>
<td>The Mercury:15</td>
<td>5 paragraphs 27 lines</td>
<td>GEOFF TAYLOR</td>
<td>Member of Public</td>
<td>Bad fishing habits are no racial habits</td>
<td>Desmond d’Sa 04/06</td>
<td>Abuse of environment by fishermen. Responds to Desmond 04/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/06/10</td>
<td>The Mercury:19</td>
<td>6 paragraphs 39 lines</td>
<td>MARK CROZIER</td>
<td>Member of Public</td>
<td>Battle for Earth is on</td>
<td>Debate in general</td>
<td>Preservation of the earth &amp; environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/06/10</td>
<td>SundayTribune: 25</td>
<td>9 paragraphs 67 lines</td>
<td>ESSOP MOHAMMED</td>
<td>KZNSFF Coordinator</td>
<td>Don’t cast that line at the fishermen</td>
<td>John Everitt 06/06</td>
<td>Response to John Everitt. False Accusations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/06/10</td>
<td>The Mercury: 11</td>
<td>7 paragraphs 53 lines</td>
<td>T. MARKANDA N</td>
<td>Member of Public</td>
<td>Anglers victimised, but beware of fishy tales</td>
<td>Desmond d’Sa 04/06</td>
<td>Claims to represent the full truth = both sides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>Paragraphs</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/06/10</td>
<td><em>The Mercury</em></td>
<td>13 paragraphs 76 lines</td>
<td>JOHN EVERITT Surfer</td>
<td>Casting aspersions in pier fishing stand</td>
<td>Response to Essop Mohammed, accuses Essop of misrepresentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06</td>
<td><em>The Mercury</em></td>
<td>8 paragraphs 52 lines</td>
<td>JOHN OTTO Competitive angler</td>
<td>Not Only Anglers Litter, Beachgoers Do Too</td>
<td>Response to Markandan 15/06 Fishermen litter, but not only fishermen should be blamed, other groups too. Also, exclusion is not the solution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/07/10</td>
<td><em>Sunday Tribune</em></td>
<td>7 paragraphs 53 lines</td>
<td>T. MARKANDAN Member of Public</td>
<td>Anglers victimised, but beware of fishy tales</td>
<td>Desmond d’Sa 04/06 Claims to represent the full truth = both sides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/08/10</td>
<td><em>Sunday Tribune</em></td>
<td>10 paragraphs 58 lines</td>
<td>JOHN EVERITT Surfer</td>
<td>Night fishing is wrecking new pier</td>
<td>N/A Rubbish left after illegal fishing on piers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/08/10</td>
<td><em>Sunday Tribune</em></td>
<td>15 paragraphs 100 lines</td>
<td>KELVYN DAVIDSON Surfer</td>
<td>Well done, Durban, for ban on fishing from beachfront piers</td>
<td>N/A Praises the closing of piers for fishermen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/08/10</td>
<td><em>Daily News</em></td>
<td>5 paragraphs 26 lines</td>
<td>P. Pillay (MP @ Minority Front Local Politician</td>
<td>Pier fishing ban is inhuman</td>
<td>N/A Fishing ban is inhumane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/08/10</td>
<td><em>Daily News</em></td>
<td>8 paragraphs 48 lines</td>
<td>UNKNOWN Member of Public</td>
<td>Punishment fits the crime</td>
<td>N/A Fishermen caused their own exclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/08/10</td>
<td><em>Daily News</em></td>
<td>5 paragraphs 28 lines</td>
<td>GEOFF TAYLOR Member of Public</td>
<td>Fishing on the piers is bad for city tourism</td>
<td>Patrick Pillay 13/08 Fishing is bad for tourism. Response to MP Patrick Pillay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/08/10</td>
<td><em>Daily News</em></td>
<td>7 paragraphs 40 lines</td>
<td>E. MOODLEY Member of Public</td>
<td>Piers are not sacred, keep entire city clean</td>
<td>N/A Not just the piers, but the whole city must be kept clean.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The letters to the editor sections in the press have been recognised as an important discursive arena (Snow, 2005). It is here where publics come together, and produce and circulate discourses to engage in discussion, which ultimately contest, negotiate, and (re)produce (dominant frames of) meaning (Dahlberg, 2007; Fraser, 1997). In the space offered by the letters’ sections, members of different publics have the opportunity to participate in “the politics of signification” (Hall, 1982) by addressing and seeking to define issues. In effect, the authors of the letters argue a particular approach or perspective to the issue at stake and so are seeking to establish what should count as “truth”, thereby persuading members of the public (Hall, 1992; Richardson, 2007). Similarly, Snow (2005: 402) argues that such discursive spaces of contestation:

… emerge or evolve in the course of discussion of and debate about contested issues and events, and encompass not only cultural materials (..) but also various sets of actors whose interests are aligned, albeit differentially, with the contested issues if events, and who thus have a stake in what is done or not done about those issues and events.

Here, I attend to the debates that took place in the letters to the editor section in local newspapers in Durban in relation to the contested issues of the fishermen using the beachfront piers. I understand the letters’ section as a discursive field in which mediated debates take place. The role of the editor is significant as s/he functions in the role of gatekeeper and contributes to the construction of meaning through the positioning, titling, and presentation of the letters.

I first consider an overview of the sample in letters to the editor in the period of my research and then analyse several letters in particular. When analysing each of these letters, I present a general outline of the argument made in the letter. I then conduct a close reading of the arguments made. To establish the focus of debate and counter-debate in this public arena, I focus on two sequences of letters.

Drawing from the “rhetorical triangle” as set out in chapter four, it is my aim to identify the “arguer” as well as the “argument”, and elaborate on how the arguer tries to persuade an “audience” (Richardson, 2007). Particular attention is paid to strategies of “expurgating the
other” by means of “stereotypes” (Thompson, 1990; Pickering, 2001; Hall, 1992) by looking at the kinds of argument or rhetoric used, whether forensic, epideictic and deliberative (2007: 157-8), and the three modes of persuasion, namely ethotic, pathetic and logitic argumentation (see chapter three).

A Mediated Debate

Letters to editor are published within a particular context. Through letters to the editor, newspapers are able to facilitate running debates, similar perhaps to a ‘running story’ without having to report on it. Crucially, the editors of the letters’ sections are agents in representing issues, as they choose which letters and authors get published (Richardson, 2007). So it has also been argued that radical positions, those outside hegemonic discourse, are rarely successful in getting published in the letters’ section (Richardson, 2007).

The letters to editor, then, are not representative of public opinion, but reflect the framing of issues by an articulate minority (Richardson, 2007: 152; Gallup, 1958). Hence, we must take into account that access to the letters to editor section is not only related to availability of material or social-organisational resources (Edwards et al., 2005). Access to this discursive arena also involves availability of human and cultural resources (Edwards et al., 2005) enabling a writer to attend to particular discursive boundaries and rules that are in place in the letters’ section.

In order to be considered legitimate deliberators, subjects must come to internalize (sic) the rules of the particular form of communication deemed democratically valid or be excluded from the public sphere. Moreover, some participants are advantaged over others, as some participants’ naturalized (sic) modes of communication (often Western masculine modes) are closer to the legitimate normative mode than others (Dahlberg, 2007: 53).

The sample of eighteen letters is recorded in figure 7 (see above). It presents the names of the letter writer, how they identify themselves, the newspaper in which the letter was published, the length of the letter, its title, it relation to the other letters (if there is one) and the basic focus of the letter. All letters in the sample of eighteen address the issue of (the denial of) access to fishermen onto the beachfront piers. It is a two-sided contestation: some oppose the ban, while others defend it. In this sample the KZNSFF leadership in the persons of Essop
and Desmond argue in favour of access to the beachfront piers for the fishermen. However, there is also a group of writers, some of whom identify as surfers, who categorically argue against the presence of fishermen in the public space offered by the beachfront piers. Eight writers do not explicitly identify themselves, and are counted as “members of the public”. Other than the letters by surfers, and (the representatives of) the fishermen, their views on whether the fishermen should have access to the beachfront piers are mixed and consider both sides. In addition to these three groups, a local politician participates in the debate and in his letter argues the ban of fishermen to be “inhumane”.

It is notable that the total of eighteen letters are not written by eighteen, but by thirteen people, as some letter writers used the letters’ section more than once. Of the thirteen writers, John Everitt is one who identifies himself as a surfer and writer of three of the letters. Following the research period Everitt vigorously continued writing letters, contesting the fishermen’s presence on the beachfront. KZNSFF coordinator Desmond too frequently writes to the letters to editor sections of local newspapers. Here, two of his letters are included. Although there is only one letter from him in this sample, Essop, the chairman of the KZNSFF, is also a regular letter writer. Geoff Taylor, a member of the public, featured with two letters. One of Graeme Bird’s letters was published during the window of my research. Also a frequent writer, he identifies as a surfer and on several occasion in early and late 2010 argued against allowing access for fishermen onto the beachfront piers.

It is also noteworthy that the letters seem to ‘talk to each other’, that is, the authors of the letters frequently respond to previous letters in order to contest its framing, ultimately seeking to rebuff the argument made and so replace it with a different account of reality. In analysing these letters I seek to establish the core argument and what the writer constitutes as “truth” (Hall, 1997). The writer frequently seeks to render the other position as not “truth”, or to constitute the other letter writer as illegitimate on some grounds.

It can be argued that access to the letters’ sections in mainstream media is more easily acquired by members of the middle class than those of the working class as the modes of communication that are hegemonic in mainstream press can be assumed to be generally shared amongst middle class writers. Hence, competence in the context of the letters’ section
is to be understood as “a culturally specific concept, … closely related to social and economic privilege” (Richardson, 2007: 153). The letters’ section might be a particular difficult space for the fishermen to engage in the negotiation of their categorical exclusion, as they largely constitute working class people (Branch et al., 2002). It might explain why Mohammed and John Otto are one of the few fishermen who contribute to these public processes of meaning construction in the arena provided by the letters section.

First sequence of letters

The first series of three letters is written by John Everitt and Essop Mohammed. On 6 June 2010 the Sunday Tribune published a letter by Everitt that criticised the fishermen and urged local government to retain the ban. On 13 June 2010 the Sunday Tribune published a response by Mohammed to the allegations made by Evitt. Two days later, on 15 June 2010 Everitt responded to Mohammed in The Mercury. I analyse these three letters in chronological order.

Article: “Fishing from piers fouls beaches” (06/06/2010, Sunday Tribune: 25)

John Everitt’s letter entitled “Fishing from piers fouls beaches” is a lengthy missive of twenty paragraphs and 119 lines and makes for the longest letter of the sample. It is accompanied by a stock photograph of the Dairy Beach pier, which was also used with previous articles (Tribune Herald, 03/05/2010: 3; Daily News, 30/08/2010: 8). It can be argued that giving this much space to the letter (which could have been edited down had the editor chosen to do so), an illustration and the large font used for the title signal the topic as important in the editor’s estimation and possibly legitimates the arguments made in the letter.

His letter, as is the case with letters to the editor, presents an argument in the attempt to persuade the reader of his position. The argument is structured as follows. In paragraph one,

---

60 It should perhaps be interesting in further research, to look at similar processes of negotiation in other public arenas such as the Daily News’ Backchat. As the form of communication in Backchat happens in short sms texts, it might actually be easier for more fishermen to acquire access to this particular arena, when compared to the more substantial letters in the editor section. Regardless, even the Backchat section does not constitute an open and fully democratic discursive space, as here too, access relies on the availability of material (texts cost R1) and cultural resources that enable valid and legitimate communication.
Everitt establishes that he has surfed in Durban for 50 years. The next four paragraphs recount unacceptable behaviour by fishermen. In the next six paragraphs, Everitt addresses the by-laws that forbid fishing on the piers calling on the authorities to enforce them. Paragraph twelve to sixteen dismiss the argument made in a previous letter by Chetty (17/05/2010) arguing instead that members of the public dislike the presence of fishermen on the piers, that the fishermen have no regard for marine life and he dismisses Chetty’s proposal to establish a “pay pier”. In closing he argues that the newly upgraded piers should disallow fishermen and that the municipality should keep enforcing the ban.

In the first paragraph of his letter, Everitt identifies himself as a surfer. With an ethotic argument Everitt establishes himself as a reliable source as he has a long history of surfing, and therefore first-hand experience, in the Durban area. The next four paragraphs present a forensic argument that looks to the past to accuse the fishermen of irresponsible and unacceptable behaviour over the years: he has been “fly-hooked with a sinker”, has seen “fishermen urinate and fornicate” on the piers, has witnessed “the killing of a seal” by fishermen, and was threatened at gun- and knife-point by a “drunk” and “spaced-out fisherman”. He further states here that fishermen have threatened “members of beach/fishing authorities”. Everitt thus censures the fishermen as a threat to public safety in the present, and as irresponsible people. This presents the reader with a pathetic argument intended to instil fear. He effectively “others” the fishermen by stereotyping them as aggressive and without regard for other members of the public that wish to use the beachfront facilities.

This justifies Everitt’s call in paragraphs six to eleven for local government control of the by-laws that ban fishing on the piers. If the “authorities” have “let the situation continue” by not enforcing the by-laws (another forensic move), he recognises that the authorities are now “addressing the problem” and so he deliberatively urges them to “continue” with the enforcement. This argument discursively positions him as law abiding and ‘civic-minded’. He implicitly unifies his likeminded readers (Thompson, 1990: 64-65) in contrast to the fishermen he has ‘othered’ above. Moreover, he represents the implementation and enforcement of the by-laws as in the interest for all as he legitimates (through his rationalising) the by-laws as a product of the system of democratic law (Thompson, 1990: 61).
The othering continues in paragraph twelve, when Everitt refers to a previous letter by Eric Chetty (17/05/2010, *The Mercury*; 7) and dismisses his statement that the public likes to watch the fishermen as “devoid of truth”. He argues that members of the public have always disliked the presence of fishermen on the piers, and so seeks to construct his alternative account of reality as “truth” (Hall, 1997).

Paragraph fifteen develops his argument about the fishermen as ‘uncivic-minded’ and irresponsible. He assumes they have no rights to the piers as he says they “forced themselves on”. He identifies them as vandals: “all the available public wooden and stainless steel benches disappeared in the first week”. The author here not only forensically argues that the fishermen have vandalised the piers in the past, he also illustrates how the presence of the fishermen is against the interests of the broader public, who might want to visit the piers and use a bench. The author again “others”, and effectively attempts to “expurgate” the fishermen (Thompson, 1990: 65).

The argument that they are an undesirable feature on the beachfront is extended in paragraph sixteen and seventeen in terms of environmental concerns. Everitt argues that the fishermen have no regard for marine life. He associates the fishermen with “filth” and argues that the piers are left in a mess after fishermen’s visits. He further argues that after the municipality cleans the piers, the filth is to be disposed in the ocean. Hence, he thus poses an epideictic argument (Richardson, 2007) that describes the fishermen in the present as irresponsible and destructive to marine life.

In paragraph eighteen Everitt returns to Chetty and concludes that the irresponsible, vandalising and environmentally destructive behaviour should argue against Chetty’s proposal to establish a “pay pier”. In paragraph nineteen he argues that the “massive, long overdue, costly upgrade (..) will benefit the public and ratepayers of Durban for years to come”. The author argues that the fishermen should be excluded from the newly upgraded piers, as they are meant to benefit the public and ratepayers of Durban. The beachfront is an important space for all – except the fishermen it seems. Here, he is addressing his middle class reader. Hence, his deliberative argument (Richardson 2007: 157-8) for the future
proposes that the municipality should keep enforcing the ban and he differentiates between the publics that should benefit from the upgraded beachfront.

In summary, this argument presents a discourse of civic-mindedness and rational behaviour (with which the reader is invited to identify with) while stereotyping the fishermen as irresponsible, environmentally unaware, destructive and aggressive.

Don’t cast that line at the fishermen (13/06/2010, Sunday Tribune: 25)

Essop Mohammed responded to the arguments made by Everitt in his capacity as chairperson of the KZNSFF. Mohammed’s response of 9 paragraphs and 67 lines is much shorter than Everitt’s letter and the editors do not use a photo to illustrate it on this occasion. In summary, the counter argument responds largely as a defence against Everitt’s account. He constructs Everitt as deluded in paragraph one, and argues that the city belongs to all citizens in paragraph two. He discusses the bylaws in paragraph three and four and denies that fishermen have engaged in acts of vandalism, instead laying the blame for damage on other groups. Arguing that the fishermen’s presence forms a tourist attraction, he foregrounds the right of access to the piers.

In more detail then, Mohammed opens his letter trying to de-legitimate the position of Everitt by stating that “Mr. Everitt” lives in a fantasy world (an ethotic argument) and therefore implies he is not rational (Thompson, 1990: 61). Mohammed delegitimizes the position of Everitt and presents an alternative “truth” (Hall, 1997).

In paragraph two Mohammed effectively tries to counter Everitt’s attempt to “other” the fishermen when he states: “[s]adly for you, this city belongs to all of us, including our beloved fishermen”, an argument for the rights of all, not a few. In that same paragraph he again attempts to delegitimise the position of Everitt by claiming that his representation of reality is not rational but “sensationalised and fabricated” (Thompson, 1990: 61).

In paragraph three he argues that the referred-to bylaws are non-existent as the city manager had not been able to produce them upon request. Mohammed claims that the bylaws were
conjured up to frighten the fishermen and keep them off the piers during the World Cup. He thereby counters Everitt’s assumption that the system of law, and these by-laws in particular, per definition serve a universal interest (Thompson, 1990: 61). Mohammed also seeks to establish the local government as an agent of exclusion and to de-legitimise the work of the state (Thompson, 1990: 61).

In paragraph five he responds to Everitt’s statements about fornication on the piers as “false”, as they “leave their wives at home”. Moreover, Mohammed differentiates (Thompson, 1990: 65) between the fishermen and vagrants who “engage in this behaviour”. In effect, he attempts to unify the fishermen with the broader public, by excluding another entity as “evil, harmful or threatening” (Thompson, 1990: 65).

In paragraph seven, Mohammed counters another point made by Everitt. He claims that tourists have confirmed that they find fishermen “clean and enjoy watching the fishermen” and that the fishermen are not to blame for stealing benches off the piers, but rather those who sell scrap should be blamed. In addition to the state as an agent of exclusion and the vagrants, he then also others the scavengers who scrap metal for economic benefit.

In closing, Mohammed pathetically seeks to evoke sympathy for the fishermen, as they generally are “poor” and need access to the piers as they enable the fishermen to access deeper waters. He thereby seeks to persuade the audience by emotionally preparing them to take his account of fishermen as “reasonable people” as “truth”. Furthermore, he epideictically argues argument that fishermen are “reasonable people” who “have learnt the value of sharing”.

In summary, Mohammed argues about rights and justice: the fishermen have a right to access to the beachfront piers and have been done an injustice by the local government that excludes the fishermen from the beachfront piers.
Two days later, Everitt responded to Mohammed. His letter is thirteen paragraphs and sixty-seven lines long, and again accompanied by a photo of the Durban beachfront. The photo is captioned as follows: “A war of words is raging between anglers and other beachgoers over the use of piers on Durban’s renovated beachfront”. Everitt’s letter is yet again accompanied by a photo, while Mohammed’s letter was not, could be indicative of a favoured stance by the newspaper. The caption differentiates between the fishermen and “other beachgoers”, thereby reinforcing the position (Everitt’s) that the fishermen and all members of the public are opposed. Additionally, the caption notes that the beachfront was renovated, a point that Everitt introduced in his argument about access. Arguably, the photo and its caption are indicative of how the letters to editor sections are indeed partial and subjective, and often aligned with the interests of the middle class (Richardson, 2007).

The structure of Everitt’s argument is fairly simple. In the first three paragraphs the author denounces Mohammed’s statements. In the next six paragraphs the author argues the fishermen to be irresponsible and careless. He closes by arguing that the ban should remain enforced in the future.

I consider this, once again, in greater detail. Everitt opens his letter, by “respectfully” cautioning Mohammed “not to resort to whimsical fairy-tale, tit-for-tat storytelling”. He seeks to establish the legitimacy of his own position (by stressing that he is “respectful”), while disregarding the position and account of Mohammed (who resorts to “whimsical storytelling”). He sums up Mohammed’s letter and notes that Mohammed acknowledged the events he described to have taken place, but that he blames it on the vagrants. Then, in paragraph four he again resorts to an ethotic argument that presents him as a reliable source. He suggests Mohammed and the reader “trust” him, as he at his “age”, and with “decades of surfing Durban’s beaches” is capable of distinguishing between the vagrants and fishermen.

Thereafter, the author again describes the fishermen as irresponsible and stresses the “inherent danger of fishing within the confines of a public bathing area”. This argument refers to past actions - thus first-hand encounters that relate to drug and alcohol (ab)use, the
fishermen’s lack of regard for marine life and the environment as they litter and catch undersized fish. He again others the fishermen when he represents them as dirty and dangerous and argues that their interests do not coincide with those of other beachgoers.

By pointing out to “Mohammed” (as if it were his first name, while Mohammed referred to him as Mr. Everitt) that “there are no deep sea fish here”, he further attempts to de-legitimise the position of chairperson of the KZNSFF, by presenting himself as more knowledgeable than Mohammed on marine life in Durban. He counters Mohammed’s argument that the fishermen are “reasonable” by arguing that the piers needed “expensive, high-pressure fresh-water cleaning”. This leads him to claim that the fishermen are not reasonable, as they did not “leave the piers in an acceptable state for daytime enjoyment”. He discusses a “recent allegation by the fishing fraternity that surfing is for rich people alone” as irrelevant. Hence, he positions himself as rational, as he ‘knows’ what statements are worthy of response and which one are not (Thomson, 1990: 61).

The author concludes with deliberative argumentation that states that the “magnificent upgrade of the beachfront must not be compromised by going back to the old days of free-for-all supposed entitlement”. He tries to persuade local government to keep enforcing the ban, and the audience to consent to the current situation in which fishermen are not allowed to access the main beachfront piers.

