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The 2010 FIFA World Cup: critical voices from below

Percy Ngonyama*

Department of Historical and Internet Studies, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, South Africa

This essay presents a different perspective of the 2010 World Cup: that of critical voices which include social movements, labour formations, Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and ‘left’-leaning individuals. Drawing on interviews with activists, written documents, conventional and alternative media, the essay argues that criticism of the event falls within two categories. First, the tournament will not benefit the poor and the disadvantaged. On the contrary, given developments on the ground, the opposite is more likely to happen. Second, the expenditure of billions of rands on the ‘elitist’ World Cup constitutes a misdirection of resources needed to meet a wide range of pressing social needs. These ‘voices from below’ also raise important questions pertaining to the projected economic spin-offs and the alleged ‘development’ and ‘anti poverty’ component of 2010. A number of community-based activities addressing the impact of World Cup preparations on the urban working class are given attention.

Introduction

In his first presidential address on 28 September 2008, Kgalema Motlanthe, told the nation and the world that the decision by the governing African National Congress (ANC) to ‘recall’ President Thabo Mbeki, would not lead to instability. He also mentioned the country’s hosting of the 2010 World Cup. ‘As you know, the 2010 FIFA World Cup is one of our major projects as a nation and as a continent’, said Motlanthe, ‘We are confident that working together, we will host the best FIFA World Cup ever. As a nation, let us welcome the world to our country, demonstrating the friendly hospitality for which we are well known.’¹ The ‘care taker’ president reiterated these sentiments in his televised 2009 New Year’s address. By emphasizing the political implications of 2010 on a national and continental scale, Motlanthe signalled a continuation of the approach taken by Mbeki and his administration.

In collaboration with soccer officials, corporate sponsors and the media, the South African government has instituted a well coordinated campaign aimed at rallying public support for the World Cup. The National Treasury has committed close to R33 billion towards stadium construction and refurbishment, and tournament-related infrastructural development.² The massive public financing has been justified along economic lines. Poverty alleviation elements have been incorporated into World Cup development plans and the expensive infrastructure, it is argued, will be of great use beyond 2010. As scholars have shown, bureaucrats and soccer bosses have invoked ‘patriotism’, ‘nationalism’ and ‘Pan Africanism’ to gain broad popular support for
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and to silence the ‘Afro pessimists’ who, for various reasons, do not believe that Africans can capably host the ‘World’s second most popular sporting event’.

Rather than engage with mainstream debates about South Africa’s hosting capabilities, this essay presents a different perspective: that of critical voices from social movements, Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), labour movements and individual ‘left’-leaning activists. Drawing on interviews with activists, written documents, alternative and conventional media, the essay argues that criticism of 2010 falls into two main categories. First, the tournament will not benefit the poor and the disadvantaged. On the contrary, given developments on the ground, the opposite is more likely to happen. Second, the expenditure of billions of rands on the World Cup constitutes a misdirection of resources needed to meet a wide range of pressing social needs. These ‘voices from below’ raise important questions about the projected economic spin-offs from 2010 and its alleged ‘anti poverty’ aspect. Moreover, a number of community-based activities and other campaigns addressing the impact of World Cup preparations on the urban working class are underway and deserve scholarly attention.

The term ‘social movements’ in this study refers to community-based grassroots organizations in post-apartheid South Africa that demand access to basic necessities, such as land, housing, water and electricity. Social movements locate the World Cup within the context of corporate globalization and South Africa’s acquiescence in this process. Commenting on the crass commercialization of the Olympic Games since the 1990s, an article in the left publication *Amandla* broadly represented the perspective of social movements and other critical voices on sporting mega events, when it noted how the Beijing Olympics ‘were run by private companies whose main aim was to make as much profit as possible. Everything from food to tampons were branded and sold like commodities.’

Eddie Cottle, Coordinator of the Campaign for Decent Work Towards and Beyond 2010 (henceforth CDW), launched at the 2007 World Social Forum in Nairobi, Kenya, has clearly articulated the position shared by many critics. In Cottle’s words:

> Nation states often compete fiercely for mega-event tournaments. They invest billions on luxury goods such as sports and entertainment facilities in the belief that it will enhance the image of the country and stimulate the economy. Impact assessments generally focus on economic growth and job creation without looking at the social implications and the social value of these projects in a context of pressing social needs.

A concern amongst grassroots activists is the neo-liberal dynamic of Western companies using soccer to profit from African markets and consumers. As the CEO of Puma, the German sportswear company, put it recently