Again, in this letter Everitt positions himself as rational and articulates a discourse that frames the fishermen as a threat to the environment, to marine life, to public property and to public safety. He expurgates the fishermen calling for continued enforcement of the by-laws by the municipality.

From the analysis of these three letters it becomes clear that both authors take opposite sides in the debate. John Everitt tries to persuade the reader of the importance of the ban of fishermen on the beachfront piers, and effectively seeks to invite truthful, civic minded and environmentally conscious people to accept his account of reality by arguing that the fishermen are irresponsible people and need to be expurgated to protect a public space. Many of Essop Mohammed’s arguments are defensive and respond to accusations made by
Everitt. Mohammed tries to establish alliances with readers who understand fishing to be a contribution to social-economic and cultural life in Durban. Mohammed argues that other groups should be blamed for the acts that the fishermen are accused of and thus argued that fishermen are unlawfully banned from the piers. He frames his argument in inclusive terms of social justice and argues that the fishermen constitute a vulnerable group that need protection from the state.

Second Sequence of letters
The second series of contesting letters that I analyse consists of five letters that appeared in the Sunday Tribune and The Mercury over the period of June and (early) July 2010. The first letter was written by Kerry Cullinan and appeared in The Mercury on 2 June 2010. The author argues in favour of the ban as she claims the fishermen have been irresponsible, abusive and dirty in the past. Desmond d’Sa responds to Cullinan in a letter that was published in The Mercury on 4 June 2010. D’Sa argues against the accusations made by Cullinan and presents an alternative account of the fishermen as responsible, working class people who are excluded in the benefit of other interests being served. It triggered a response by Geoff Taylor whose letter was published in The Mercury on 9 June 2010. He argues against a reference to apartheid made by d’Sa in his letter. Taylor argues that dirt is left behind on the piers, and explains the irresponsible behaviour of fishermen to be the main reasons for the ban. On 10 June 2010, a letter by Mark Crozier was published in The Mercury. He did not respond to any particular letter, but reflected more on the public debate between fishermen and other members of the public itself. Several weeks later, a letter by T. Markandan was published in the Sunday Tribune on 15 June 2010, which referred to d’Sa’s response to Cullinan’s letter. Markandan agreed up to a degree with d’Sa but stressed the importance of a balanced representation of the issue and continued arguing the irresponsible and dirty nature of fishermen. John Otto responded to Markandan and argued that not the fishermen litter the beachfront. Below I analyse these six letters in chronological order.

61 Markandan’s letter was again published in the Sunday Tribune on 4 July 2010. Markandan may have sent in his letter to the editors of both newspapers. What could also be the case is that the Sunday Tribune needed extra text to fill up an empty space. Regardless of the reason for this double publication, it adds to the argument that newspapers and their editors are agents in the construction of meaning in the letters to editor section.
except from the letter by Mark Crozier, which I leave for last as it refers to the debate itself, rather than to one letter in particular.

**Fishermen abused city’s piers (02/04/2010 The Mercury: 11)**

In “Fishermen abused city’s piers”, a letter that is eleven paragraphs and sixty-nine lines long, Kerry Cullinan expresses her support to the municipality for banning fishing from the beachfront piers and argues that tourism related services should be developed more on the beachfront.

In paragraph one, Cullinan describes the beachfront as “a wonderful public space that is used by a wide range of people for many different activities”, thereby effectively applying the strategy of universalisation and unification (Thompson, 1990: 61, 65) as she represents the beachfront as an unproblematic space to which everybody (who is reasonable) has equal access. This ignores the issues discussed in Chapter 2, as well as recently reported issues concerning access for street traders, and issues over land use.62

In the next seven paragraphs Cullinan juxtaposes that “wonderful” image with a forensic description of irresponsible and “intimidating” behaviour by fishermen. She refers to public drinking of alcohol and smoking of “dagga”, which resulted in “numerous drunken fights”. She argues that every morning the piers had to be cleaned (“for at least an hour per pier”) from broken bottles, litter and “fish guts from the sardine baits and undersized fish usually caught by the fishermen”. She contends that a number of fishermen urinated on surfers, while others deliberatively tried to hook them with their tackle while on the pier. She further claims that members of the public who complained about the littering, harassing and illegal catching of under-sized fish were “sworn at”, “harassed” and “intimidated”. She is “relieved” to find out about the ban after her surfer daughter was frequently “being hooked” and “harassed”. Hence, the author others the fishermen by stereotyping them as aggressive and irresponsible. She argues they form a threat to public property and safety and approves of by-laws that would exclude them. Moreover, she (forensically) argues that fishermen have no regard for marine life as they “usually” caught undersized fish.

---

62 See Appendix H:2a-b
Cullinan rejects the claims of fishermen that fishing is for their subsistence. In paragraph nine, Cullinan argues that subsistence fishing “is not a solution to poverty” and, if anything, is a threat to the “nutrient deficient waters”. Instead, the beachfront should be used in an alternative way to create jobs, namely by stimulating tourism initiatives. But, she concludes, “this cannot happen when the piers in the prime recreational areas are dirty and dangerous”. She thereby counters the social justice argument as provided in his letter by Essop Mohammed (analysed in the first sequence of letters above) and at the same time presents the fishermen as a threat to the natural environment as they form a destructive force to marine life. Hence, she offers an economic argument that the tourism industry should be developed in order to create jobs.

In summary, Cullinan’s central premise argues the continuation of the ban in favour of interests related to the protection of the environment and the positioning of Durban as an attractive tourist destination. By referring to several personal (forensic) encounters with fishermen she deduces that the fishermen at large are irresponsible, dirty and aggressive (an eoidetic argument). Assuming that Durban is trying to attract more tourists, and assuming that tourists do not want to be amongst irresponsible, dirty and aggressive people, she uses logitic reasoning (Richardson, 2007) to persuade the reader to agree with her that the municipality should continue to ban fishing on the beachfront piers. In her reasoning she defines the public interests in relation to increased tourism and argues that environmental sustainability and the presence of fishermen contradict each other.

*City must have other fish to fry. (04/06/2010, The Mercury: 11)*

On 4 June 2010 a letter written by Desmond d’Sa was published in *The Mercury*. It consists of 8 paragraphs and 58 lines. The structure of the argument is as follows. He represents the fishermen as responsible and hard-working, working-class people. He argues that the fishermen are victims of policies and macro-economic downfall and that fishermen’s only source of steady income and food is subsistence fishing. He juxtaposes the fishermen with middle and upper class white surfers and ski-boat fishermen, who do not have worries like
the subsistence fishermen have, and argues that fishermen are victimised due to their class position.

In the opening of the letter Desmond d’Sa argues that Kerry Cullinan’s account was not convincing as she did not acknowledge “the role of privilege”. Hence, he prepares the reader for an alternative account of the truth. He uses pathetic (Richardson, 2007) arguments to illustrate that the fishermen are a vulnerable group who are oppressed and marginalised.

In paragraph two, Desmond counters the accusation that fishermen were drinking more than they were fishing on the piers. He claims that the majority fish “as their primary source of income”, and this makes him “question whether ‘many fishermen did more drinking of alcohol and dagga smoking than serious fishing’”.

In paragraph three, he argues that fishermen are responsible and that those “few who violate laws and do not respect surfers should be singled out”. He effectively argues against previous attempts by members of the public to fragment the fishermen and other them from the broader public. He acknowledges the complaints by the other letter writers and suggests action against those particular individuals. Thereby he attempts a strategy of unification (Thompson, 1990: 64-65) with the broader public who share his concern with the violation of laws and recurring conflicts with surfers.

D’Sa continues in the next paragraph arguing against the “collective punishment” that the fishermen receive, and in a forensic move he refers back to apartheid in this context. He frames the issue in terms of social justice and attempts to establish a sense of unity with those members of the public that acknowledge the injustices of apartheid. In paragraph five, Desmond argues that fishermen are already victim to rising licensing fees and transport costs, while also being victim to the decline of employment in South Africa. Hence, he uses pathetic argumentation to evoke sympathy for the fishermen. He continues to focus on poor fishermen who rely on fishing to sustain their families, and argues against Cullinan’s views by stating that “[h]oping for tourist money to trickle down to ordinary poor people is a tired old suggestion”. D’Sa thereby recognises the middle class interests that the tourist industry will largely serves. He argues that the fishermen inhabit a social strata that is unlikely to
benefit from tourism. He further juxtaposes the fishermen with other stakeholder groups like the surfers and boat fishermen who are argued to be largely white and middle class. He identified the fishermen as victim to types of harassment particularly by the state. He closes off by arguing that the oppression of fishermen is similar to the racial oppression during apartheid, although is in this case based on class position. Thus the state is considered an agent of exclusion and oppression. D’Sa seeks to persuade the reader to sympathise with and support the attempts of fishermen to regain access to the beachfront piers.

In summary, d’Sa argues that fishermen are mostly working-class and less privileged than other stakeholder groups who use the beachfront and ocean for their pleasure. He uses a discourse of social justice and argues for equality of citizenship, regardless of class position.

*Bad fishing habits are no racial matter (09/06/2010, The Mercury: 15)*

On 9 June 2010 a short letter by Geoff Taylor was published in *The Mercury* that responded to d’Sa’s response. This letter is brief at 5 paragraphs and 27 lines. He argues against d’Sa’s assertion that fishermen are responsible. Taylor first argues against the fact that the ban is racially motivated and concludes that fishermen are irresponsible and he expresses his support for the decision of the municipality to enforce the ban.

In paragraph one, Taylor states that d’Sa’s letter “begs a response as he is playing the so often heard racist tune”. Hence, Taylor deems it necessary to counter d’Sa’s account with a ‘true’ representation of reality. In particular the reference to apartheid seems to bother the author here.

He rejects d’Sa’s statement that fishermen are responsible people using a forensic (Richardson, 2007) argument where he describes the fishermen as dirty – a conclusion based on first-hand experience. He visited the piers, which he found “extremely unpleasant with rotting bait, entrails, etc lying all over the surface”. He continues to ask why the fishermen, if in fact most of them are responsible like ‘d’Sa claims, do not correct each other in an effort to keep the pier clean. Rather, Taylor claims, the fishermen have assumed the municipal services will clean up after them. Had they been responsible, they would have cared enough
to keep the pier clean in the first place. He effectively once again others the fishermen by stereotyping them as dirty and irresponsible. He thereby tries to persuade the responsible and hygienic reader to accept his account of reality. Taylor thus concludes by complimenting the municipality for the fishermen “from certain places” as he further explains that the fishermen “have brought it on themselves”.

In summary, the reasoning of this argument is peculiar as Taylor seems to implicitly argue that only some fishermen are responsible for the mess left behind on the piers. However, he continues to argue that all fishermen are to blame as the minority is not corrected or sanctioned by the majority of fishermen. Taylor seeks to persuade the reader to approve the current situation in which the piers are closed to fishermen. He does so on the basis of forensic arguments (he found it unpleasant), and epideictic rhetoric (the fishermen in general are irresponsible people who leave the piers in a mess). The irresponsible nature of the fishermen renders them without access to the beachfront piers, so he argues.

*Anglers victimised, but beware of fishy tales (04/07/2010, Sunday Tribune: 25)*

On 15 June 2010, a letter by T. Markandan that consists of 7 paragraphs and 53 lines was published in the *The Mercury*. It attempts to present a balanced, and yet again alternative account of reality. The structure of the argument is as follows. First, Markandan notes previous correspondence on the topic and reasoned it necessary to participate in the debate to present a ‘true’ account of reality. While s/he allows that d’Sa presented a few worthy arguments, s/he attacks him for not representing the full truth an argues against the fishermen using the piers.

In paragraph one Markandan compliments d’Sa for his “compelling argument”. S/he thus legitimises d’Sa’s position but only partially. In paragraph two, s/he identifies the points to which s/he actually agrees such as the “fishermen (..) being victimised”; “the rich who own boats are not being hassled” and “fishing should not be banned from the pier in favour of

---

63 Markandan does not identify her sex. In the analysis I use s/he to indicate that here sex is unknown to the researcher.
surfing”. S/he thereby presents himself as rational (Thompson, 1990: 61), as s/he is capable of taking into account both sides of the debate.

In paragraph three, however, the author de-legitimises d’Sa when he states that “D’Sa is telling a fishy tale” and he thereby seeks to present an alternative account of “truth”. Markandan rejects the idea that all fishermen are economically dependent on fishing by providing a forensic argument (Richardson, 2007). S/he states: “for many it’s a hobby and, since many now own cars and bakkies, they take their own friends and families along with them and it’s not uncommon for them to leave the fishing or picnic spots littered with rubbish”. The author further differentiates amongst the fishermen and argues that they inhabit a variety of class positions. However, regardless of class position, the fishermen are categorically to be understood as irresponsible, the author argues, and even stereotypes those who associate with the fishermen as irresponsible and dirty (Pickering, 2001; Goffman, 1963; Elias et al., 1994).

In paragraph five Markandan asks:

> has he seen the thousands of bags of rubbish collected from the bay and the beaches on beach clean-up day? Or has he seen frenzied fishermen standing shoulder to shoulder, cursing and swearing, swinging their rods wildly when the shad are on the bite? I don’t know about him, but I wouldn’t dare go anywhere near them. If you confront them, they might use you as bait!

Markandan directs his questions to d’Sa to effectively de-legitimise his position as he only presented half the truth. Instead, the reader is persuaded to accept Markandan’s account as s/he is able to present the full truth by attending to both sides of the debate (Hall, 1997). What is interesting, though, is that it is implied that the fishermen are responsible for all of the rubbish that is produced (and collected) on the beachfront.

Markandan describes the fishermen as disregarding other members of the public who may wish to visit the piers. In effect, the author presents the fishermen as a threat to public safety - “they might use you as bait”. In the last paragraph of the letters, the author continues to de-legitimise d’Sa by arguing that he “should know better”. In effect, Markandan is here also
trying to differentiate between Desmond d’Sa and the constituency he represents. He argues that Desmond has a background and history of noteworthy activities in the protection of the environment. However, the author also argues that the fishermen are a major threat to the environment and therefore claims it to be peculiar for Desmond to represent and fight for the fishermen and their interests.

Like Everitt, Cullinan and Taylor the author argues that the fishermen are irresponsible and have no regard for litter they leave behind in public spaces. Moreover, s/he argues that fishermen are aggressive and potentially dangerous to the public at large. Ultimately, the author argues that “humans” should care more for the environment as we all depend on it for different purposes. S/he differentiates the fishermen from the broader public that might use the beachfront facilities, and expurgates the fishermen as a common enemy to the public.

*Not only Anglers Litter, Beachgoers Do Too*, (21/06/2010, *The Mercury: 13*)

John Otto responded to Markandan’s letter that was published on 15 June. Otto’s letter is 8 paragraphs and 52 lines long. The first four paragraphs are consistent with much of the critique on the fishermen and Otto repeats this in his own words. However, in the next 3 paragraphs he argues against the idea that only the fishermen are responsible for the litter that is left behind on the beachfront and beaches. He concludes by arguing that the solution is not to exclude the fishermen and ban fishing from the piers, but to enforce the law by controlling access and behaviour.

In closer details, Otto starts off by identifying himself as a competitive angler, which possibly indicates a class position. By identifying himself as such, he makes clear to the reader that he is not a subsistence fisherman who depends economically on his catch. Neither is he just a hobbyist, but can be assumed to be a member of a fishing club and to be participating in fishing competitions (for which financial investment in rods and reels are often necessary). In that same paragraph he sides with the critiquing letter writers by stating that he is “aware of the mess and disruption caused by the less well behaved anglers”. It is not clear whether he is aligned with the KZNSFF, but like some of the older fishermen that I discussed in chapter 5, he does at least in part blame fishermen for their own exclusion.
In the next two paragraphs he continues by stating that he agrees with the idea that the fishermen “often show little regard for the environment and leave litter lying around”. He also confirms that not all fishermen are subsistence fishermen, and thereby picks up on the attempt by Markandan to fragment the fishermen by emphasising internal differences based on class position. That Otto accepts this point might be understood in relation to the manifestation of his own class position. Otto universalises the legislative system as he argues that the law should be obeyed by everyone, including the subsistence fishermen.

From paragraph four, however, he argues that “in the interest of fairness and equity” other stakeholder groups that use the beachfront should also be held responsible for the mess and litter that is left behind after using it and he refers to Christmas and New Year to prove his point. Both holidays take place around the turn of the year, which is exactly half a year before, or after the publication of this letter. In December the beachfront is a particularly busy place as many families from greater Durban, KZN and the rest of South Africa visit Durban to, amongst other things, use its beaches. Whereas the beaches are relatively quiet throughout the year and mostly frequented by a largely mixed public, around this time of year it is especially the African public that visits the Durban and KZN beachfronts. It can get extremely busy, with thousands of visitors using the beaches. Although the letter writer is not explicit as such, his complaint in June about rubbish left behind in December constructs a relation between litter, and the largely African constituency that uses the beaches at this time of year.

Further, he continues by arguing that also street vendors and their customers also leave their mess on the beachfront. He does, however, not point to the fast food chains or coffee shops that sell snacks of all sorts, thus does not establish a logical link between commercial outlets and customers littering on the beach.

It can be argued that Otto seeks to persuade his middle class reader of the idea that fishermen are not the only ones who litter. Groups such as holiday visitors, or the street vendors litter as well, according to Otto.
In the next paragraph he explains that this rubbish is collected and amounts to “thousands of bags” and he argues that this is more than the “irresponsible anglers” could possibly produce. In paragraph seven he questions why the authorities do not clamp down on the leaving behind of rubbish, and he argues that the fishermen are only a minority that litter but is the only group that is punished through exclusion.

In the last paragraph, Otto implies that the “absence of enforcement” is the reason for the fishermen’s exclusion. He argues that “tax money” should be used to appoint staff who are to “control access and behaviour”. He concludes with the idea that an entrance fee could be charged so to cover the additional and accompanying costs.

In summary, Otto agrees with the idea that some fishermen are irresponsible and form an undesirable entity on the beachfront mainly due to the leaving behind of litter. However, Otto directs attention to other groups, like the (African) holiday visitors in December and the street vendors and their customers, who also leave litter behind. He therefore argues that the fishermen should not be the only ones to blame. Their exclusion should be reversed and their conduct and access should be better controlled by specially appointed staff.

Battle for Earth is on (10/06/2010, The Mercury: 19)

On 10 June 2010 The Mercury published a letter by Mark Crozier that consists of six paragraphs and thirty-nine lines. Crozier reflects on the running debates in the letters to editor sections. He establishes that the sides taken by the fishermen and other publics are “like a microcosm of attitudes to the planet we live on”. His argument is basically that surfers are ecologically aware while fishermen engage in more selfish behaviour, without regard to the natural environment. He appeals to the reader to side with the surfers’ position.

In paragraph one Crozier recognises two sides that have taken up the public debate. He then positions himself as he argues that the surfers represent an “ecologically aware” stance as they are “passionate about preserving the environment”. He states:
they harness the Earth’s energy to enjoy their sport and want to keep the ocean and beaches where they spend so many happy hours pristine for future generations. Fishermen, on the other hand, also use the Earth’s resources, but many couldn’t care less about the future. All they want is to get food on the table today (10/06/2010, The Mercury: 15).

Crozier here stereotypes the fishermen as selfish, irresponsible and careless people by juxtaposing the fishermen with the surfers, who are represented as responsible and environmentally aware, as they spend “many happy hours” in the “pristine” ocean. Hence, while surfers are associated with “happy hours” and “pristine”, the fishermen are accused of treating “the ocean and beaches like a toilet”. His use of words such as “battle” and “supremacy” implies a conflict in which sides have to be chosen. Hence, he presents the fishermen as an “evil” that need not gain “supremacy” for otherwise, so he concludes in his next paragraph, the planet will turn into “a rubbish dump”. He thereby tries to persuade the environmentally aware reader to accept his account and sympathise with the surfers, rather than with the fishermen.

In summary, Crozier’s argument is that subsistence fishermen form a threat to ecological systems and the natural environment in general. Hence, he attempts to expurgate the fishermen by framing them as irresponsible, careless and destructive citizens. He argues that the outcome of this public conflict will ultimately determine the environmental state of the planet in future times, and so persuades the reader to beware of the possibly disastrous effects of sympathising with fishermen.

In this sequence of letters we see similar patterns of arguing and othering. The representative of the KZNSFF, Desmond d’Sa, defends the fishermen and uses a discourse that argues for social justice and equality. John Otto, a competitive angler, agrees with much of the critique on fishermen but argues that the fishermen should not be the only group that is attributed responsibility for the litter that is left behind on the beachfront. The other side of the debate in this particular sequence is characterised by discourses that other the fishermen as forming a threat to public safety and property and environmental conservation.
Conclusion

In this chapter I argued that the letters to editor section can be understood to be a discursive arena where members of the public engage in processes of meaning contestation. In this case study I particularly focused on letters that were published during the research period and considered the issue of access for fishermen to the central beachfront piers. The fishermen were represented by the KZNSFF in the persons of Essop Mohammed and Desmond d’Sa. The public of surfers was also represented, and several letters written by surfers have been discussed in detail above.

All letter writers are engaged in a project to define what should count as “truth” (Hall, 1997). As Foucault (1980) reminds us, some people have more power to establish what counts as “truth”, hence the availability of a variety of resources is pertinent in effective public sphere deliberation (Dahlberg, 2007; Edwards et al., 2005). Apart from Essop Mohammed, no other fishermen participated in the debate. It coincides with arguments by Gramsci (1971) and Spivak (1988) that consider the role of the leadership in articulating and negotiating the issues of the subaltern. Moreover, the above discussion illustrates the difficulty for groups like the fishermen in Durban, who are mostly working-class people, to access these public arenas and successfully and effectively participate in the “politics of signification” (Hall, 1982). To a degree, access depends on availability of cultural resources, such as knowledge of hegemonic conventions on how to write and structure a letter. Further, it requires a sense of the discursive boundaries that are maintained in the letters to editor section, as to transgress these boundaries would result in dismissal of the arguments made or refusal to publish the letter at all (Dahlberg, 2007). It should be noted here, then, that the fishermen were mostly written about, as others managed to access this particular arena and negotiate the fishermen’s exclusion.

The KZNSFF leadership applied a discourse that framed the issue in terms of social justice. They argued for increased equality of citizenship and claimed equal rights to access the public space of the beachfront piers. Many fishermen identified the state as the most important agent of exclusion, and reference was made to apartheid to argue the state-secured injustice that was inflicted upon the fishermen. The other side of the debate was articulated by writers who argued in favour of the ban. They generally represented the fishermen as
irresponsible, dirty and (potentially) dangerous, thereby othering the fishermen and opposing them to other publics that might use the beachfront facilities. The critique on the fishermen was informed by discourse that explained the benefits of the fishermen’s exclusion in terms of the environment, public safety, and/or economic benefit.

It is also be interesting to identify what arguments are not made. For example, the pro-fishermen writers do not argue a ban on surfing or swimming near the central beachfront. In fact, it is not even mentioned that the surfers, or anyone else for that matter, are not allowed to jump off the beachfront piers by law. The definition of the beachfront with regards to access for swimmers and surfers has arguably become dominant common sense over the last decades, while fishing related purposes are much more subject to contestation.

What is also noteworthy here is that the representatives of the fishermen consider their exclusion in terms of class and race struggle and refer to apartheid to argue their point. These arguments were commonly ignored by the other side of the debate or dismissed as irrelevant. However, in chapter five I have discussed that many of the fishermen understand their exclusion in terms of class and race positions. In the arena of the letters’ section it proved very difficult to persuade the opponents of these views. The representatives of the fishermen, often lacked the resources and authority to define what should count as truth in relation to the other debaters, who largely represented middle class interests in an arena controlled by an editor that can be argued to do the same.
CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSION

This study has set out to explore the ways in which the Durban beachfront fishermen understand the enclosure of the piers and negotiate their exclusion from this public space. Working within the constructionist paradigm, and following an ethnographic and textual approach, it attempts to understand and examine processes of meaning construction in relation to issues of in- and exclusion from public space. The “politics of signification”, hence, the relations of power in which the construction of meaning is to be understood received detailed attention when attending to inter-discursive contestation in the context of the KZNSFF meetings, public discursive negotiation during two public protests and in the letters to editor sections in local corporate press.

This study is contextualised by a historical frame of exclusion. I have presented a history of fishing in Durban and illustrated how the outbreak of the plague, increasing industrialisation and apartheid legislature, most notably the Group Areas Act of 1950, caused what was once a tightly knit community centred around the act and trade of fishing, to disperse (Scott, 1994). In the 1980s and 1990s legislature was introduced that required fishermen to carry a license and Durban rod and line fishermen were increasingly excluded from important and historic fishing sites. The fishermen organised into the NRSAA, which won an important battle for access to two of the three central beachfront piers in the 1980s. In 2004, the KZNSFF was established in response to widespread concern amongst many fishermen with regards to the proposed rises in license fees and the enclosure of fishing sites in the Durban harbour (KZNSFF, 2010).

The World Cup provided a particular context to the events described here. Many fishermen understood the World Cup, and the (middle class) interests that were to be served during the event, as the main reason for their categorical exclusion from the beachfront. However, it was also reasoned by KZNSFF that the World Cup could provide them with opportunities to raise
their voice. I have indicated that neither the South African government, nor FIFA, had an interest in the dominant presence of a critical civil society. The nation was urged by its president to subdue possible critique on the state until after the tournament. Even so, KZNSFF decided to organise action during the football tournament and mobilised fishermen in the greater Durban area. The significant degree of heterogeneity amongst the fishermen is argued to have posed a challenge to the leadership in their quest to construct a collective action frame. Rather, a degree of coherency and a collective understanding of the issues amongst the fishermen at large was needed in order to effectively communicate a message. The responsibility to do so lay with the leadership who attempted to define their collective issues particularly during the KZNSFF meetings. The state was particularly identified as a determining agent of exclusion and the issues at large were framed in terms of social justice and equality of citizenship. This discourse was in part informed by the preparatory developments in the context of the Durban Social Forum, of which the KZNSFF was to become temporarily part.

The DSF was a collective of SMOs and NGOs that aimed to utilise the World Cup for public action. The organisation of a march, several days into the World Cup, was given careful attention and the (master)framing of the collective issues was meticulously strategised. Many partners in the DSF were extremely critical of FIFA and the role of the state in protecting their interests, but it was decided not to argue against the World Cup tournament itself. In the period leading up to the tournament the South African people received many messages that celebrated the upcoming event. Advertisers, broadcasters and government officials attempted to use the World Cup to construct a national South African identity and a sense of patriotism. For DSF to be critical of the World Cup, it was reasoned, would have resulted in their isolation and a general rejection of their message. Hence, in the context of major economic interests that were to be served, a particular discourse (regime of truth) was articulated by the advertising industry, which was reinforced by state implemented legislature. The FIFA World Cup, then, and I would argue, similar occasions like the Olympics are not to be understood as neutral events that are solely occupied with the exhibition of a sport event. The organising bodies such as FIFA, but perhaps also the International Olympic Committee (IOC), are indeed implicated in relations of power that enable them to determine the “sayable” and “thinkable” and “unsayable” and “unthinkable” (Foucault, 1980; Hall, 1997).
Regardless of calls by among others President Zuma to postpone any critique of the state until after the tournament, on 16 June 2010 the DSF marched through the city centre of Durban and presented a memorandum to mayor Logie Naidoo and advisor to the (provincial) premier Cyril Xaba. Thanks to a significant degree of access to resources among the SMOs and NGOs that constituted the DSF, several thousand participants joined the march, which received much attention in local, national and international press. Moreover, the framing of the DSF issues was coherent and consistent as it was carefully strategised and controlled by capable and experienced leadership.

It is argued that the workings of democracy can be located in such public action (Fraser, 1997). The DSF attempted to engage with political society and requested them to look into particular matters as were formulated in a memorandum of demand. The DSF may have been allowed to march on a match day, and the local government officials may have taken the time to come out and engage with civil society, but the manner in which particularly Xaba addressed the crowd in his ‘acknowledgement’ of the memorandum is indicative of the complexities of a working democracy. A democratic constitution and democratic institutions could not prevent Xaba from evading the statements made by the DSF, while attempting to mobilise the crowd into celebrating the World Cup instead. As mentioned before, no response to the memorandum has been received as yet, which adds to the argument that civil society in South Africa is often demobilised by political society (Heller, 2009).

Unlike the DSF, a more modest and spontaneous protest was organised on the Durban beachfront on 21 August 2010. Availability of and access to resources of various kinds, particularly human resources in the form of leadership, are crucial in effective SMO (Edwards et al., 2005). This protest was hardly coordinated and the presence of, and control by experienced leadership was lacking, which resulted in little interest by the public and press. Uncoordinated public action can result in a “nonevent” if it does not receive media attention (Gamson, 2005), and can even be damaging to the entire movement if it is not capable of communicating a degree of worthiness, unification, numerousness, and individual and collective commitment (Tilly, 2002). The protest resulted in an “orgy of participation and of talk” as effort did not appear to be directed towards the control of the collective action.
framing (Morris et al., 2005: 180). Had there been more availability of sophisticated human resources, the leadership might have intervened by offering strategic frames and organisational tactics in order to more effectively communicate a coherent and consistent message (Gramsci, 1971; Spivak, 1988; Morris et al., 2005; Snow, 2005).

Democracy is not only practised on the streets and in (front of) City Hall but its workings can also be located in newspaper sections that are open to the public to express their views on matters of concern. The letters to editor section is understood here as a discursive field where meaning is contested and negotiated (Snow, 2005). Sections like the letters to editor, or backchat for that matter, are often presented as spaces in which the public is offered access to deliberative democratic processes. However, these media spaces should not be taken as equally accessible for all, thus offering a view of public opinion. Access to these arenas is controlled not only by the editor (who decides whether a letter is published or not) but also by the discursive boundaries that determine whether a particular writer or reasoning is legitimate or not (Dahlberg, 2007; Fraser, 1997). In negotiating the exclusion of fishermen from the beachfront piers, it was the KZNSFF leadership who established access into these arenas. Through their letters they debated with members of the public who attempted to persuade particularly civic-minded members of the middle class to favour the fishermen’s ban to the beachfront piers. The letters to editor sections are used by a literate section of the population. Hence, members of the middle class are equipped to unevenly leverage the space in these public arenas. It adds to the argument that rather than serving a democratic purpose, the letters to editor in corporate press particularly serve the interests of the middle class and constitute ‘common sense’ in Gramscian terms (Richardson, 2007; Gramsci, 1971; Hall, 1997).

The power dynamics in the preparation and staging of public and political action by means of protest or writing letters to editor are illustrated here. The politics in the formation of a collective identity are also, be it more implicitly, touched upon. As is argued, some have more power than others to establish what should count as “truth” (Hall, 1997; Foucault, 1980), which has been discussed in detail in this explorative project dealing with a population engaged in the “politics of signification” (Hall, 1982). The fishermen and KZNSFF in particular were not only concerned with a struggle for access to public space. They were
engaged in a struggle for equality of citizenship, a struggle for race and class positions, and a struggle for a de-stigmatised collective identity. The positions that represent fishermen in relation to dirt and destruction are ultimately aimed at social fixation through the establishment of a common sense that categorically denies people the right to access a public space. It is arguably the subaltern, or the relatively marginalised parts of the population of a healthy and strong democracy that should deserve the assistance, the attention and protection of the state. Not only does the local government in Durban exclude the fishermen through by-laws from an important space with historical connotations, but also seems to refuse to recognise the fishermen and allow their interests to be represented in the political arena. Although South Africa may claim to have the most democratic constitution in the world, it must be stressed that access to civil and civic rights and the practise of citizenship are contested (Heller, 2009). It is therefore especially those who lack the means of power to represent themselves in public arenas who need the acknowledgement and protection of a state that claims to be working in favour and by virtue of democracy.

On 27 April 2011, almost a year after my retreat from the field, KZNSFF organised a defiance campaign and occupied the Bay of Plenty pier from early in the morning. When the police entered the pier to usher the fishermen out, they explained that their presence and actions were illegal under the South African law. Bob’s wife, Layla, raised her voice and loudly demanded an answer from the police officers when she asked: “Whose law? Whose law are you talking about?”. The officers did not answer the question, as perhaps they were not sure of the answer themselves. Layla had raised an important point, for the democratic state cannot uncritically be taken to exist and manifest itself in the equal benefit for all. Layla was not just fighting with police officers, then, or the city manager that allegedly ordered the closing of the piers to fishermen. She was fighting a historic bloc, which she, and many other fishermen had come to see as particularly in the benefit of the dominant classes that failed to attend to the needs and interests of the Layla, her family, and her many fellow fishermen. She refused to consent to the dominant order by de-legitimising the democratic law as only in the benefit of those already inhabiting positions of dominant power.
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CITY'S DECISION UPS TENSION

It's war as fishermen threaten to ignore ban

The Mercury 17/05/2010
Appendix A:2

Fishermen ready for court over piers ban

The Mercury 24/05/2010
Anglers set to defy ban on pier fishing

Campaign to challenge municipality planned

AARIF SAID

DURBAN Fishermen plan to defy eThekwini Municipality’s ban on angling from Beachcroft Pier and the Face of Plenty pier.

City manager Mike Stobbie has said fishers were the reason behind the council’s decision not to allow anglers to fish on the pier.

“The active fishing public does not constitute a majority of people using the upgraded promenade and beachfront. We decided that fishing would be allowed on the piers – Blouberg Pier, Battery Beach, Country Club and Blue Lagoon – given that it is difficult to manage conflict between beach users and fishermen if they are allowed to operate on all piers,” Stobbie said.

The remaining three piers will still be available for pedestrians. This is a fair arrangement,” he said.

But Eritsh Magumens, chairman of KZN Submerged Fishermen’s Forum, said there had been no consultation with the fishermen over the proposed ban and they would challenge the council’s decision.

He said some fishermen were concerned about this and the forum will hold a public meeting today at Stellenbosch Community Hall at 10am to discuss this issue.

Submerged suggests to the Herald that they have been unfairly treated and that it is a deep sea tragedy.

“The city closed the piers for removal and told us they would reopen to fishermen. They told us that if we have not fished since then and are assuming on my incorrectness,” said Aquila, who did not wish to give his name for the protection of his family.

“The city closed the piers for 13 years and having raised their subscriptions, how Aquila holds the city has done nothing to their behalf,” he said.

Heart-breaking

Stellenbosch Fisherman, Maxu Magumens, 57, and his last came to offer a month ago, “I used to fish for a living on the pier. I am not really aware of the council’s decision as I am not able to continue fishing there.”

“A week ago, I told the council that we would not be able to continue fishing there,” he said.

Asked why he believed the council had banned fishing at the pier, Mohmed said, “It is part of a wider strategy not to allow World Cup fans into the over-developed side of the pier. We are not there. It is not the right thing to do.”

Sunday Tribune 30/05/2010
Marchers protest against World Cup

KAMICILLA PILLAY

THE mood of uncertainty ran through the air in Durban yesterday, but for one large group there was little to worry about.

Amid cries of phoney economic growth, sanitised winemakers, fast-food chains, and a sea of business owners perceived the government's push only for the rich, civil rights organisations took to the streets protesting against poor service delivery and the World Cup.

Aliabhai Base Mthethwa, leader of the Social Forum and several other organisations gathered at the Union Buildings for the march which started at Durban City Hall yesterday.

"The whole nation has taken the government on the World Cup, we have constantly voiced our concerns," said Base. "We say that the foreigner's view of South Africa is not the truth about what's happening around the World Cup," he said.

Chairman of ACO's Durban and Free State Executive, Michael Mlambo said: "These people were tired of calling for the roses. We are marching against oppression."

**Fish**

"We let FIFA come here and they leave us the way they came, but they won't let us fly," he said, referring to a story that the FEDS was going to start a taxi service.

"Now they want to ruin the country with the World Cup." He ended the call. The people of South Africa have been let down.

"We can only say that we are angry, as the policeman, who said the mobilisation of the".

---

Daily News 17/06/2010
Solution to fishing row after football

AARIF SAIB

The longstanding battle between the City of Durban and local fishermen barred from fishing at Durban’s piers is expected to be resolved after the World Cup.

The municipality banned activities from fishing on Dory Beach, North Beach and Day of Plenty piers, which are open to pedestrians.

Fishing is allowed on four piers: Snake Park, Battery Beach, Canoe Bay and Blue Lagoon.

Protests on paddle ski boards were also stopped from operating around the pier for the duration of the World Cup and warned again about operating outside the marked area.

Chairman of the Durban Paddle Ski Club, Johnny Nassar, said: “There is no longer a protest. The piers are still closed. We have written several times to the municipal CEO. They have not responded. They do not want to meet us,” he said.

Mohammed says he does not understand the municipality’s logic.

Sunday Herald 04/07/2010
Muddy waters

With his line in the water (right), fisherman Collin Christoffel patiently waits for the big one at the Country Club pier. The pier suffers broken railings and kiddies bins and lighting. Above, the newly revamped pier enjoyed by surfers and pedestrians, while fishermen are cramped in the derelict Snake Park pier.

Anger over

City to step up policing, but fishermen say only tourists and surfers benefit from revamped piers, writes Aarif Saib

Sunday Tribune 01/08/2010
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City to step up policing, but fishermen say only tourists and surfers benefit from revamped piers, writes Aarif Saib

ANGLERS are flouting the ban on fishing from Burum beachfront’s upgraded piers and the mess they leave behind is hardening the attitude of council officials and the surfing community.

But anglers protest they are being punished for the misbehaviour of a few.

City manager Mike Scatallati accused fishermen of damaging the new piers and vowed to step up policing and prosecution of offenders.

“Fishermen have access to the beaches and to four of the piers. If you look at the damage already caused by some fishermen on the weekly upgraded piers you would realise that the city cannot simply allow a free for all. We are getting more visible policing on all piers. Action will be taken against anyone caught destroying the facilities,” said Scatallati.

Surfing activist John Isring, who was willing to consider a compromise that allowed fishermen to use the new piers at night, said because the anglers were fishing a mess of blood and fat on the piers and newly-installed lights had been damaged, at least supported a total ban on the anglers.

On a visit to the beachfront, it was evident that while surfers and tourists enjoy the revamped Dairy Beach, North Beach and Bay of Plenty piers, fishermen are unhappy they cannot use the former fishing spots and are breaking the ban at night.

Fishing is allowed on four piers at Snake Park, Buytenoor Beach, Country Club and Blue Lagoon.

The municipality justifies the ban by arguing it is difficult to manage conflict between beach users and fishermen if they are allowed to operate on all piers.

The fishermen, however, accused surfers of lobbying the city to remove the piers.

They said the newly revamped piers have security barriers nearby, adequate lighting and refuse bins.

But these facilities do not exist at Blue Lagoon, Buytenoor Beach and Snake Park piers, and at some piers the security barriers have broken off.

Picking off the rocks at the Blue Lagoon pier, recreational fishermen Anshal Maharaj complained over the lack of ramps at Dairy Beach.

“Finding and swimming is expensive. We don’t get much money’s worth. The poor suffer and fishermen are forced off the piers and into cramped spaces. Daily tourists and visiting surfers benefit,” he said.

When asked about the closure of the piers by fishermen, Chisum said only a few fishermen assisted it but “we will suffer the consequences.”

The Sunday Tribune received a number of fishermen drinking and smoking. When asked why Chisum said I am drunk, said a few fishermen assisted it but “we will suffer the consequences.”
Appendix A:6d

Blue Lagoon pier is the extension of the parking lot. Country Club is too short. Battery Beach pier is incomplete. Snake Park pier is an extended storm drain.

Redevelopment plans for the beachfront.

"The first phase of the redevelopment was up to the stadium. We are going through a process to upgrade the area from the stadium to Blue Lagoon providing better facilities. This will happen once the next few years, subject to the availability of funds so that all along they are to raise, lighting, etc. This programme has nothing to do with who fishermen fish," he said.

Justifying the future plan and eliminating the claim of racial bias, individuals said: "In terms of numbers there are very few fishermen compared with other users of the piers (surfers are also not allowed to jump from the piers). If one simply visited the piers you would see that claims of racial and income discrimination are present abroad."
Appendix A:7

Daily News 03/08/2010 (a photo of some active KZNSFF participants, amongst whom Aman, Lovie, Bob, Sewsunker and chairperson Essop)
Damage justifies pier fishing ban

Fishermen reject authorities’ allegations

NOMUNISO MBUYAZI

WHILE the city and fishermen continued to entangle themselves over the rights to fish on Durban’s piers, city authorities recently claimed that thousands of pounds of damage had been caused to the piers last week, which was enough for a ban.

Fishermen have, however, denied responsibility, saying they continue to fish from all beaches except.

The angler have also threatened to take legal action against city manager Michael Suttle, who yesterday announced that fishing from any pier was prohibited, unless it was specifically permitted by a permit issued.

Speaking at an evening meeting, Suttle said that for two days last week, the city did not enforce the prohibition at night, only to discover during the day that the piers had been left in an appalling condition.

Several damaged fences were also damaged, he said.

“Not only have we had to replace lights, the fencing costing around R5,000, but moreover, we have had to clean the area and get rid of the smoke and smell,” Suttle said.

However, Kwezi Mntuli, Durban KwaZulu-Natal, said the city’s actions against the fishermen’s right to fish were “unnecessary”, saying it would only reduce revenues coming from fishing at the piers.

He also denied claims that it was fishermen who were responsible for the damage to the piers.

“If the municipality continues to move their own law enforcement forces that we have no place but to fish at the piers. That will obviously not go down well with workers and businessmen. If fishermen want to make a living, we still have to survive it.”

Suttle said that in the future his management teams had decided that fishing would only be allowed at four piers, Smith’s Point, Battery Beach, which is now being enlarged, and the Umhlanga Club and the Umhlanga Point piers.

He said he was “very happy” at the arrangement, given that the active fishing public did not constitute a majority of the people using the recreation and bowling areas.

With the upgrade of the piers and bowling areas, my management teams and members feel that the people we serve have an improvement in the management and investment of the betting areas,” he said.

“Small parts of their plans involved around the question of how we manage the piers and whether we can still fish on them,” said Fisherman Enoo Mobhumel.

Daily News 11/08/2010

158
Call for report on pier fishing ban

ARUN THANAPATHY

The local government and local people have been lobbying for a ban on pier fishing for several years, and finally, their demands have been heard.

The ban on pier fishing is expected to reduce the pollution and improve the quality of the water. It will also help to protect the local ecosystems and marine life.

Earlier this year, the government had considered the issue of pier fishing but had decided against it due to the lack of scientific evidence to support the ban.

However, after receiving feedback from the public and environmental groups, the government has decided to ban pier fishing.

The ban will come into effect from September 1, 2010, and will remain in place for at least six months.

Daily News 02/08/2010
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Daily News 25/10/2010

Individual fishing rights not protected

Daily News Reporter

JOHANNESBURG: Fishermen believe that the government’s assurances that all fishing communities in the country are the same will affect their livelihoods when the draft policy for the small-scale fishing sector comes into effect. As a meeting at the University of Johannesburg on Friday, fishermen said there had been no enough communication with them, but only with commercial fishermen in the Western Cape.

The modest Living Oceans Act grants fishing rights to certain types of indigenous commercial, recreational and subsistence.

The draft policy for the small-scale fisheries sector by South Africa government that will not be changed to accommodate small-scale fishermen who do not fall under any of the commercially targeted categories of anglers.

While the fishermen were unknown for subsistence and small-scale fishermen a lack of communication between them and the government had led to questions on whether it would work for them.

KZN Subsistence Fishermen Portfolio Chairperson Eusebius Mohlaba said the government assured that methods of fishing were the same as the small-scale fisherman.

It is obvious in the draft the government has not taken an inclusive approach. They have taken all the research and interaction to the Western Cape and have failed to involve the other provinces.

It is obvious to us that the government has not taken an inclusive approach. They have taken all their research and interaction to the Western Cape and have failed to involve the other provinces.

We were different in KZN and the Eastern Cape. The telling was that the Western Cape fishermen will be out of the picture.

Concerning the coordinator for the KZN Subsistence Fishermen, Desmond Dla, speaks on behalf of the fishermen who are not happy with the new draft policy. He said that the draft policy was not fit for purpose and did not protect subsistence rights.

Once the minister has approved these community tools, the body would actually send its allowing to fish within the group.

The ministry would decide how many and what fish are allowed to catch.

Responding Dla, an executive of the KZN Fishermen, said the policy did not protect individuals’ rights and permits.

He was concerned that the minister would have the final say without the involvement of appeals being made and the fact that certain important information had been left out and left out of context.

“Certain fish are better to catch out of season, for example, just when caught in season are extremely poor. The fish during out of season. If we are restricted to catch them in certain season, we will run a low price.”
Frontpage of the Daily News covering the Rubicon speech by president P.W. Botha. On the bottom of the page (next page) is an article that reports about the fishermen defying the police on Bay of Plenty pier.
Police order off 200 groyne fishermen

Daily News Reporter

About 200 fishermen were ordered off the mouth of the groyne at Sotherby's by the USN A/V New York yesterday afternoon.

Mr. Max Magnoons, spokesperson for the anglers who regularly use the groynes, said the anglers were told to move off the groynes by four policemen at about 8:30 pm. They left the groynes they gathered at the entrance.

There was a police dog there nearly holding the men.

One of the policemen warned in 1991 that the first time someone caught the groynes, they would be removed.

"We think it is very unfair that we would have been treated like this," he said.

Fishing is banned from the groynes. This means the Anglers' Committee of the US National Federation recommended that the ban on fishing be kept.

Mr. Magnoons said he was shocked and disappointed with the decision.

"But we will be back there every night. They can't stop us now, we have been fighting for years."

Appendix B:2
Short article on the day after the Rubicon Speech by president P.W. Botha published in *The Natal Mercury*. 16/08/1985
Approaching the MLRA of 1998 the public was informed on the introduction of licensing in the *Daily News*, 16/11/1998.
Fishermen to defy Sutcliffe ban

“FISHERMAN bait up in defiance of Sutcliffe” refers.
Fisher folks have vowed to ignore the directive given by the eThekweni municipal manager to halt their fishing from the Durban piers which they have fished from all their lives. They will bait up their rods and continue to fish on all piers on the Durban beachfront.

After democracy local Durban fishermen have been denied access by Transnet, which is using apartheid legislation to deny fishermen their livelihoods. Most of the fisherfolk are third-generation subsistence fishermen who fish to food their families. This honest livelihood is being threatened.

This action by the eThekweni municipal manager to defy fisher folks their right comes on top of the determined attitude of the Marine and Coastal Management team of DEAT, now part of the Ministry of Agriculture, to increase the permit tariffs. Food and livelihood are a right and enshrined in the South African constitution but subsistence fisher folks of KZN find themselves in Limbo, while the rich fish all their expensive boats and yachts in Durban Harbour and the ocean without the fear of police harassment or arrest.

Andy Johnston, representing the artisanal fisherfolks in the Western Cape, states that there is no law that bars them from fishing on the beaches of either the Atlantic or Indian oceans. He further states they have won a case in the Equality Court that has resulted in interim relief granted to over 1 500 subsistence folks in the Cape Province.

The Durban beachfront is becoming a rich man’s playground and the poor man’s death ground.

DESMOND D’SA
SDCEA co-ordinator

Daily News 14/05/2010)
What about pay pier?

THE PUBLIC likes to watch the fishermen on Durban's piers, so why deprive these fishermen of their sport and also the public from viewing their activities?

As an alternative for the fishermen and the public, why don't we have a pay pier at a low cost with proper fishing facilities like bait tables, lights and taps using sea water to wash their hands and keep the place clean. At the same time the city will gain some income.

Currently fishermen pay a lot for their licences, but they do not have fishing zones on the beachfront.

Please help these fishermen and the public.

ERIC CHETTY
Pinetown

The Mercury 17/05/2010
Fishing ban of their own making

THE KZN Subsistence Fishermen’s Forum has threatened to “risk arrest and continue fishing from all piers” (The Mercury May 24).

The wanton disregard of city bylaws was probably the reason for fishing on piers being banned in the first place. Instead of complaining about the consequences of their members’ actions, the forum should focus on educating them about how to fish in a way that is not detrimental to the environment and non-fishermen in general.

GRAEME BIRD
Durban

*The Mercury 26/05/2010*
Fishermen abused city’s piers

THE DURBAN beachfront is a wonderful public space that is used by a wide range of people for many different activities.

Unfortunately, the fishermen who have been fishing off the piers at New Pier and the Bay of Plenty have failed to respect the other people who use these areas.

In fact, many fishermen did more drinking of alcohol and dagg smoking than serious fishing on these piers, and there were numerous drunken fights.

Every morning, municipal workers equipped with high-pressure hoses had to spend at least an hour per pier cleaning up broken bottles, litter and fish guts from the sardine bait and undersized fish usually caught by the fishermen.

A number of fishermen also made a sport out of urinating from the piers on to surfers paddling past.

Others get their entertainment from deliberately trying to hook surfers and paddlers.

Many members of the public have been sworn at and intimidated when asking the fishermen to refrain from littering, harassing non-fishermen and illegally catching undersized fish.

After years of watching my daughter being hooked and harassed by these fishermen and being threatened for trying to protect her, I am relieved that the Thembelihle municipality has decided to ban them at places where swimmers, surfers and paddlers use the sea in large numbers.

“Subsistence fishing” in KwaZulu-Natal’s under-stocked and rather nutrient deficient waters is not a solution to poverty.

Attracting more tourists to our revamped beachfront has much more potential to generate income and jobs for the people of this province.

But this cannot happen when the piers in the prime recreational areas are dirty and dangerous.

KERRY CULLINAN

Durban

The Mercury 02/06/2010
City must have other fish to fry

WHEN Kerry Cullinan, “Fishermen abused city’s piers” (The Mercury, June 1), complains of abusive behaviour, it would be more convincing if she acknowledged the role of privilege.

Since the majority who fish do so as their primary source of income, we must question whether “many fishermen did more drinking of alcohol and dagga smoking than serious fishing”.

Most fishermen are responsible. Those few who violate laws and don’t respect surfers should be singled out.

It was during apartheid that “collective punishment” was meted out, and city manager Michael Suttcliffe’s return to that strategy is revealing.

Working-class fishermen pay for licences, bait, fees and transport at a time when it is increasingly expensive and difficult, given the demise of the busses, to travel from townships, and when a million lost jobs in our country’s economy put added pressure on the informal sector.

Today’s oppression of fishermen — removing us from the harbour, the Point and now the piers — reeks of the same racial bias that saw hard-working people prevented from earning a living by fishing during apartheid. The difference is that the power to exclude is now based on money.

DESMOND D’SA
South Durban Community Environmental Alliance co-ordinator
Bad fishing habits are no racial matter

DESMOND D’Sa’s response to the letter from Kerry Cullinian (The Mercury, June 4) begs a response as he is playing the so often heard racist tune.

His comment that “most fishermen are responsible” is highly questionable as I have visited the piers on a few occasions and found them extremely unpleasant with rotting bait, entrails, etc lying all over the surface.

If most fishermen are responsible people, why don’t they ensure that those who fish with them on the piers do no abuse this environment?

Why worry if you know that and hose the piers down to get rid of all the muck left behind? Enough said. Good on you: the municipality for banning them from certain places, after all, they brought it on themselves.

GEOFF TAYLOR

The Mercury 09/06/2010

Battle for Earth is on

RECENT Mercury articles regarding the conflict on Durban’s beaches between the surfing and fishing factions is like a microcosm of attitudes towards the planet we live on.

Surfers tend to be ecologically aware, and most are quite passionate about preserving the environment.

They harness the Earth’s energy to enjoy their sport and want to keep the ocean and beaches where they spend so many happy hours pristine for future generations. Fishermen, on the other hand, also use the Earth’s resources, but many couldn’t care less about the future. All they want is to get food on the table today. So they catch juvenile fish, leave litter, nylon fishing line and hooks lying around, causing harm to both humans and animals. They treat the ocean and beaches like a toilet.

These are the two mind-sets that are now doing battle for supremacy around the world.

Who prevails in this battle will determine whether our children’s children will inherit a living planet or a stinking rubbish dump, fit only for rats, cockroaches and what’s left of the human race.

MARK CROZIER

Durban

The Mercury 10/06/2010
Don’t cast that line at the fishermen

IN RESPONSE to the letter titled “Fishing from piers fouls beaches” dated June 6, Mr Everitt, you are living in your own fantasy world where you seem to be mayor for a city that was made for you and your fellow surfers.

Sadly for you, this city belongs to all of us, including our beloved fishermen who are also ratepayers. Your letter is sensationalised and fabricated on all accounts. These bylaws you speak of are non-existent in the mind of fishermen.

A letter was sent to Mike Sutcliffe asking for information on these bylaws and to date he has not responded. One can only deduce from this that these bylaws, like the falsities in your letter, are imaginary.

These bylaws were made up to frighten the fishermen into becoming invisible by staying home during the World Cup so they wouldn’t taint the façade that the municipality is trying to portray for Durban.

Your claim of fishermen fornicating is false. These men leave their wives at home when they go fishing.

It is the vagrants that are homeless and engage in this behaviour and now you are blaming the fishermen.

Last weekend tourists were interviewed on the beachfront and we (the KZN subsistence fishermen’s forum) have iron record that the tourists welcomed the presence of the fishermen. They walk on the piers and find them clean and enjoy watching the fishermen.

Accusing fishermen of stealing beaches is ridiculous. The real thieves are those men that scavenge around for scrap to sell to scrappers.

The vital point that you (John Everitt) and the municipality fail to realise is that the pier is the only “boat” for the poor man to access the deep sea fish. Fishermen are reasonable people and are prepared to fish at the piers at night when the surfers are not allowed to surf. They have learnt the value of sharing a facility that belongs to all us.

ESSOP MOHAMED
KZN Subsistence Fisher Folks

Sunday Tribune 13/06/2010
Casting aspersions on pier fishing stand

15/06/2010

The Mercury

Appendix C:10
BEACHGOERS DO TOO

NOT ONLY ANGLERS LITTER.

As a competitor angler myself, I become hideous of it into a habit that I publish. The writer is correct in his statement that not all anglers are responsible. However, in the interest of fairness and equity, all beachgoers, not just anglers, are responsible for good behaviour. Littering on the beaches, especially at the Durban beaches, is unsightly and unhygienic. This is not the image of what we want to portray as a country.

Nothing is more embarrassing than a beach covered in litter. The beeches of False Bay, the Durban beaches, and others should be clean and well-maintained by all beachgoers. It is our responsibility to protect our beaches and ensure that they remain clean and inviting.

I encourage all beachgoers to take responsibility for their actions and ensure that they do not litter on the beaches. It is important to remember that the beaches are for everyone to enjoy and that we should all do our bit to keep them clean and safe for future generations.

JOHN OWEN

Appendix C:11

The Mercury 21/06/2010
Anglers victimised, but beware of fishy tales

*NHS letter: “City must have fish”*

designed for a compelling...it’s a shame...it can’t be revealed...the truth is...

The environment is no...and the destruction...in the water...are on the horizon...I don’t know anything about it...but I wouldn’t go anywhere near them...they might even use you as bait...If you don’t want to know better...but D’s should know better...

*Sunday Tribune* 04/07/2010

(also published in *The Mercury* on 15/06/2010)
Night fishing is wrecking new pier

I HAVE a sincere apology to make in respect of my previous correspondence.

It is but two weeks since the completion of the World Cup. To my trustful, law-abiding, responsible fishermen, I am now compelled to warn them of a potential danger: the new pier is wrecking new life.

Anyone who saw the new pier the other morning would have noticed the disgust and horror that new pier. The recently cleaned ocean was left to rot, with the stench.

In plain view were empty bags of fish, blood, lard, plastic bags, fishing line, a hook, rotten fish and bones and slime.

Not only were these items discarded on the pier deck, but the stanchions and railings were covered in blood and slime.

It is evident that the required daily high pressure (water) cleaning down has not been taking place and the build-up of fish and slime is overpowering.

With no cleaning taking place, in just two weeks we have gone straight back to the last few days’ experience in just days.

Having read the counter argument that fishermen are condoning, I now have an option but to withdraw my support for a monolith that is now a monument to the ruin of new pier.

The ban of no fishing at any time must be enforced.

Gentle should note that the last new pier fishing spot has been trashed and the stanchions has already been broken.

I suggest that according to the fishing community, we must start cleaning the Derrell and the stanchions, and the stanchions are now part of the new pier.

John Everitt
Durban North

The Mercury 01/08/2010
Well done, Durban, for ban on fishing from beachfront piers

AS A SURFER for 30 years, I write regarding the ban on fishing from Durban beachfront piers.

The city needs to be applauded for their hard-line stance on this issue.

These piers are for all local and international visitors to Durban and all residents. Their use should be as a viewing platform to enjoy the feeling of being in the ocean without getting wet.

The entire fishing contingent is to blame for the mess and the often violent confrontation between surfers and fishermen.

Day in and day out, fishermen dare and the greater population of piers users by littering, getting and stealing fish on the floor and railings of the piers. The public is not considered during these inconsiderate acts.

Fishermen band together when any member of the surfing community conducts one of theirs. If it were a single individual transgressing, then the majority of fishermen should keep their fellows in check and self-regulate.

The commonly castigated as selfish is an attempt to remain and injure. These fishermen quickly run once you inform them you are leaving the water to call the police.

I have personally been threatened and my son harassed (13 years old at the time) by these cowardly fishermen.

Fisherman Mark Chinu’s suggestion that “only tourists and white surfers benefit” from the ban “Anong over fishing ban”, Sunday Tribune, August 1 is a fabrication and stink of racism as much as his bald.

There are many non-white surfers and bathers in Durban.

Durban has 16 of kilometres of beaches to fish and only five piers are in the tourist hot spots: Umhlanga, New Pier, North, Bay and uShaka.

These piers earn the city millions of rand in revenue each year as they are an attraction.

Fishermen who float the law and fish at night and damage and litter the piers (let’s not forget, defective and unsafe) cost the city millions of rand in cleaning and policing— all the while putting tourists off the city by leaving the pier in a disgusting state.

I choose to not surf in the centre of Durban for many reasons, so I write this not so much as a surfer but as a Durbanite.

I don’t personally agree with much city manager Mike Suttle’s has to say, but Suttle’s remarks in the same Sunday Tribune article that “claims of race and income discrimination are patentely absurd”, are as true as it gets.

Well done, city of Durban, enforce the law. Instead of being a toothless dog, keep these inconsiderate fishermen far away from our clean, upgraded central beaches.

KELVYN DAVIDSON
Durban
Appendix C:15

Pier fishing ban is inhumane

THE Minority Front has called on the Executive Committee to provide answers on the banning of fishing on piers.

The banning of fishermen is a violation of their constitutional rights and an inhumane act against the poor who depend on fishing for survival.

The party is also calling for an investigation into the hefty fines imposed on fishermen and the confiscation of their rods and gear.

When people litter in Mitchells Park, officials do not ban people from entering the park. Fishing on the pier should not be banned because of the perception by officials that fishermen litter.

The livelihoods of subsistence fishermen must be protected and our city must demonstrate its principles of Ubuntu.

PATRICK PILLAY
Minority Front

Daily News 13/08/2010
Punishment fits the crime

DAILY NEWS

Punishment fits the crime

Byline

ATTACKS between surfers and anglers have been fought since the first piers were built in Durban, says the Daily News editorial in page 7 of the newspaper.

The most recent debate about the mess left on the piers by anglers has stirred up old arguments among them the allegation that some of the anglers are drug dealers. Some surfers deal drugs on the beachfront, but that is no reason to ban surfing. Such accusations must be removed from a debate about the use of piers.

But it is in the abuse of piers that the downfall of the anglers lies. Over the years there have been attempts by Durban to accommodate anglers, but no attempt by most fishermen on the piers to reciprocate.

Bad attitudes to other beach users cannot be the fault of all anglers nor intimidation or activities such as illegally selling bait and fish. But piles of plastic bait boxes, bins used to hide undersized fish rather than for rubbish, fish slime or blood encrusting on the concrete and rails, and the tangled abandoned lines are clear evidence of abuse. It is hard to ignore the insanity that is a Durban pier with anglers on it - respectable anglers already practise a self-imposed ban.

Poorer fishermen are under pressure with the closing of the harbour and North and South Breakwaters. Piers allow the anglers to get out into deeper water, which would otherwise require expensive tackle, athletic abilities and calm seas. Those who cannot afford boats or transport to other angling venues are being crowded out.

Foolishly they have not responded well to warnings over the years, ignoring simple solutions such as tickets, leasing instead of the structures, and taking their rubbish with them.

It is not up to the city to provide a place for anglers to create a mess and interfere with other beach users. It is up to those who wish to fish to show they are able to keep their end of the deal.

They have not done so and the ban from piers at the popular bathing beaches is justified.
Fishing on the piers is bad for city tourism

THE letter from Patrick Pillay of the Minority Front reads:

There is no "protection" of these fishermen leave the place untidy.

The fact is that they do and they seem to have absolutely no concern for the mess they leave behind.

"Oh, I am forgetting - it is their constitutional right to fish off the piers and leave all their muck behind for the municipality to clear."

Pillay also says that "fishing on the piers is a tourist attraction and we must show this experience to the world" which is a joke since it is more of a tourist deterrent than an attraction.

"Oh, I was forgetting that 2011 is a municipal election year and Police are seen to be seeking re-election and this is their prime motive. They are the Executive Committee - or am I also wrong in this view?"

GEOFF TAYLOR
Westville

Daily News 19/08/2010
Piers are not sacred, keep entire city clean

He piers are not sacred and the whole city must be kept clean.

Much has been written about the unhygienic behaviour of some of the fisher-folk by the piers. It is unfair to label anglers as bad because some use the facilities.

Those who complained about the condition of the piers must have landed there either by plane or boat because they golfed all the broken bottles and trash that is regularly strewn in the car parks and the area being used by fornicators and as an open air toilet by the revelers who openly flaunt the city’s by-laws in front of the police and the public conforms.

Now that fishermen have been banned, when can we expect the banning of the other law breakers?

Some of the surfers have also dumped off the piers and on the_handiavan to kick anglers off the piers.

The steadily and hourly_lurking of impaired police must be given a new mandate to unreservedly supply the city’s by-laws not only at the piers but throughout the beachfront and city.

Those who are prosecuted and found guilty must be given community service to clean up the city and beaches.

F. Moodley
Cato Manor

Daily News 30/08/2010
KEEP DURBAN AS A HOLIDAY DESTINATION OF CHOICE

With reference to the Durban Dialogue series, seeing our stadium finished has instilled a feeling of pride in our city for me. It is a masterpiece and the fact that you can see it from all corners of Durban makes it our ‘Mozambalin’. Living through the mess on our beaches has been intolerable as I have been able to encourage the finished product, and I believe that this is going to lift Durban to the holiday destination of choice, as it used to be.

I look forward to showing off our city to the overseas visitors but, more than that, I look forward to enjoying it when they have spent their time and gone home. To be able to take my kids down to the beachfront and have them riding their bikes and enjoy our Durban weather as a family is what excites me. To see the runners, roller-skaters and all sorts of people exercising and living a healthy outdoor lifestyle is what it is all about.

I can’t wait to see the negative words but I hope Durban as a city maintains the beachfront from two points of view:

First, there needs to be a permanent police presence and the laws of our country must be enforced. Secondly, Durban has been known for its cleanliness, and that is never more evident than seeing our beachfront covered in litter and broken glass at the weekends.

It has always amazed me that when the Tourism Board is in town, we are able to keep it clean. Durban has a lot to be proud of.

Durban

Glenn Nugent

Durban
FIFA’S IRON FIST DOESN’T EXTEND TO THE SEA

The Mercury, (10/06/2010)
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Beachfront is dirty and dangerous

ON SATURDAY we went for a beachfront walk, our usual route, from Suncoast to uShaka and back. It was a beautiful Durban afternoon.

Unfortunately the walk was not as beautiful. Our expensive, safe, wonderfully renovated beachfront has reverted to its former state.

Contrary to both our city manager and mayor’s assurances that it would remain as it was during the World Cup, well-policed, safe, clean, free of vagrants and the attendant petty crime and as a result Durban’s number one attraction, it has returned to what it was before: unsafe, dirty and not a pleasant place to walk.

We did not see one policeman/woman or beach official during the walk.

There was litter aplenty and men urinating openly as well as the usual naked semi-naked showering and many groups of loitering vagrants.

It is only a matter of time until unwary beachgoers and tourists once again become the victims of muggings and violent robbery.

Unless this is remedied now, people will stop flocking down to enjoy the beachfront and there will be nothing to attract the businesses it sorely needs and it will become a sad white elephant.

What a pity.

GWYNETH SMITH

Durban

The Mercury (01/08/2010)
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Beachfront trip
a pleasant outing

MY OWN experience of cycling on Durban’s beachfront differs greatly from the most recent negative reports.

I cycled from Suncoast to uShaka on a week day, stopping for rests at two piers and for a coffee on the prom...

Having read about the lack of police I decided to count them, but stopped counting after passing 25 officers.

I saw no vagrants, no filth or bad behaviour from anyone. It was a very pleasant experience and one I intend to repeat often.

WILLIAM RAGNALL
Waterfall

The Mercury 25/08/2010
IT APPEARS that many people are not proud of our new beachfront and are willing to destroy it.

On Sunday morning last week, areas north of the casino and all the way up to Blue Lagoon were no-go areas because of the broken glass littered everywhere, not to mention the stink of alcohol, urine and faeces.

By 9.30am, the municipal cleaners were not yet close to finishing their unenviable job and people were already arriving for a day on the beach. Even the new paved promenade near the stadium was broken glass.

Meanwhile, drunken hooligans were still being loaded into taxis under the apathetic eyes of metro police personnel.

What part of our heritage is it not so drunk in public, to hurt others everywhere, to make them anywhere? And why are the police unwilling to control the problem?

They managed very well during the World Cup: it is too late to arrive in time to maintain the order after the mayoría.

This will become an ongoing problem for many years. The last time I visited it was now everywhere many years ago.

Hooligans destroy beachfront

Richard Salmon
Durban

The Mercury 05/09/2010
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Daily News 20/09/2010

Something fishy about pier ban

I have read, with a sense of shock, the report that the Galle Face pier ban has been extended to the beachfront, and the proposal for a market is contemplated.

The pier is a haven for the less privileged who gather to enjoy the sea. Despite the ongoing construction, the area is not only used for recreational purposes but also for social gatherings.

The proposal for a market is a concern as it may lead to the displacement of people living in the area. The market will not only affect the locals but also the visitors who come to enjoy the beach.

Instead of promoting the local economy, the proposal seems to prioritize commercial interests over the needs of the community.

In conclusion, the pier ban extension raises concerns about the impact on the local community. It is crucial to consider the social and economic implications before making any decisions.
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Thanks for highlighting concerns of fishermen

IN REFERENCE to the letter “Something fishy about pian”, published on September 20.

I was deeply touched after hearing about the poor fishermen and their families going to bed hungry.

I am sure that Nelson Mandela has a great sense of humour and concern.

I am sure what he says is an eye opener or a wake up call to the authority concerned.

We have disabled and wheelchair-bound fishermen who fish off these piers, including the poor fishermen women and children who supplement their income to put food on the table.

These fishing folks don’t wait for handouts from the government and are not lazy; they earn a living.

Crime, hunger and poverty are here to stay while the rich and privileged enjoy themselves.

Mr. Manga you have said it all, thank you for highlighting our case. We sing the same song together – “an injury to one is an injury to all”.

Viva fishermen, viva...

K SEWSUNKER
KZN Subsistence Fishers Forum

Daily News 27/09/2010
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29/9/2010 DAILY NEWS

Thanks for highlighting concerns of fishermen

IN REFERENCE to the letter "Something fishy about pier ban" published on September 20.

I was deeply touched after hearing about the poor fishermen and their families going to bed hungry.

I am sure that Nelson Mandela has a great sense of humour and concern.

Mr Langa - you have said it.

Statement exploits the disabled

I REFER to K Sewssunker from the KZN Subsistence Fishers Forum in the Daily News on Monday.

As per my previous correspondence, I fully support the ban on fishing on all Central Beach piers. Straight up I have to question the use of the offensive statement:

"...we have disabled and wheelchair-bound (poor) fishing folk...

The use of this statement is nothing but an insult to those who suffer such disabilities.

While I accept that there are indeed disabled fishermen who enjoy the therapeutic relaxing aspects of fishing, in all my years of surfing, I can honestly say I have never seen a wheelchair-bound fisherman fishing from any of the Comrades Beach piers.

This is nothing but sickening, disingenuous, sentimental exploitation of the disabled to (falsely) support his agenda.

In any event, this still does not address the real issues which are now a matter of record. Simply - the fishermen have had decades to co-operate and share the facilities, but have never made any such effort, being in complete disdain of all the other members of the public who use the piers.

This is a desperate, belated and skewed attempt by Sewssunker to bring heart-tugging sentimentality into the fray at the expense of those who deserve our support and sympathy.

JOHN EVERITT
Durban North

Daily News 29/09/2010
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City has undergone a transformation

WHAT a pleasure to read the Daily News and only see objective, moving feedback of our country and World Cup! I endorse what your readers Tshepo Tshabalala, Mohammed and all other positive readers have to say about our clean city and the sterling job our city manager Mr Mike Sutcliffe has done.

Also, it is such a pleasure to feel safe in our own city and to see how clean and near our beaches are. We are truly so in awe because we have come to “accept” the negative conditions our beautiful Durban reached in the last few years.

Hopefully, we can maintain the wonderful standard we are now enjoying.

Readers must please feel free to take a peek at www.zappy.com (user name ilke). On my own accord, I promote Durban (without compensation, but for the love of our lovely city) with the changes that have taken place and it is always nice to prove to family, friends and overseas visitors that we truly offer wonderful hospitality, kindness and a clean city!

Well done Durban city and to management, a job well done!

RENE ELK

Beachfront Resident

The Mercury. Date unknown
Protestors lash out at FIFA

The Rising Sun, 23/06/2010
Disabled anglers discriminated against by the municipality

I salute the SA Navy for caring about disabled anglers (referring to the article on page 14, Weekly Gazette, 5 August 2010) by hosting a fishing competition for them at the Durban Harbour.

It was understandable that whilst the north and south piers were being worked on by contractors fishermen and the public were barred from the area and also recently this applied to the Durban beachfront piers. Now that the contractors are off the piers the council should simply open them and make them fully accessible again as they were before.

These are the only areas disabled people have any chance of enjoying the sport of fishing with their family and friends again.

Durban Metro and the harbour authorities must try walking with crutches or pushing a wheelchair on the beach sand and then they will know the plight of the disabled. The municipality should heed the statements made by Nelson Mandela that "what was free and accessible before the elections will remain free and accessible after".

A disabled angler,
Mike Bloxham
Durban CBD

The Chatsworth Gazette 12 August 2010
Phoenix fishermen protest for their rights

Phoenix Sun 26/08/2010
Fishermen defy ‘no fishing’ on the piers

The Chatsworth Tabloid interviewed a sufferer, who was forced to leave the pier, the council has decided on an occupation against fishing restrictions. The council reported that similar restrictions have been imposed on the piers in the past.

The council has decided to make fishing restrictions more strict and to prevent fishing at the piers. The council has also decided to tighten fishing regulations at the piers.

The council has also decided to strengthen fishing regulations and to prevent fishing at the piers. The council has also decided to tighten fishing regulations at the piers.

The council has also decided to strengthen fishing regulations and to prevent fishing at the piers. The council has also decided to tighten fishing regulations at the piers.

The council has also decided to strengthen fishing regulations and to prevent fishing at the piers. The council has also decided to tighten fishing regulations at the piers.

The council has also decided to strengthen fishing regulations and to prevent fishing at the piers. The council has also decided to tighten fishing regulations at the piers.

The council has also decided to strengthen fishing regulations and to prevent fishing at the piers. The council has also decided to tighten fishing regulations at the piers.

The council has also decided to strengthen fishing regulations and to prevent fishing at the piers. The council has also decided to tighten fishing regulations at the piers.

The council has also decided to strengthen fishing regulations and to prevent fishing at the piers. The council has also decided to tighten fishing regulations at the piers.

The council has also decided to strengthen fishing regulations and to prevent fishing at the piers. The council has also decided to tighten fishing regulations at the piers.

The council has also decided to strengthen fishing regulations and to prevent fishing at the piers. The council has also decided to tighten fishing regulations at the piers.

The council has also decided to strengthen fishing regulations and to prevent fishing at the piers. The council has also decided to tighten fishing regulations at the piers.

The council has also decided to strengthen fishing regulations and to prevent fishing at the piers. The council has also decided to tighten fishing regulations at the piers.

The council has also decided to strengthen fishing regulations and to prevent fishing at the piers. The council has also decided to tighten fishing regulations at the piers.
Fishing forum calls for unity

The KZN Subsistence Fishers Forum calls for unity among fishing enthusiasts to claim back traditional fishing grounds. A meeting will be held on Wednesday, 27 April 2011 at 5am at the Durban Beach Front, Snake Park Pier.

The purpose of this programme of action is for fisher folk to take their fishing grounds back from their government. The forum encourages all fisher folk to join together and put pressure on all spheres of government to ensure that fishing as a livelihood remains at the forefront of overcoming poverty.

For too long, government has ignored the rights of fishermen and supported other users of the beaches and harbours because the fishermen/women remained silent. Desmond D’sa, spokesman for the forum said, “Everyone needs to unite to ensure the defiance campaign can be successful. We cannot sit back and expect that government will change.”

The fishermen must continue to apply pressure on the authorities until:
1. They remove security preventing entry to the Beachfront Pier.
2. They open all other areas within the Durban beachfront to fisher folk.
3. They open all the traditional fishing grounds in the Durban Harbour
4. They consult with all fishermen in regard to fishing areas, policies, cost of license and quotas.

Contact Essop Mohammed at 031 404 8780 or 083 786 4175 or K Sewsunker at 031 539 1947 or Desmond D’sa at 031 461 1991 or 083 982 6939.
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“Fishermen being victimised”

Chatsworth Gazette 09/06/2011
Fishermen mobilise for protest

DASEN THATHIAN

FED UP off the fortunes of generations in Egypt, Durban fishermen have vowed to “take back” their fishing quota from the city.

Anglers and city housewives have been at loggerheads over a ban placed on fishing in various parts of KwaZulu, including the once-popular beachfront places.

Speaking at a public meeting at the Redfern Community Hall in Phoenix yesterday, activist and spokesperson for the KwaZulu-Natal Subsistence Fishermen’s Forum, Dassen D’Sa, said legal processes were too slow.

“You can’t argue with a court that you have the right to fish in Durban. There’s no time like today to hit the streets. You have to take it back yourselves. The beaches should be your ‘Cités’.”

D’Sa said people were being mobilised for a mass protest at the beachfront on March 21. “I’m ready to fight. We should all be ready to fight. On March 21, we will bring masses of fishermen to protest.”

Easop Mohamed, chairman of the forum, said the beachfront was a place for all, not just the rich, and poor fishermen relied on fishing to feed their families and make a living.”

Thieves disrupt the industry in the 1980s and now it is being taken over. Only the rich benefit financially because they have boats. But what about you and I?” he said.

Vice-chairman Ram Sewusunker said it was a “broad and bitter issue” and those trying to make an honest living should not be forced to turn to crime to survive.

D’Sa and the team are expected to hold a meeting in Chatsworth this weekend to get more support for the protest.

Another meeting is due to be held in Phoenix at the end of the month, where final arrangements for the protest would be made.

Cay manager Michael Stittley could not be reached for comment last night.
Durban fishermen protest against ban

MPUME MADLALA

SUBSISTENCE fishermen defied police and city authorities today by entering a no-go area to protest against a ban on fishing.

The fishermen, who have been banned from fishing in the harbour (by Portnet) and all but one of the piers on Durban’s central beachfront, gathered at the newly refurbished Patterson Groyne pier – between North Beach and the Bay of Plenty - at 5am.

City manager, Michael Sutcliffe, said the decision to ban fishing at beachfront piers was a council policy and not his policy. He said the city was willing to meet with the fishermen to discuss a way forward.

“The majority of the fishermen were willing to co-operate and it is just a small bunch of people who believe that confrontation is the only way to solve things.

“It has been an impossible task to keep the piers clean with bait and fish blood splattered all over the place.

“In some instances lights were broken so people could not see what was going on on the pier,” said Sutcliffe.

Desmond D’sa, KwaZulu-Natal Subsistence Fisher’s Forum spokesman, said they were angry at Sutcliffe for taking a decision to ban them from the piers.

“There are families who depend on fishing for food and money. If he takes away their right to live, what is he saying? We want the African National Congress to make sure he does not return to power in June.

“Surfers don’t pay money to the city and they are allowed to surf, yet fishermen – who pay for a fishing licence and are also ratepayers – can’t fish where they like,” he said.

D’sa said they wondered why Sutcliffe had continued to ignore the fishermen’s plight.

“We will continue fishing on these piers because they were built with taxpayers’ money and that includes us. Sutcliffe has no right to stop us from fishing and we will continue.

“This ban was meant to be
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ANGRY: Desmond Ong, the Penang state Subsistence Fisher's Forum chairman, addresses fishermen who were protesting against the city's decision to ban some fishing activities on Penang's central beachfront.

PICTURE: P. C. Chong

It's not easy to persuade a group of angry fishermen to move away from the Penang Grain Store. The anglers were protesting against the city's ban on fishing times.

Henry Rall, right, who was part of the protest today, hooked a pumice, estimated at 30 kg, and said he would share the catch with his family.

Rall and others say they can't fish at the site they used to.

He wondered if someone could find a way to return to the fishing site.

"This was the most popular place to fish because it's near the World Cup, but now we have to move," one man said.

"The city's decision to ban fishing is unfair," another said.

"I hope the city will reconsider," someone else said.

"We need a place to fish, especially during the monsoon season."

"There are no other places to fish around here," he added.

"We can't continue if we don't have a place to fish," another man said.

"Let's keep fighting until we get our rights back," someone else said.
Fishermen up in rods over new fishing regulations

But municipality doesn’t budge

ABOVE: Fishermen line up various parts of Conder and holding a protest at the lake. Joe Glynn, who is one of the fishermen, said the municipal has been asking fishers to stop fishing. He said it’s a violation of their rights and tells them they have no choice but to stop fishing.

Logan Gowan

POST PAGE 3
July 13, 17 2011
Fishermen

Since access to the fishing spots at the harbour and Bluff were blocked in 2006, fishermen have been looking for another way to earn a living. Although some have found alternative employment, many others face difficulties. The fishermen's situation has been worsened by the Port Authority's decision to deny them access to the harbour, leading to financial strain and uncertainty for their families.

Above: The absence of the fishing boats has affected various parts of the community, with the owners of various small businesses feeling the impact. Right: The younger generation, who often accompany their parents when they go to fish, now have to rely on other means to earn money.

The Chair of the Port Authority, Eusebius Moodie, said the Port Authority's decision was made to ensure the safety of the general public. However, the fishermen argue that the decision has affected their way of life and that they have not been given enough notice to adjust.

The situation is particularly challenging for the fishermen's children, who have had to adapt to new circumstances and face the prospect of not being able to continue their families' tradition. The fishermen fear that their way of life will disappear if nothing is done to address the issue.

The fishermen have been represented by the South African National Union of Fishworkers, but their appeals to the Port Authority have been met with little success. The situation has led to many fishermen and their families feeling despondent and uncertain about their future. The fishermen's plight has been further compounded by the ongoing closure of the harbour, which has forced them to seek alternative means of earning a living.

The fishermen's story highlights the challenges faced by many small communities in South Africa as they struggle to adapt to changes in the economy and the environment. It raises questions about the role of government and private institutions in ensuring the well-being of communities and the sustainability of their livelihoods.
Appendix G:1

before throwing it into the sea? Why didn’t he show us a bold image of his dead face? The CNN, BBC pictures are not clear. After 10 years wouldn’t they want to parade their “prize”? Makes you think, doesn’t it?

City

• We don’t need more policemen, we need to step crime rate by dealing properly with criminals. Start by bringing back the death penalty.

• If Mike Sutcliffe and his team reflected the millions, possibly billions, owed on vehicle fines, rates from hostels and government buildings, instead of giving amnesty or even worse, writing them off, then they would have a lot of cash to use for vacant posts without having to rob the law-abiding ratepayers, a lot of whom are already living on the edge, especially those on fixed pensions.

• I went to the Durban beachfront yesterday and the underground discgem car area was a pathetic sight to behold as well as the video gaming area. If I was a tourist I would never want to be seen in such filth again.

Dean Patier.

• Accidents: there’s hardly a week that goes by without an accident at the M41 and Northern Drive intersection. The jaws of life had to be used twice in the past week. What are authorities doing about these reckless motorists and how can they prevent further carnage? I suggest bring back cameras. Nav.

Fishing

• Firstly, Wally: I’m not missing the point at all, as the point is, the fisherman should clean up after themselves and they don’t. They can argue all they want. I have witnessed the filth they leave countless times and, to Zaff, the benches and lights are there to be vandalised and the reason the homeless are sleeping on the benches is because the

Fisherman can’t. As far as the dog pooh? Who are “you people” if I don’t have a dog? We are talking filthy, vandalised piers, not dog owners and their pood’s. Amn. NB.

• Am, you speak as if the piers are larger than the ocean by stating dirty ocean equals no fish. What about storm pipes that lead to the sea? What about polluted rivers that lead to the sea? Zaff.

• Walk around the beach area at about 5pm on Sundays, if you do not see any dog poop then you are biased against the fisherman, or maybe you are a pooh cultist!

Elections

• Uganda informal settlement resident complains bitterly about the ANC transit shacks, but in the same breath says he will vote ANC, because the ANC is like God. You desire the government you vote for. Stop complaining about God. Adrian Moss.

• Gwede Mantashe: the ANC has done nothing for the people of Wentworth. We only see you around election time, but take note we have not hung down any crimes, Mantsh.

• Craig, if one pays taxes then you are entitled to complain for non delivery. Voting is optional, so you are saying the people who voted for the ANC are to blame for the corrupt politicians, Mike.

Education

• Why, oh why is Sadtu Umngeni Branch having an AGM on a school day (Wednesday, May 11) starting at 1am? As if this term has not been disrupted enough. If they are interested in education, they would have it after school. Like the politicians who quote the Ministerial Handbook, they would say conditions of service allow time off for union activities.

• Do away with the R800 a month rental allowance for people that do not own a house that work for the state and increase subsidy for those that own a house to R1 200 a month. State would save millions.

• Why must the “teachers who did not strike suffer”? There are many dedicated teachers who resisted no
Our readers share their views

Daily News
BackChat
Sms your views to 32024
Each SMS costs R1

City

The response to Councillor Chapmann's letter is agreement of the fact that the DA is encouraging its constitutional rights to freedom of association. City Chapmann made a clear thing showed that the DA is welcome to attend DA press conferences. The DA has only agreed to receive the DA from their main list. The other letter add's to the comments. The Western Cape and all other DA run municipalities have received unmistakable standards to the DA from their main list. Steinhof Gaborone

- Duane Geroza help praise on Strut and his merry men for doing wonderful work. If he was a legitimate retailer knowing that the city is in deep financial troubles he would not be praising them, but berating them. Maadi, D.

- During the past week two delegations from National Treasury and the other from the Reserve Bank visited foreign experts, interrogated the City's finances etc. The vertical taxation is one of the best measures in the country. World Bank will be having the transport strategy as a learning document. Of course, some of this will eventually be to the front page. As usual.

- In Pravin Gordhan's speech interesting budget speech, he says that tax must be caught and not brought. How can we catch less when Strut still has 204 cars? WAF

Education

- People are constantly asking about the identity of David Beatty Mabola. Two years ago, he was asked what should be done to the DA in this period. Makwava, an ex-DTF linked to the ANC, told them how he thought the ANC should be advising, the principal. Mabola, D.

- Street vendors' notes to be investigated on their work. Working Class in the clearance to hold on to the warrant to turn. If you are asked, just give us a call, and we will do what is necessary. But if you should try to cut them in the street, they teach "Do not have to pay the school fees"!

Drunk driving

- A new law Department of Transport is public announcement of drunk drivers. Why? Because the number of fatalities caused by drunk drivers in very high. What a joke. Why don't the authorities just close alcohol counter? But they won't, because they themselves are guilty of consuming alcohol. "Frying pan putting the pot black." That is my story.

Budget speech

- Finance Minister Pravin Gordhan was wise not to hike VAT, because he knows that it would impact the apple bill. The ANC would lose votes in the municipal elections. Ismail M Maadi, Tshwane.

Odds and ends

- Why doesn't the Daily News print a world map once? Such a lot happening around the world. A world would help.

- Shun doctor committed sexual offense and may not be identified. Pursue all avenues, take legal actions and expose him.

- The information that Muslims had about the ancient civilization of thousands of years ago is unknown. Muslims have kept alive the ancient history of science and mathematics for thousands of years ago. Baghdad.

- Hindus knew there are 50 billion planets millions of years ago - good joke.


The Earnest Interior

- When we look at the pictures of our democracy when most of us are free by the second of the month, we do.

- Will have to strictly follow the council and reduce the "s settlers" (blank) exposure of St. George. South Africa's economy will continue to grow. That's a fact.

And finally

- President Zuma; Col. Gaddafi thought it would never happen to Libya. When government rules the people, the government lives.
Readers express their views

Education

No Mhatha, it is you who is out of touch with reality. Heads of departments, principals and deputies actually teach and teach, so we all learnt in class entirely only.

I don't know where some of your readers get their information from. My entire management staff teach at my school on the topic of school management. There are some things we do not do in any course one teach you except for subject allocation and timetabling. In the rest of the variables, you cannot have much experience, than somebody with a whole lot of paper knowledge, and not much else. Phoenix (proprietary).

RDP Houses

It is ridiculous to be told that these houses are ready to hand over. How come documents that got teachers were preserved and inserted in their misunderstanding?

The contractors who built must be held responsible for repairs. They were given money to build decent houses. Now make them pay.

Cycling

There is no agreement with CAF. New road regulations and parents can allow children of up to 12 years to ride at a speed that includes a maximum 3kph.

City

Bicycles are a means to get from place to place in a manner that doesn't use a car. If that's the case, it is illegal. People should jump on a car and cycle on the roads. Cyclists should have the same rights to steer as any other vehicle. There is a distinction that exists in the potential to remain on accidents.

Fishing

To all fishermen. Why make us walk over the piers to fish. We fished on the pier for 25 years. Don't allow Sonset to dictate to us.

BackChat

SMS your views to 22043. Each SMS costs R1.

Steve Hofmeyr

Win 10 tickets to see the world-famous musical "Rent."

Well done to Steve Hofmeyr for championing our U2 tickets in the river. With the support of the residents of the Durban Waterfront, we were able to solve the problem. Soft targets to fill our coffers at reduced rates. Thank you for your support because our food would have been poisoned by this river. Go to Soweto, U2. You belong there. Truth be told.

Odds and ends

I strongly believe that the Pokasane don't believe that the Senate has any power. This is a real and imminent threat to our future.

So, most month's bicycles have been stolen. With the least possible intervention, a few days ago wasגן. So my available time will increase and my bills come down, but Don't make me laugh. I am not interested in these crooks. They are greedy and will find a way to trick us and charge us more. Mike.

And finally

As much as possible, transport companies to continue working on their own. Sonset is not interested in salaries. So the first thing to employers' minds in 2023.
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Durban? I will help with the catering. DRG.

- Royal wedding shows us what royalty is all about. Why should we shell out $2 million just to rebury remains of King Zwelithini’s mother and entertain a few. After 52 years her soul should be left to rest in peace. Build houses for the poor with that money as that would appease the gods. Joe.

- Zulu queen mother’s new burial ground to cost around R200 million, while R96m for renovation of dilapidated Alabama flats in Wentworth? Priority of dead over living? Another example of the ANC getting it’s priorities wrong. However, you get the government you vote for, hey! Ross.

Fishing

- Zaff, where’s the dog p00? Piers are trashed by fishermen. Don’t your forefathers teach you to clean your mess up? Hairy ahm. Equal no fish.

- On the matter of fishing on the pier, I believe Zaff has a valid point, but both Zaff and Ann are missing the point, which is everyone should clean up after themselves. The fact that rates are paid is no excuse nor reason for misuse and abuse. It comes down to responsibility and ethic. Wally Lage.

- Mike, some of us have been fishing on Durban beach for 50 years. Why take it away from us now? On West Street pier in 1990 we paid a fee to fish. Why not go that way and see how it works? Tom.

Elections

- Visvin Reddy’s letter to the editor is indeed intriguing. He should steer clear of statistics as it exposes the ANC government’s weaknesses. If the majority of South Africans are receiving free basic water and electricity, then this shows that the majority of people are living in poverty, and hence that the ANC’s economic policy is not working. Those other statistics that he quotes does not augur well for the ruling party and their policies. My vote is no longer with the ANC.

- Why should I vote for a party that since 1994 internal some good infrastructure in Durban, but neglected to maintain them e.g. Addington hospital, schools, roads, drainage systems, etc. Also, most of the by-laws passed are
Fishing

- Ann, you are talking nonsense with your false allegations that the fishermen are trashing and vandalising. What is there to be vandalised?
- Furthermore, we are also ratepayers and pay for cleaning of trash. Go at night on the piers and see that the homeless are sleeping on the benches. You complain about fish blood and bait – what about the dog poo all over the promenade, which belongs to you people? So which is more filthy: the fish blood or the poo? Zaff.

- Fishing on beachfront piers is permitted. Fishing on the beachfront piers would be a good tourist attraction aspect. The city manager used the Soccer World Cup as a perfect event to keep fishing on the piers. This must also be made up to the irresponsible segments of the fishing fraternity who leave trash wherever they fish. Wish to respect for the facilities provided. Everyone must take what is reasonable. The love of the sea worth of Franklin and democracy.

- All those who wish to continue fishing from the piers and in the port should now know which party they should not vote for come 18 May.

- As a member and follower, I may we need to keep the current piers clean and we must open back up piers for all.

Beachfront

- Billions were spent on the promenade just a year ago for the World Cup, and now all the parking has been stripped to rework. People are starving and tax money is getting thrown away to the gutters. Zk.
Readers have their say

Fishing

- How can you as fishermen not take responsibility for the mess you made of the pier? Who else would leave dead fish and sardine boxes on the pier? We have photographs of sinkers and hooks lying in the four-metre light fittings. If you were so-called doctors, judges and policemen you have no excuse not to clean up your mess! Keep Durban beautiful.

- Sg’s comments are blatant lies! Surfers jump off the pier on their first ride because it is easier than to fight the current before they have warmed up. Secondly, the problem with a few fishermen is that they do not clean up their mess and spoil the pier for all users. Surely the tidy fishermen could change this and there would not be a problem, Mr.

- To all those fishermen who are now playing victim. You brought this upon yourselves by your behaviour, the rubbish and the abuse. Maybe, just maybe, if you had policed yourselves you may still have been allowed to fish off the pier. You made the choice to, or ignore those who did, misbehave. Andrew.

MXit

- Why blame MXit for “Mary” being raped? They do not force you go and meet strangers, they even warn you never to give out any personal details and it’s totally your choice as to who you want to chat to. Parents don’t understand this and you’ll give MXit a bad name for no reason, Lucy.

- MXit is a waste of time and money; I don’t see what is so hard in phoning the person to speak to him or her… My suggestion is that they should do away with MXit. Facebook, MySpace and Twitter; it creates more problems. New generation MXit has.

Shaik

- After all this time Shaik is still around being given more free time to enjoy his life. Terminally ill, what a joke. Gill, Durban North.

- Selena Shaik, your family man! You get four hours to go to mosque when normal Muslims do it in 45 minutes. Were you not lying a few months ago? So crime does pay, to SA:

Strike

- If you public servants spent less time doing the national dance (toy-toy) maybe more things would get done in this country. You guys are a disgrace to the country.

- Teachers, nurses and policemen deserve more pay. Don’t we all work better when rewarded? Come on, people, without them we’ll be dumb, sick criminals. Umhlanga.

- I am a teacher who loves his job. I have always earned less than if I was employed in the private sector, but my job satisfaction is priceless. Useless teachers go on strike. Voesters.

- Gone are the days that a teacher goes 100 percent of putting the pupil first. Why will parents be paying hundreds of rands to educators for additional tuition, if they were being given the attention at school? Everyone has the ability and if you can’t recognise that ability and bring it out then you don’t deserve to be a teacher. For people who have so many holidays, privileges plus leave, I think they earn the salary they deserve. People who show more commitment in the private sector earn far less and settle for much lower increases. Dama.

Odds and ends

- The ANC introduced the protection of information bill to curb the media. The media in retaliation must give less publicity to ANC activities. Ismail Moola.

- During the World Cup I experienced no power outages. Post WC it’s a weekly event. Seems like random load-shedding. With media gag laws looming we’d never know.

And finally

- What utter rubbish to tell us that our matric certificates compares well with international standards when some of our matriculants can’t speak English.
Fishing

To Ann, North Beach: Well this is because surfers jump

Road safety

Mary says: a thousand and one... Need to make more visible.

Why can’t the police do their job instead of being micromanaged?

Fishing

The ANC is an association of fishermen and should be a voice for the fishermen.

Congratulations to the Early Morning Market Association for saving the historic market from the clutches of State Bank and his crew.

City

The traffic is terrible, what are the plans for the future?

Elections

Any temporary provincial candidates should be removed before the election.

Once again it’s voting season. The poor, the sick and the aged will receive attention.

Fishing

Fishing folks: I’m about to take back the pierz. Otherwise we will be streaming one by one to the Spekfontein basin, pulling fisherman and others, not to mention the dolphins.
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Nico says: We are deeply concerned about the pollution.

BackChat

The Daily News readers share their views.

Fishing

Fishing folks: I’m about to take back the pierz. Otherwise we will be streaming one by one to the Spekfontein basin, pulling fisherman and others, not to mention the dolphins.

Fishing

Nico says: We are deeply concerned about the pollution.

BackChat

Fishing

Fishing folks: I’m about to take back the pierz. Otherwise we will be streaming one by one to the Spekfontein basin, pulling fisherman and others, not to mention the dolphins.

Fishing

Nico says: We are deeply concerned about the pollution.

BackChat

The Daily News readers share their views.

Fishing

Fishing folks: I’m about to take back the pierz. Otherwise we will be streaming one by one to the Spekfontein basin, pulling fisherman and others, not to mention the dolphins.

Fishing

Nico says: We are deeply concerned about the pollution.

BackChat

Fishing

Fishing folks: I’m about to take back the pierz. Otherwise we will be streaming one by one to the Spekfontein basin, pulling fisherman and others, not to mention the dolphins.

Fishing

Nico says: We are deeply concerned about the pollution.

BackChat

The Daily News readers share their views.

Fishing

Fishing folks: I’m about to take back the pierz. Otherwise we will be streaming one by one to the Spekfontein basin, pulling fisherman and others, not to mention the dolphins.

Fishing

Nico says: We are deeply concerned about the pollution.

BackChat

The Daily News readers share their views.
A text message by Lovie as it appeared in the Daily News
White poverty is a silent poverty, says Zuma

People were made to believe there were no poor whites during apartheid, President Jacob Zuma said on Tuesday.

"The previous government did not want to acknowledge that there were whites who were poor. It was psychology and propaganda," Zuma told hundreds of people at the Bethlehem informal settlement in Pretoria West, home to a poor Afrikaner community.

He spoke after trade union Solidarity's deputy general secretary Dirk Herman related how it was almost politically incorrect to talk about "white poverty".

"White poverty is a silent poverty. People seldom talk about it. The time has come to break the silence," he said to cheers and applause.

He criticised affirmative action, saying white children faced discrimination because of their race.

"There is no moral justification for excluding those people from empowerment," Zuma said he still needed to "take him on" regarding affirmative action, but that the government would not allow anyone to oppress another group.

"We should not create an impression that we are excluding other people... in working together we can help a great deal to remove that perception. The strength of the nation lies in unity,"

This visit, under the auspices of Solidarity’s Helping Hand fund, was aimed at discussing the poor community’s problems with Zuma.

Zuma said his first visit to the area in 2008 was an eye-opener for most South Africans.

"People saw for the first time that there were poor whites."

He said it was the government’s duty to ensure services were provided for all South Africans, regardless of religion, colour, race or creed.

People from several informal settlements in Pretoria filled a large white tent to listen to Zuma. He addressed the crowd from a podium in his black suit, while members of his Cabinet sat on a stage behind tables draped in Solidarity's orange and green colours.

Zuma said he was happy that his visit with his Cabinet came just days before Easter, one of the holiest times of the year for Christians.

"For the poor, the sacrifice is not restricted to the month of Lent, but is a cross they bear daily. This is what informed our visit here today."

He began his speech joking about how he came to learn to speak Afrikaans, which left the multi-racial crowd in stitches.

"I do not want to hide behind policies and reports. I want to hear first hand and indeed I have heard," he said.

"He is bringing us hope in the area and in South Africa as a whole," said Ria Nel, who runs a soup kitchen for Bethlehem residents.

"From his visit, we know he will open doors because he is in the right position and has knowledge," she said.

Some of the concerns raised on Zuma's previous visit included housing, water, electricity medical care, social security and unemployment.

Rina Vry, 78, had her old age grant rejected twice in previous years. She was then told her last application to the SA Social Security Agency had been lost.

Solidarity's Helping Hand fund said it was inundated by complaints by the elderly about old age pension applications being repeatedly denied. Tents were set up on Tuesday to register those that qualified.

Tshwane mayor Gwen Ramokgopa and Gauteng premier Nomvula Mokonyane also addressed the crowd.
switching from English to Afrikaans and promising to provide the necessary services.

Ramokgopa said some families had been given title deeds since Zuma’s last visit. They were working with the relevant department to sort out problems related to social grants.

Some 13 houses were already receiving 100 KW free electricity and 12 litres of water free each month. A mobile clinic came once a month.

“We will work with you to ensure that where there are blockages we unblock,” said Ramokgopa.

Mokonyane said: “We want to build a non-racial South Africa.”

About 2000 mixed residential units would be built in Lady Selborne for the poor. A contractor had already been appointed.

“Your life must change for the better, we want to de-racialise South Africa.”

Zuma enjoyed some potjiekos at one of the houses before he left. This was one of the reasons he was always encouraged to visit, he said.

The crowd formed long queues to get their lunch, hot dogs and snack bars, before leaving in buses. Those living around Bethlehem walked home. - Sapa
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Title: “Gordon’s Paddle to save Vetch’s”

Daily News 03/06/2010
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Blakie added: “Not everyone will be able to afford to go there any more.”

The Durban Paddle Ski Club, situated in the area, agrees with this.

“We support the initiative by the developers to upgrade the Point area. However, we do not believe that all SCH is necessary to achieve this,” the club said on its website.

But Nyuswa said: “The environmental impact assessment was conducted by a panel of independent experts, who approved the application.”
Appendix H:3

Durban to bid for 2020 Olympic Games

Sep 6, 2010 | Sapa-AP

Durban has emerged as South Africa’s candidate for the 2020 Olympics after three other cities failed to express interest.

The government is expected to rubber-stamp Durban’s bid after Cape Town, Johannesburg and Port Elizabeth failed to apply to the South African Sports Confederation and Olympic Committee.

“We put our hand up and SASCOC has supported us, which is great,” Durban city manager Mike Sutcliffe said. “We believe we have the credentials. Now, it is a probability rather than a possibility of us bidding. We are very happy.”

The host city for the 2020 Olympics will be announced in 2013 at the International Olympic Committee session in Buenos Aires, Argentina.

Sutcliffe said Durban officials and SASCOC will meet with the government in the next month over the bid, which could bring the Olympics to Africa for the first time.

“The government would have to be involved. We couldn’t do it on our own,” he said. “We will begin a process in the next three or four weeks where we will engage with the government over the nuts and bolts of the bid.”

Sutcliffe said the country’s third largest city, situated on the east coast, was considering some of the implications of bidding.

Durban will almost certainly receive the co-ahead after South Africa President Jacob Zuma publicly endorsed an Olympic bid earlier this year, and IOC president Jacques Rogge said his organization would welcome a bid from the African country.

South Africa believes its chances have been boosted after its successful staging of Africa’s first World Cup in June and July.

Durban was one of the tournament’s host cities.

Inspired by the success of the football tournament, SASCOC announced two days after the World Cup final that the country would bid for the Olympics.

South Africa has previously bid for the Olympic Games. Cape Town missed out in 2004, finishing third behind winner Athens and Rome.

Durban has a chance to impress voters when it hosts the IOC session next year. After that meeting, the IOC will formally invite bids for 2020.

So far, only Rome has declared its intention to bid for 2020.

Tokyo, Istanbul and Dubai are among other possible candidates.

Sutcliffe said Durban would center its bid on Moses Mabhida Stadium, which was built for the World Cup and could easily be converted into an 85,000-seat athletics venue.

“We built the Moses Mabhida according to the Olympic code, as well as for the World Cup,” Sutcliffe said, hinting that an Olympic bid had been part of Durban’s long-term plans.
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Message from the Chairperson

Fishing has been a part of the subsistence fishermen’s heritage since the 1860’s. It is their livelihoods and has supported generations of families. The money generated from selling surplus fish allows them to have a sustainable life although their standard of living may be poor. It has ensured that the fishermen and their families’ basic needs are taken care of in respect to food and paying for essential services such as lights and water, rent, clothing, and educating their children. They are not men that have not asked for hand outs from the government, nor have they been a burden to society by contributing to the country’s already soaring crime statistics. These men do not complain about being unemployed or wait for the government to invest in multi-million rand stadiums before “creating employment” but these are the men who have made a living from learning and practicing the skill of fishing. The KZNSF was established in 2004. There has been no previous AGM in the organization’s history so at the very first it will cover the work done since 2004. Thereafter AGM’s will take place on a biannual cycle. Although the lack of AGM’s, there have been several public meetings and marches since the organization’s inception. The pivotal march would be the “Train March” where the fishermen opposed the policy to halt trains running from South Durban that would transport fishermen to their fishing grounds. The fishermen won this battle and were empowered to continue the struggle of the plight of fishermen. The organization has worked with the government on various policies but we have not yet succeeded in this light. We have written many letters to different members of the government including Deputy Mayor Logie Naidoo; Dr Mike Sutcliffe, Minister of Environmental Affairs, Mr. Martin Van Schalkwyk as well as the head of Marine and Coastal Management Services. Issues of the fishermen were brought to the attention of NEDLAC, a community, government and industry bargaining committee. KZNSF worked with PACSA in order to take fishermen issues to the provincial government. Durban has assisted in highlighting government failures in terms of not allowing fishing in certain traditional fishing areas.

Within the next two years the organization is hoping to engage with port regulators in concern to port rule that prohibit fishing. KZNSF will also be recruiting attorneys to assist the fishermen in fighting the city manager and mayor. Progress has been made in the development of a small scale fishermen policy and is in the process of being approved.

As chairman of KZNSF, the message I would like my fellow fishermen to take home is that although we are going through the hard times right now, it is important to keep the fight going. We will continue fighting for our rights. With continued unity, dedication and commitment, the fishing communities throughout KZN can free themselves from the injustices dealt out by government.

KZN Subsistence Fishermen AGM report
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Fishermen’s media release

- Nov 25, 2004: Angry fishermen take to the streets (The Mercury), protesting against the intended closure of Wesla stations outside Metrotails’s Durban office.
- April 6, 2007: There is a new deal for fishermen concerning the application fees of each type of fish.
- May 29, 2007: Anglers protest closure of harbour piers is a heavy blow. Fishermen are being denied access to the Durban’s harbour north pier.
- May 29, 2007: Fishermen are to march over pier closures.
- June 1, 2007: Subsistence fishermen strike against port authority’s latest restriction (Southern Sun newspaper).
- June 1, 2007: Still no relief for angry fishermen (Daily Newspaper).
- June 5, 2007: Subsistence fishermen are fighting for survival.
- June 10, 2007: Profit mangers have pushed small fishermen from the sea
- June 12, 2007: KPA blasted over pier ban, subsistence fishermen lose out.
- June 17, 2007: Fishermen fight Pier closures (Sunday Tribune).
- June 19, 2007: An article by the Daily News captures a fisherman speaking on how much fishing means to him.
- June 25, 2007: An article by the Daily News: "Try to understand plight of the fishermen" was by Logan Moodley.
- June 29, 2007: Threat of Pier closure angers fishermen.
- Sept 17, 2007: The fisherman in stand-off with security guards.
- Oct 10, 2007: This date captured the fishermen’s expensive haul.
- Jan 11, 2008: An investigation found oxygen depletion as the primary cause for the fish kill at Wilson’s Wharf.
- Jan 13, 2008: The clean waters of Umhlo River were found to be polluted. Industrial pollution was the main suspect.
- Mar 16, 2008: Hundreds of fish in Durban’s rivers are found to be dead due to sewage dumped in these rivers, reducing the oxygen levels (Joynner Canal, Prospecton).
- May 7, 2008: Fishermen stand up for their rights to fish in Bat Center and Wilson’s Wharf pier areas on Freedom Day. There are laws allowing fishermen to catch fish in the harbor. However, most of these subsistence fishermen obtain their livelihood from shoreline fishing, which is restricted.
- Aug 17, 2008: Police officers begin to crack down on shad fishing on the piers of Durban.
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- Aug 31, 2008: Fishermen are finding it hard to follow the fishing regulations. Many complain that they have no choice but to break the laws and attempt to get away. Some fishermen argue that they are unaware of the specific regulations. These restricting laws have also resulted in conflicts between fishermen.
- Mar 1, 2010: A meeting was held in Morton at Chatsworth Civic hall. The meeting discussed the increases in license/permit fees. It also addressed water police harassing fishermen that were fishing in legal areas such as the Bat Center and Wilsons Wharf.
- Mar. 6/7, 2010: Fishermen are faced not only with limited access to fish due to the closings of the major fishing spots, but also must now pay an increased fee for fishing permits.
- The Minority Front attends the public meeting supporting the subsistence fishermen of KZN to assist in the fight against the increased permit fees.
- May 11, 2010: The contents of the response addressed the issue of banning fishing on the beachfront piers. It also asked for the exact laws used by the municipality to support its decisions. To date, no laws were put forward. The letter also invited Dr Sutcliffe to hold a meeting with the fisher folk.
- May 21, 2010: A response was sent to Dr Mike Sutcliffe regarding the letter dated Jul 13, 2010: An open letter was sent to the Deputy Mayor Cogie Naidoo. It proposes possible solutions to the fishing row between the municipality and fisher folk after the footfall. It questions the reasons why the municipality ruled with an iron fist, against the fishermen and how no effort was made on the part of the municipality to meet with the fisher folk and discuss their issues. The letter calls for the Deputy Mayor to immediately set up a meeting with the subsistence fishermen.

The exclusion of subsistence fishers from public spaces in Durban
The research done by Amanda Dray and Draane Scott on the fisherman, examines the issues of the subsistence fishermen in Durban area, whose fishing sites are being eroded through various development processes.

The focus on subsistence fishermen who fish off the piers and beaches along the Durban coastline and around Durban bay have been eroded concerning the public and private sector. The research revealed that the public fishing sites have been closed off, the aim of the study was to investigate why this is so, the results revealed that the group of fishers have a rich and long history in fishing and that in addition to it being livelihood, fishing is a source of spiritual fulfillment and culture. There has been no substantial answer as to why the piers and fishing spots have been closed off. The fisherman have opposed closures through the formation of the KZN subsistence fishermen forum, writing to the relevant authorities, organizing protests and opening up a legal case against the national ports authorities, organizing protest (NPA). Also noted is that the eThekwian municipality, Ezemvelo KZN wildlife and the NPA have not been supportive of the fishermen’s concerns.
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KZN SUBSISTENCE FISHERS’ FORUM

PUBLIC MEETING

The purpose of this meeting is to provide members with an update in the struggle to have the Durban Bay, Piers and beaches open to all fisher folks. We have an attorney Mr Jay Surju who has acted on behalf of all fisher folks in the case against Transnet. This meeting will also discuss the information required for the KZN Subsistence Forum. We will brief all fisher folks on the subsistence policy and what progress has been made.

We cannot sit back and expect that government will change, the fishermen must continue to apply pressure on the authorities until:

1. They remove the fence preventing entry to the beachfront Pier.

2. That they open all other areas within the Durban Harbour and beachfront to fisher folk. Our ocean and harbour belongs to the people and we need to claim back what belongs to us.

PUBLIC Meeting takes place as follows:

Date : Thursday 6th May 2010
Time : 7.00pm
Venue : SNAKE PARK PIER /JETTY
Address : North Beach [Durban Beachfront]

Essop Mohamed : 031 – 4048780
Max Magnussen : 031 –3373406
Desmond D’Sa : 031—4611991 or 083982693

All fishermen must try and attend
KZN SUBSISTENCE FISHERS’ FORUM

PUBLIC MEETING

The purpose of this meeting is to provide members with an update in the struggle to have the Durban Beaches and Piers open to all fisher folks. We want to brief fisher folks on the progress of getting an attorney in assisting with the fines. This meeting will also discuss the information required for the lawyers. Our chairperson Essop Mohammed will launch the subsistence fisher folks defiance campaign and how this can be successful.

We cannot sit back and expect that government will change, the fishermen must continue to apply pressure on the authorities until:

3. They remove the fence preventing entry to the Beachfront Pier.

4. That they open all other areas within the Durban beachfront to fisher folk. Our ocean belongs to the people and we need to claim back what belongs to us.

PUBLIC Meeting takes place as follows:

Date : Saturday 22\textsuperscript{nd} May 2010
Time : 3:30pm
Venue : CHRIST CHURCH ADDINGTON
Address : 398 Point Road Durban

Essop Mohamed: 031 – 4048780 / cell: 0837864175
Max Magnussen: 031 - 3373406
Desmond D’Sa: 031 – 4611991 / cell: 0839826939

For further enquiries please call the above people.
Memorandum Of Grievances TO: KZN Premier Zwelethu Mkhize, Durban Mayor Obed Mabaso, Deputy Mayor Logic Naidoo and Durban City Manager Michael Sutcliffe
RE: Grievances about World Cup 2010 management

We are the citizenry of Durban. Our organisations have long registered grievances about the way the city is being run. In recent months, we have found that many of our problems are worsening, especially because of the way the World Cup has been implemented by FIFA, its corporate partners, politicians and bureaucrats.

While in principle we do not oppose Durban hosting seven World Cup games, we are very opposed to many decisions made by FIFA and city, provincial and national officials. The problems we record below require urgent attention and immediate remedial action.

Economic Burden

- Whereas Durban’s 70 000-seater Moses Mabhida Stadium cost taxpayers R3.1 billion; the cost escalation for Mabhida rose from an initial R1.8 billion; and redirecting most of this spending could have erased the majority of the vast backlogs Durban faces, of housing, water/sanitation, electricity, clinics, schools and roads;
- Mabhida’s next-door neighbour is Absa Stadium, home of Sharks rugby, which seats 52 000 and which could easily have been extended (considering that Durban municipality will knock out 15 000 seats from Mabhida after July);
- the companies and individuals that have profited most from Mabhida’s construction include multinational corporations and those responsible for notorious municipal disasters, such as bus privatiser Remant Alton and Point development failure Dolphin Whispers, along with at least one fake Black Economic Empowerment front company;
- the import bill for Mabhida appears unreasonable, as reflected in breakdowns of Mabhida’s Sky Car due to imported German cables held up for repair by the Icelandic volcano, and in imported German tents erected next to Mabhida by an imported German marquee construction crew;
- the soaring foreign and domestic debt we are now suffering because of World Cup expenses will cause untold problems for the SA economy in years to come; FIFA is not subject to South African taxes; FIFA is also allowed to ignore SA exchange control regulations; and the FIFA profit estimate is more than R25 billion;

Corruption and State Failure

- whereas this kind of extreme waste and crony capitalism typifies the relationship of FIFA to host governments; bribery and corruption have been associated with FIFA’s operations (as documented in lawsuits in Zug and New York); bribes have been predicted (by England’s former World Cup bid manager) that would distort play by some of the leading teams coming to South Africa; and corruption whistle-blowing in Mpumalanga Province led to several suspicious deaths, reportedly by organised hit squads;
- Durban’s own recent corruption in the construction of low-cost housing by Zikhulise Cleaning, Maintenance and Transport became a national scandal; Durban housing official Nigel Gumede and City Manager Mike Sutcliffe rejected the findings of the National
Home Builders' Registration Council report which shows extensive wrongdoing – one third of houses in Umbali requiring reconstruction - in a R300 million contract begun in December 2006; politically-connected Zikhulise owners Shauwn and S'bu Mpsiane have a notoriously luxurious lifestyle with a car fleet worth a reported R100 million;

- Durban's Council and ward committee system has become a form of top-down political control; Council does not take our voices upwards; the democratic gains that were won in 1994 are also our victories, but have been taken from us;

- the September 2009 attack on the Abahlali baseMjondolo (AbM) movement, its leaders and well known members, their family members and its offices in the Kennedy Road settlement apparently received the backing of the local ruling party and government structures; many AbM members cannot go back to Kennedy Road; and several of the Kennedy Road 13 are being imprisoned interminably without bail or being charged;

- the Durban council has made clear its intent to demolish the Early Morning Market at Warwick Junction in favour of a shopping mall; the Early Morning Market is one of the surviving monuments of the indentured Indian labourers; and hundreds of jobs – as well as affordable edibles – for poor people are at stake;

- Durban fisherfolk have witnessed rich people fishing off expensive boats and yachts unhindered while working-class subsistence fishermen suffer police harassment and arrests; fishermen have recently been denied access to New Pier, the South Pier, the Bluff military base and the quayside shore (Gunter Gulley, Yacht Mole, Lucky Dip); and there is worsening sea-water pollution – rubbish, oil and chemicals in the harbour – and apparently no environmental precautions being taken;

- Durban's hundreds of thousands of immigrants are under sustained attack; the May 2008 xenophobic attacks demonstrated a failed municipal state which by August washed its hands of ongoing xenophobia crisis and by November used police brutality to displace desperate refugees; Lesotho migrant workers are protesting the revocation of the 'six month' system of border concessions; there remain inadequate support systems and preventative measures against another xenophobia attack; and immigrants continue to face oppression in their dealings with the South African government and police;

Workers, the Poor and Communities under Attack

- whereas this country is rich because of the theft of our land and because of our work in the farms, mines, factories, kitchens and laundries of the rich; and that wealth is therefore also our wealth;

- the working class and poor of Durban are under severe pressure because of the world and SA economic crises, which have not yet lifted for us, costing the country more than a million lost jobs and leaving Durban badly exposed in sectors like shipping, clothing and textiles; poor and working people are being pushed out of any meaningful access to citizenship; recent government statistics prove the urban poor are becoming poorer; and we are being forced off land and out of our cities;

- too many of us who have formal water and electricity connections have not been able to afford the fast-rising costs of these services and face disconnection; the promise of housing has been downgraded to forced removal to a transit camp more like prisons than homes; housing that has been built exists in human dumping grounds far outside of the cities and far from work, schools, clinics and libraries; and there is a new, heavy-handed,
privatised municipal debt collection strategy that is wrecking state-community relationships;

- poor flat dwellers have suffered from unaffordable and exploitative rents; and the poor have been forced to sign exploitative rental agreements under duress and threat of eviction;

- farm dwellers have suffered the imprisonment of cattle, demolition of homes, denial of the right to bury loved ones, denial of basic service and brutality (and sometimes murder) at the hands of some farmers; and a biased justice system which has systematically undermined farm dwellers;

- outsourcing of casualised labour has become a full-fledged crisis, as witnessed in the revolt by Stallion Security workers who were exploited at Moses Mabhida and four other stadiums to the extent of protesting in the face of police stun grenades, tear gas and rubber bullets; crises caused by Durban’s labour brokers include the ports – partly responsible for a recent three-week strike by transport workers – and the University of KwaZulu-Natal, where underpaid workers (less than R1000 take-home pay for UKZN cleaners) are suffering;

**World Cup’s Pro-Rich Bias**

- whereas while the rich have benefited from the World Cup, the poor have not; the Zakumi doll mascot and other memorabilia were made in China not South Africa; Durban’s informal street traders have been displaced and barred from selling in the vicinity of stadiums; and Durban fisherfolk have been evicted from the city’s main North Beach and South Beach piers;

- township soccer facilities were meant to be created and maintained with state subsidies but have not been; and street kids were brutally displaced from central Durban in advance of the World Cup; according to former chief executive of the South African Premier Soccer League Trevor Phillips; “Durban has two football teams which attract crowds of only a few thousand. It would have been more sensible to have built smaller stadiums nearer the football-loving heartlands and used the surplus funds to have constructed training facilities in the townships”;

- FIFA’s tourist initiatives are based on what it calls ‘luxurious ambiance’ not working-class hospitality; promises of 450 000 international visitors for the World Cup were high overestimates; and many jobs in the tourism sector were shed when the overestimates became apparent;

**Public Transport**

- whereas many in Durban continue to be dependent upon private automobiles (with resulting adverse impacts on climate change); there has been a sharp decline in Durban’s public transport compared to other South African cities which have begun investing in the Bus Rapid Transit system; a government website (www.sa2010.gov.za) promised benefits for the host cities of the 2010 FIFA World Cup Soccer including “a fast, comfortable and low cost urban transport system … for central business districts but also in townships”;

226
• Durban officials have implemented air-conditioned “People Mover” buses with security guards at every stop, running every 15 minutes from 06h00 until 23h00, but only in the city centre and along the beachfront, mostly for the benefit of tourists; there is still terribly inadequate public transport in both the townships and suburbs, and many areas are currently unserviced, and others have with an infrequent and unreliable service with no bus timetables available;

Environment

• whereas the ‘greenwashing’ of the World Cup includes incorrect claims by Durban officials that the CO2 permanently emitted in the vast cement construction plus increased air travel can be ‘offset’ by planting trees (which themselves are only a temporary, fragile container of CO2 because they emit the same carbon when they die and biodegrade); officials brag about ‘carbon credits’ from burning methane from rubbish dumps in a World Bank Clean Development Mechanism project (even though such ‘emissions trading’ is a dangerous distraction from fighting climate change), and the poorest people of Durban will suffer the most from climate change;

• there is no sense in constructing new coal-fired plants (such as Medupi) and nuclear generators so as to give further electricity subsidies to vast multinational corporations such as BHP Billiton (which receives the world’s cheapest power). 100% renewable energy is a pre-requisite to avert global climate disruptions; the refusal to phase out coal, oil and gas also causes military conflicts, magnifying social and environmental injustice; and governments; corporations such as BP continue to support and finance fossil fuel exploration, extraction and activities that worsen global warming such as forest degradation and destruction on a massive scale, while dedicating only token sums to renewable energy, and leaving areas like South Durban with some of the world’s worst air pollution due to oil refining;

• global climate disruptions – extreme weather events, droughts, floods, increased disease, scarce water – are already disproportionately felt by small island states, coastal peoples, indigenous peoples, local communities, fisherfolk, women, youth, poor people, elderly and marginalised communities;

Our Rights of Expression

• whereas according to the bid proposal and subsequent contracts with the South African government, FIFA was given full indemnity “against all proceedings, claims and related costs (including professional adviser fees) which may be incurred or suffered by or threatened by others;” and in addition, “Police officers and other peace officials will be provided to enforce the protection of the marketing rights, broadcast rights, marks and other intellectual property rights of FIFA and its commercial partners” – as witnessed in the ridiculous arrest of Dutch women whose only crime was to wear an orange dress to Soccer City for the Holland-Denmark game;

• our own leading journalists are stifled from reporting on FIFA’s wrongdoing because of a required pledge not to throw the organisation into ‘disrepute’ as a prerequisite for
accreditation, as witnessed by the refusal of the national broadcaster to show the documentary film Fahrenheit 2010 made partly in Durban;

• the murder of three young men in Phoenix earlier this month is yet more evidence of local police brutality, as was the excessive force – stun grenades, tear gas and rubber bullets - used to subdue non-violent Stallion Security workers protesting at Moses Mabhida Stadium on Monday, June 14;

We therefore demand

• adequate compensation to Durban ratepayers and national taxpayers for the windfall profits made by construction of unnecessary stadiums such as Moses Mabhida,

• investigations into extreme cost escalations, and a renewed commitment for a fiscal boost to remove South Africa’s vast backlogs of housing, water/sanitation, electricity, clinics, schools and roads;

• immediate imposition of taxation and exchange controls on multinational and local corporations associated with the World Cup, on grounds that contracts entered into with FIFA are legally Odious;

• investigations into bribery and corruption associated with FIFA contracts and World Cup construction in Durban and especially in Mpumalanga Province, and full criminal investigations into Durban’s own recent corruption scandals;

• a thorough overhaul of Durban’s Council and ward committee system so as to introduce genuine democracy and popular participation;

• a commission of inquiry into events associated with the jailing of the Abahlali baseMjondolo Kennedy Road 13, their unconditional release, and the right of return of AbM to Kennedy Road;

• the end of municipal harassment of traders, especially in the Early Morning Market at Warwick Junction, and subsidies that would permit it to become an historic monument, having just marked the market’s centenary;

• the end of municipal harassment of Durban fisherfolk, the imposition of more reasonable fishing license fees, and a recommitment to cleaning the harbour and beaches of pollution of all sorts;

• a renewed commitment to combating the scourge of xenophobia;

• a redistribution of the society’s income and wealth so that South Africa is no longer the world’s most unequal major economy, an end to the municipal debt collection strategy and other systems that worsen inequality, and increases in free basic water and electricity allotments financed through a luxury consumption tax on those who use too much;

• an end to exploitative rental and housing arrangements, to oppression of rural people and to injustice against farm dwellers;

• a ban on labour broking, as has long been promised by the ruling party;

• a dramatic increase in township soccer and sports facilities;

• follow-through on the promise of “a fast, comfortable and low cost urban transport system … for central business districts but also in townships” and an expansion of “People Mover” buses across metro eThekwini;

• an end to new coal-fired plants and nuclear generators so as to save the environment from certain destruction, stringent monitoring of air and water quality and public access to the
findings, strict law enforcement against polluters and littering, a commitment to proper maintenance of all Durban’s green areas in a cohesive, sensitive,
• responsible and inclusive manner for the benefit of the environment and the people of Durban not just the city elite, dedication to the eradication and control of alien species with a view to permanent job creation, and strict enforcement of city bylaws by Metro Police to prevent urban decay, slum development and the resultant health hazards
• and environmental degradation;
• a retraction of indemnity to FIFA and end to the order prohibiting journalists from throwing FIFA into ‘disrepute’ as a prerequisite for accreditation;
• an end to police brutality, proper policing of all neighbourhoods, and redirection of policing resources spent on FIFA to all citizens;
• an end to the arrogant, authoritarian, exclusive, insensitive, parochial decision-making processes undertaken by the ETHEKWINI Municipality throughout all areas of its jurisdiction.

When considering the speed and lavishness with which services were delivered for the 2010 World Cup, we have no doubt the above demands can be met timeously and professionally.

Handed over by: ______________________ on ___________________ at _________________

Signature: __________________________

Received by: _______________________

Signature: __________________________

DURBAN SOCIAL FORUM CONTACTS:
Abahlali Base Mjondolo – Mnkelo Ndabankulu 0797450653
Abasha – Phindile Xulu
Centre for Civil Society – Trevor Ngwane 0790307657
Climate Justice Now! KZN – Alice Thomson 0845643891
begin_of_the_skype_highlighting 0845643891 end_of_the_skype_highlighting
Clairwood Ratepayers Association – Rishi Singh cell 082553907
begin_of_the_skype_highlighting 082553907 end_of_the_skype_highlighting
Clairwood Social Forum – Pravin Namsok or Sydney Govindasamy
Diakonia Council of Churches – Karen Read 0837831515
begin_of_the_skype_highlighting 0837831515 end_of_the_skype_highlighting
Early Morning Market Support Group – Roy Chetty 0823348461
begin_of_the_skype_highlighting 0823348461 end_of_the_skype_highlighting
ECOPEACE Party – Alan Murphy 0842037721
begin_of_the_skype_highlighting 0842037721 end_of_the_skype_highlighting

Earthlife Africa – eThekwini – Alice Thomson 031 465 9038
begin_of_the_skype_highlighting 031 465 9038 end_of_the_skype_highlighting
groundWork – Bobby Peak cell 083 982 6939
begin_of_the_skype_highlighting 083 982 6939 end_of_the_skype_highlighting
Islamic Propagation Centre International – Yusuf Ismail 076 816 4169
begin_of_the_skype_highlighting 076 816 4169 end_of_the_skype_highlighting
KZN Subsistence Fishers' Forum – Essop Mohamed cell 083 786 4175
begin_of_the_skype_highlighting 083 786 4175 end_of_the_skype_highlighting
Palestine Support Committee – Lubna Nadjai 083 786 4918
begin_of_the_skype_highlighting 083 786 4918 end_of_the_skype_highlighting
Social Movements Indaba – Rassool Snyman 083 543 2480
begin_of_the_skype_highlighting 083 543 2480 end_of_the_skype_highlighting
Socialist Party of Azania – Asha Moodley
South Durban Community Environmental Alliance – Des D'Sa 083 982 6939
begin_of_the_skype_highlighting 083 982 6939 end_of_the_skype_highlighting
Ubuntu Babash Youth Organisation – Marvellous Ngwenya 084 376 2901
begin_of_the_skype_highlighting 084 376 2901 end_of_the_skype_highlighting
Umbilo Action Group – Vanessa Burger 082 847 7766
begin_of_the_skype_highlighting 082 847 7766 end_of_the_skype_highlighting
Umphilo waManzi – Mary Galvin 031 205 9034 begin_of_the_skype_highlighting 031 205 9034 end_of_the_skype_highlighting
World Class Cities for All campaign – Lou Haysom / Pat Horn cell 076 706 5282
begin_of_the_skype_highlighting 076 706 5282 end_of_the_skype_highlighting
Wentworth Development Forum – Patrick Mkhize cell 083 555 0023
begin_of_the_skype_highlighting 083 555 0023 end_of_the_skype_highlighting
Women in Action – Carmel Chetty 031 563 1722
begin_of_the_skype_highlighting 031 563 1722 end_of_the_skype_highlighting
Youth in Action – Ndemiso Sandze 076 114 5083
begin_of_the_skype_highlighting 076 114 5083 end_of_the_skype_highlighting
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Press release Durban Social Forum

The Durban Social Forum consists of a number of civil society organisations. We will march peacefully on June 16 2010 to highlight the many long outstanding grievances of our communities and especially the youth. During the World Cup schools are closed yet there are valid fears of human trafficking. South Africa’s youth need education and real prospects, not prostitution, not army call-ups. Youth also demand delivery to the people not delivery to the rich elite and multinational corporations like Feefa.

Many of our grievances have been raised with various departments e.g. the Housing Department, with no joy received from the responsible officials. We have discovered a trend from eThekwini Metro to the KZN provincial government that unless grievances are raised by the alliance partners of the ruling party, communities that raise such grievances are ignored.

We are always willing and available to discuss these issues with government. On the day of the march we will be expecting someone appointed directly by government to come and collect the memorandum of grievances. It is important to expose these matters to the entire world that will be watching the World Cup tournaments.

The Durban Social Forum’s World Cup for All Campaign is for delivery of community needs. We unite our many and varied struggles not to boycott or oppose the World Cup, but to raise attention to the fact that since South Africa can host a successful international 2010 World Cup, and build some of the best stadiums in the world, then all other delivery should be also accomplished within a minimum timeframe.

For example, street traders must get their fare share – if we have money for stadiums we should not have any homeless people or people having to live in shacks – if we can afford the World Cup there should not be pot holes in the roads, electricity hikes, etc. etc. etc.

We ask all communities to send a message of support for this campaign together with their concerns and demands. We also ask for any creative ideas for alternative types of protests and actions.

We want to present government with these demands in order to ask for written
assurances of when they will live up to their commitments and duties to all the peoples and communities of South Africa.

Please pass on this message to as many interested people as possible. Please support this campaign. This is NOT anti-SA, but a PRO-delivery campaign to try and attain better service delivery for ALL people in our country. We note with dismay that South Africa has the most unequal economy in the world.

Vulnerable children, traders, the homeless, and other ‘undesirable’ elements are being removed from our cities so tourists won’t be ‘offended’ by the sight of the less fortunate, or they prove an embarrassment to our government. A camp established to temporarily house approximately 400 during the World Cup has had over 1600 people dumped there by the “Cleaning up the City” drive. Conditions there are considerably worse than living on the street.

The needs of ALL South Africans have been negatively impacted in the long term by this mega-event - from earning potential, the provision of basic services, to impingement on press freedom, the burden of national debt, etc, while the much vaunted potential tourism revenue dwindles in comparison.

Our government has sold its citizens out for a gigantic, short-term publicity stunt and we must not let them forget their responsibilities.

We have to ask about all the unfinished tasks of government: What about the poor, the shack dwellers, the homeless, the vulnerable children, the refugees?

We are very much concerned about issues such as human trafficking, and child prostitution since schools are closed while alcohol consumption is encouraged. Meanwhile the Police are redeployed from normal duties to devote service instead almost exclusively to THIEFA interests.

We are concerned that resources that should have also gone to the poor are instead used to gain profits only for the already wealthy and an elite group of corrupt tenderpreneurs. Street traders, subsistence fisherfolk, artists and local businesses are denied their rights.

*Please join our endeavour to rather serve the least well off in our society.*
Poor ‘cut out of Cup benefits’

NICOLA HAW

ALTHOUGH many people believe the World Cup has brought immense benefits to the city of Durban in terms of huge advances in infrastructure and tourist benefits, others are of the opinion that it is not as positive as it may seem and not everybody will score during the month-long tournament.

The Durban Social Forum, which encompasses a large number of civil society groups based in and around Durban, says that while Durban officials emphasise the benefits of the World Cup, these developments only affect the rich and serve to deprive the poor.

In order to convey its grievances, the forum is holding a peaceful protest march tomorrow at 10am from Dlinzulu Park (Botha’s Gardens) to the City Hall, where members hope to deliver a memorandum outlining their complaints to Mayor Olwez Mthaba.

The organisation, consisting of civil society organisations such as Ecopace, Atahillai Base Mjondolo (Snack dwellers’ movement) and Youth In Action, believe that all the complaints about the negative affects of the tournament have been ignored by Durban officials.

‘It argues that the R40 million the government had spent on the World Cup could have been used more effectively.

The group also objects to the prioritising of the World Cup over the building of schools and housing for the poor and believes that the hosting of the tournament has led to huge increases in terms of electricity, water and other living costs.

The dangers associated with the World Cup, it says, include threats of human trafficking and child prostitution.

**Obligations**

The country, it claims, has failed to meet its obligations to the South African public for a short-term publicity stunt.

‘There are hundreds of people being affected by the World Cup and nobody is taking cognisance,” said Des D’Sa, one of the organisers. “It’s the people that run the city and it’s these very people who are being deprived.

“We welcome the World Cup to South Africa, but our lives should not have to come to a standstill because of it,” said D’Sa.”

Daily News 15/06/2010
THIRTY-SIX sexily dressed Dutch women were forced out of Soccer City and held for hours in a Fifa office for wearing an orange outfit designed by a Dutch beer company.

The body-hugging orange mini-dress, known as the Dutchy dress, was part of a gift pack bought with Bavaria beer in Holland as part of the build-up for the World Cup.

Peer Swinkels, of Bavaria beer, said last night that colleagues in South Africa had told him 36 Dutch women had been arrested after the Netherlands-Denmark match yesterday for wearing the dress.

He said there was “no branding on what had been described, which was well known to be part of Bavaria beer in Holland.”

“People should have the right to wear whatever they want,” he said. “We launched the item on April 30 on the (Dutch) queen’s birthday which we call Queen’s Day. The Dutch people are a little crazy about orange and we wear it on public holidays and events like the World Cup.”

But Fifa has said the dress was part of an ambush marketing campaign that it would not allow.

Enoch Mavinia Barbara Kamin was a part of a large group that wore the dress, but many women at the stadium were the outfit.

“We were making a lot of noise and the cameras kept on focusing on us,” Kaminia said. “We were singing and having a good time.”

She said a Fifa official approached her and told her the dress was banned and that the women would have to leave the stadium, which they refused to do.

“In the second half, about 40 security guards surrounded us and forced us to leave. They pushed us up the stairs and one of the girls fell,” Kaminia said the group was taken into a Fifa office and interrogated for hours about the dress.

“The police came and they kept asking the same questions, if we worked for Bavaria. They said we were ambush marketing and that we would be arrested and stay in jail for six months.”

She said 34 of the girls were held for more than three hours.

The dress is worn by Sylvie van der Vaart, the wife of Real Madrid player Rafael van der Vaart.

It is not the first time Bavaria has courted controversy at a World Cup.

Four years ago Dutch fans in Bavaria-branded orange lederhosen were held to take the pants off at matches, which left many of the fans wearing just their underwear.

“This time we put no branding on the dress,” said Swinkels. “Fifa doesn’t have a monopoly over orange.”
Pamphlets taken away from activist

AITHI SANPATH

This was the scene opposite the headquarters of the Universal Taxi Congress when the police were called in to remove pamphlets from the venue.

The police removed the pamphlets and replaced them with “labels” that read “Stop the violence” and “People before profit.” However, the police also took the opportunity to remove all the pamphlets from the venue.

Thomson, who is leading a campaign against the police, was detained and charged with possession of pamphlets.

Thomson, who is leading a campaign against the police, was detained and charged with possession of pamphlets.

“While I was waiting for pamphlets the police said we had to come with them,” said Thomson.

The police took the official Pap message and replaced it with “Stop the violence” and “People before profit.”

She said she was also concerned about the lack of a proper public transport system.

“We only have the public transport system in place for the World Cup. But what happens after that?”

Desmond Dlamini, coordinator of the South Durban Community Environmental Alliance, said the march would continue.

He said that while all the arrests were in the city, the march would not stand still.

Metropolitan police commander, Joyce Khanyile, confirmed that metro police would be deployed at the march.

Daily News 16/06/2010
World Cup stewards strike over pay
Police cadets take over security at half of South Africa's World Cup stadiums as strike action spreads

David Smith and Owen Gibson in Johannesburg
guardian.co.uk, Wednesday 16 June 2010 15.08 BST

Protestors demonstrate against the 2010 World Cup in central Durban. Photograph: Aris Messinis/AFP/Getty Images

Police cadets have taken over security at half of South Africa's World Cup stadiums as strike action spreads across the country.

Police are now responsible for both Johannesburg stadiums and those in Cape Town, Durban and Port Elizabeth, as well as the International Broadcast Centre, after stewards walked out over pay. "We will do it for as long as it takes," a police spokesman said.

The protests began on Sunday night when police used teargas and fired rubber bullets to disperse stewards who refused to leave Durban's Moses Mabhida Stadium.
In Durban today stewards joined community activists in a peaceful demonstration of about 800 people to protest against the World Cup, which they say has directed public funds away from providing housing and jobs.

Demonstrators held placards that said "Apartheid Still Exists" and "World Cup for All! People Before Profit".

A police spokesman, Colonel Vish Naidoo, said the force was using cadets who had almost completed their police training, together with more experienced officers.

He added there were 1,000 officers on duty at Ellis Park last night for Brazil's match with North Korea after employees from security contractor Stallion downed tools hours before kick-off, but was unable to confirm how many were involved elsewhere.

The World Cup organising committee declined to address the issue at its daily news briefing today, referring all questions to police.

"We have nothing further to say about the security issue, please call the police," spokesman Rich Mkhondo said. "They are able to answer all security-related matters. All. Not me."

Mkhondo did not say which agency or security firm would provide security at the 84,000-capacity Soccer City stadium in Johannesburg when Argentina play South Korea tomorrow. Police spokeswoman Major Gen Leko Mbatha told the Associated Press that officers would be on duty at Soccer City as part of a "temporary arrangement" with the organising committee.

She said officers at Ellis Park did "an excellent job. We're very much confident they will continue to do so."

Fifa spokesman Nicolas Maingot said he did not know whether the organisation would be required to help fund the policing bill.

Fifa was criticised today by activists who said football's governing body had too much influence in South Africa, which has invested 33bn rand (£2.9bn) on stadiums and infrastructure.

Lubna Nadvi, from the Durban Social Forum, said: "Today's march is to give a voice to people who have been left out of the World Cup and to protect people who are being exploited by companies involved in the World Cup."

Cyril Xaba, a special adviser to the provincial prime minister in KwaZulu-Natal province, said the government could not intervene in the labour dispute, which could be settled by a state-funded arbitration committee.
"People have benefited from the World Cup," Xaba said. "Roads are built, stadiums were built and that brought jobs. There was also more work in the hospitality industry and more taxes raised by the government so everyone benefits from this, even when it's not visible straight away.

"Of course, we are not naive and we realise that not everyone can benefit directly. I sympathise with them."

Part of Durban's beachfront was cleared for fan zones, and street traders and fishermen have been excluded from the areas.

The protesters sang, prayed, danced and chanted slogans as they marched to the coastal city's town hall. Armed police were on standby.

As the protesters gathered in the shade of trees in a dusty downtown park impoverished residents collected water in empty bottles from a broken tap.
Striking South African World Cup guards wage war

By Pumza Fihlani
BBC News, Johannesburg

At a time when South Africa wants to put its best foot forward, a series of strikes at almost half of the World Cup stadiums threatens to hog the limelight.

Thousands of guards tasked with ensuring safety at the stadiums have gone on strike in Johannesburg, Durban and Cape Town - hours before the kick-off of World Cup matches - citing a wage dispute.

The country's police have been forced to take over security duties at four stadiums.

In one of the latest incidents, 1,000 officers from around Gauteng Province had to be diverted to Ellis Park stadium in Johannesburg to manage the 55,000 football fans set to attend the game hours before Brazil took on North Korea.

The guards told the BBC that they often worked 15-hour shifts and were "angry" and accused security company Stallion, their employer, of "exploitation".

"We are very angry. How can they expect us to survive on the money they want to
pay us?" one steward, who spoke on condition of anonymity, said.

"We are being exploited because we are poor, uneducated and don't know better," she added.

After just finishing a long shift, she had joined other guards in a protest outside Ellis Park - some chanting for their unpaid wages.

"I am tired that last thing I need is to be sitting here. But what choice do I have? These people are robbing us we have to fight them," she said.

'Fifa mafia!' The guards say they were promised 1,500 rand ($194; £133) per shift when they signed with the company last month. Instead they say they are receiving as little as 190 rand ($24; £17).

Most of the stewards are contracted to the Stallion, which has refused to comment on the strikes.

"We enjoy what we do," another guard at Ellis Park says.

"I have been unemployed for years and working as a security guard for the World Cup, it makes me feel like I am helping my country.

"But I deserve to be rewarded for my work, and rewarded well," she says.

Her views reflect a growing frustration at World Cup venues.

At a march in Durban, some 3,000 campaigners vented their anger on Wednesday at the lavish spending on the World Cup, AFP news agency reports.

"Get out Fifa mafia!" crowds chanted, their ranks swelled by stewards involved in clashes with riot police on Sunday.

Their dispute sparked the strike on Monday in Cape Town, where more than 1,000 police trainees were sent to Green Point stadium hours before the Italy-Paraguay match.
The head of the local organising committee, Danny Jordan, said that he recognises the right of workers to strike, but that match day disruptions were unacceptable.

The Congress of South African Trade Unions, a partner in an alliance with the ruling African National Congress, said the workers' wage shortfall was an example of "greed".

South Africa's Transport and Allied Workers' Union - the largest union representing the security guards - says it has asked labour authorities to investigate.

High alert
The union says it seems many workers were employed without written contracts.

"Most have been employed on a temporary basis under conditions which do not comply with the minimum conditions," the union said in a statement.

The police are on high alert - and anxious to show they can handle the disruption.

"Our priority is the safety of the tournament and the country as a whole. We will perform our responsibilities with diligence," Police Commissioner General Bheki Cele said.

He spoke as it was announced on Wednesday that his force would continue stadium security duties in Johannesburg, Durban and Cape Town.

His words will give little assurance to the strikers, who serve as a reminder that the millions of dollars generated by the World Cup are unlikely to improve the lives of millions living below the breadline.

More Africa stories

[news/world-africa-14283502]
The UN World Food Programme is set to start airlifting food aid to Somalia, its director says at crisis talks on East Africa's drought.

[Military plane crashes in Morocco]
[news/world-africa-14290795]
[Top Senegalese rapper arrested]
[news/world-africa-14288491]
IF THE government could commission and complete huge stadium projects with haste, what stopped it from delivering housing and services in good time to its people?

This was asked by thousands of people who marched through the Durban CBD yesterday, protesting against ills they said were visited on them because of the World Cup.

Marching under the banner of the Durban Social Forum, the marchers represented several NGOs.

The group protested over a range of issues, including backlogs in housing and increased growth in shack settlements, and poverty and unemployment. They said people had been promised jobs through hosting the World Cup, but traders had been barred from trading on the city's streets during the tournament.

Trevor Ngwane, an organiser of the march, said: "The government is not prioritising our concerns, they are not putting the needs of the people first. They can complete building stadiums early, but they can't complete building proper houses for the people."

Patrick Mkhize, provincial secretary of the Socialist Party of Azania (Sopa), said the purpose of the march was to expose that the city was in debt of R500 million because of the World Cup.

"If the city can spend so much money on Fifa, what has been stopping them from spending that on education, housing and health?"

Other protesters joined the strike to voice concerns about the rising water and electricity costs, and poor housing developments. Keith Gukel,
of the Wentworth Development Forum, said that RDP houses constructed in Lansdowne Road were unfit for habitation.

"Water leaks because the houses were badly built. The walls are cracking and the toilets don't work properly. How does the government expect us to live in those houses?"

Vanessa Black, of Earthlife Africa, a non-governmental organisation which addresses environmental issues, said the "overspending" on the World Cup was a cause for concern.

"There has been very little economic development. The transport system is in disarray, which has resulted in increased energy consumption," she said.

The protesters marched to the Durban city hall, where they were received by deputy mayor Logie Naidoo.

Representatives of the organisations in the march voiced their grievances and handed over a memorandum to Naidoo, who said all South African citizens would benefit from the World Cup.

He said there had been major upgrades in areas such as Clermont and Umlazi, and that construction of King Shaka Airport had created employment.

"The legacy of the World Cup is that the country will be at the centre of world attention. It will open up marketing opportunities, bring more tourists into the country and create more jobs," he said.
East Coast Radio

Environmental concerns around Cup
17 June 2010 - 11:52

By Bongi Tshiqi

Several organisations are hoping government will start focusing on ensuring poor South Africans also reap the rewards from the World Cup and that the tournament doesn't harm our environment.

The groups include Earthlife, Streetnet and the South Durban Community Environmental Alliance.

Members banded together for a march in the city centre yesterday to highlight their grievances around how the tournament is being handled.

One of the organisers, Alice Thomson, says a memorandum was handed over to the deputy mayor.

"There is an exclusion zone around the stadium so it's just the elite that are benefiting from the World Cup, and in fact poor people who've tried to benefit from the World Cup have been jailed or fined.

"We were promised a very good public transport system and that was supposed to be one of the benefits of the World Cup, and we have been environmental concerns about staging a big event like this."
Thousands protest against World Cup spending

MARINE VEITH | DURBAN, SOUTH AFRICA - Jun 16 2010 11:59

Thousands of South Africans staged a march on Wednesday to protest against lavish spending on the tournament and the sacking of security staff, inflicting a new embarrassment on organisers.

As the country marked the 34th anniversary of the Soweto uprising against apartheid rule, about 3 000 people marched in Durban to denounce Fifa and the government for their spending priorities when millions live in poverty.

"Get out Fifa mafia!" chanted the crowds in a Durban park, their ranks swelled by stewards who were involved in clashes with riot police on Monday after protests over their wages.

Monday's protests triggered walkouts by other stewards, which have led South Africa's police to take control at the World Cup stadiums in Cape Town, Port Elizabeth, Johannesburg and Durban.

Ever since it was awarded the staging rights, South Africa's government has faced accusations it should not be spending hundreds of millions of dollars on stadiums when about 40% of the population lives on less than $2 a day.

"If we have money for stadiums, we should not have any homeless people or people having to live in shacks," organiser Allan Murphy said ahead of the protest.

Much of the marchers' ire was directed towards Fifa, which has made record amounts of money from the first World Cup to be held in Africa.

Football's governing body has insisted that the dispute over stewards' wages is not its responsibility, having sub-contracted the work.

Widespread anger
But there is widespread anger among South Africans towards Fifa, whose demands for a smooth-running tournament have seen the government pour R33-billion ($4,3-billion) into World Cup preparations.

"The government has taken the ratepayers' money and handed it over to Fifa," said Desmond D'sa, one of the protest organisers.

The walkouts by the stewards, a wildcat strike by bus drivers and ranks of empty seats have combined to take the gloss off a largely triumphant opening to the tournament last week.

As the last of the 32 teams was due to play their first match in the tournament, including joint favourites Spain, local organising committee chief executive Danny Jordaan said that "overall, it's
been great".

But while organisers have rolled a series of new bus and rail services for the tournament, Jordaan acknowledged problems with transport and said restrictions on cars around the stadium may soon be extended.

South Africans have traditionally been wary of using public transport over fears of crime and are reluctant to leave the relative safety of their own vehicles.

"We have to try to restrict entry of cars into the precinct area around the stadiums and that will definitely happen," Jordaan told South African television.

Show of national unity
Bafana Bafana make their second appearance of the competition with an evening match against Uruguay after their opening day draw against Mexico.

Many workers turned up for the office on Wednesday wearing their green and yellow Bafana jerseys in a show of national unity seen as priceless in a country that is still trying to bridge racial divides.

The Star said the staging of the World Cup underlined how far South Africa had travelled since 1976, but added that the party atmosphere should not obscure the problems facing the nation.

"Instead of its despised status as a pariah state, South Africa is hosting 31 soccer teams from around the world, as well as the thousands of fans that have come to cheer them on," it said in an editorial.

"But post-apartheid South Africa is not a sea of love. It still has serious and potentially even explosive levels of inequality and poverty.

"We must be careful not to be misled by the bonhomie generated by the World Cup and common loyalty to Bafana Bafana." -- AFP

Source: Mail & Guardian Online
Web Address: http://mg.co.za/article/2010-06-16-thousands-protest-against-world-cup-spending
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(VIDEO recorded dates)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PLACE</th>
<th>EVENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAY, 2010</td>
<td>DURBAN, BEACHFRONT</td>
<td>KZNSFF meeting SNAKE PARK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY, 2010</td>
<td>DURBAN, BEACHFRONT</td>
<td>SNAKE PARK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY, 2010</td>
<td>DJURBAN, POINT</td>
<td>KZNSFF Meeting CHURCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE, 2010</td>
<td>DURBAN, BEACHFRONT</td>
<td>KZNSFF MEETING BAY OF PLENTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE, 2010</td>
<td>DURBAN, WENTWORTH</td>
<td>TALK W/ DESMOND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE, 2010</td>
<td>DURBAN, BEACHFRONT</td>
<td>TALK W/ FINANCIAL TIMES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE, 2010</td>
<td>DURBAN, BEACHFRONT</td>
<td>TALK W/ LEMONDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE, 2010</td>
<td>DURBAN, BEACHFRONT</td>
<td>BBC RADIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE, 2010</td>
<td>DURBAN, BEACHFRONT</td>
<td>OPENING WORLD CUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE, 2010</td>
<td>DURBAN, BEACHFRONT</td>
<td>SNAKE PARK GENERAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE, 2010</td>
<td>DURBAN, CITY CENTRE</td>
<td>SEAN &amp; CHRIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE, 2010</td>
<td>DURBAN, BEACHFRONT</td>
<td>DSF MARCH 16/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE, 2010</td>
<td>DURBAN, BEACHFRONT</td>
<td>CLARENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE, 2010</td>
<td>DURBAN, BEACHFRONT</td>
<td>RAMBO &amp; MAHARAJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULY, 2010</td>
<td>DURBAN, CATO MANOR</td>
<td>AMAN FRENCH TOURIST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULY, 2010</td>
<td>DURBAN, CATO MANOR</td>
<td>TALK W/ AMAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULY, 2010</td>
<td>DURBAN, CATO MANOR</td>
<td>DSF MARCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULY, 2010</td>
<td>DURBAN, CITY CENTRE</td>
<td>TALK W/ AMAN &amp; LOVIE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULY, 2010</td>
<td>DURBAN, BEACHFRONT</td>
<td>SNAKE PARK GENERAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULY, 2010</td>
<td>DURBAN, CATO MANOR</td>
<td>TALK W/ AMAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULY, 2010</td>
<td>DURBAN, BEACHFRONT</td>
<td>BAY OF PLENTY 22/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULY, 2010</td>
<td>DURBAN, BEACHFRONT</td>
<td>BAY OF PLENTY 24/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULY, 2010</td>
<td>DURBAN, BEACHFRONT</td>
<td>BAY OF PLENTY 28/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST, 2010</td>
<td>DURBAN, CATO MANOR</td>
<td>TALK W/ AMAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST, 2010</td>
<td>DURBAN, BEACHFRONT</td>
<td>SNAKE PARK GENERAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST, 2010</td>
<td>DURBAN, CHATSWORTH</td>
<td>KZNSFF AGM MEETING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST, 2011</td>
<td>DURBAN, BEACHFRONT</td>
<td>PROTEST 21/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER, 2010</td>
<td>DURBAN, PHOENIX</td>
<td>INTERVIEW BOB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER, 2010</td>
<td>DURBAN, CATO MANOR</td>
<td>TALK W/ AMAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY, 2011</td>
<td>DURBAN, CHATSWORTH</td>
<td>CLARENCE UNIT 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH, 2011</td>
<td>DURBAN, CHATSWORTH</td>
<td>CLARENCE UNIT 3 &amp; 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL, 2011</td>
<td>DURBAN, BEACHFRONT</td>
<td>OCCUPATION BAY OF PLENTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY, 2011</td>
<td>DURBAN, CHATSWORTH</td>
<td>INTERVIEW CLARENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY, 2011</td>
<td>DURBAN, BEACHFRONT</td>
<td>CLARENCE NIGHT FISHING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY, 2011</td>
<td>DURBAN, CATO MANOR</td>
<td>TALK W/ AMAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY, 2011</td>
<td>DURBAN, CATO MANOR</td>
<td>TALK W/ LOVIE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix K:2
(List of newspaper articles and letters to editor)

Bond, P. (08/06/2010) Six red cards for FIFA. *The Mercury*: 11
Carine, T. (17/05/2010) It’s war as fishermen threaten to ignore ban. *The Mercury*: 4
Davidson, K. (08/08/2010) Well done, Durban, for ban on fishing from beachfront piers. Sunday Tribune: 24
Everitt, J. (06/06/2010) Fishing from piers fouls beaches. Sunday Tribune
Govender, L. (13-17/07/2011) Fishermen up in rods over new fishing regulations, but municipality doesn’t budge. The Post: 3
Markandan, T. (15/06/2010) Anglers victimised, but beware of fishy tales. The Mercury
Mohammed, E. (13/06/2010) Don’t cast that line at the fishermen. Sunday Tribune: 25
Moodley, E. (30/08/2010) Piers are not sacred, keep entire city clean. Daily News:
Nugent, G. (17/05/2010) Keep Durban As A Holiday Destination Of Choice. The
Mercury: 7
News: 5
Daily News: 8
Roberts, D.J. (18/06/2010) The rebranding of Durban. The Mercury: 17
d’Sa, D (14/05/2010) Fishermen set to defy Sutcliffe ban. Daily News:12
d’Sa, D (04/06/2010) City must have other fish to fry. The Mercury: 11
Saib, A. (30/05/2010) Anglers set to defy ban on pier fishing. Campaign to challenge
municipality planned. Tribune Herald: 3
Saib, A. (04/07/2010) Solution to fishing row after football. Sunday Tribune:
Sanpath, A. (02/09/2010) Call for report on pier fishing ban. Daily News:
Daily News: 5
News: 8
Smith, G. (01/08/2010) Beachfront is dirty and dangerous. The Mercury
Taylor, G. (09/06/2010) Bad fishing habits are no racial matter. The Mercury: 15
Unknown (26/05/2010) Well done, Mike, on World Cup. Daily News:
Unknown (23/06/2010) Protestors lash out at FIFA. The Rising Sun, Overport: 3
Unknown (16/08/2010) Punishment fits the crime. Daily News: 8
Unknown (22/04/2011) Fishing forum calls for unity. Chatsworth Tabloid.
Unknown (04/05/2011) Fishermen defy ‘no fishing’ on the piers. Chatsworth Tabloid:
Elk, R. (unknown) City has undergone a transformation. Unknown
Keep Durban Beautiful (unknown) Clean beachfront is amazing. Daily News
Coleman, S. ( ) See how good the beachfront is now.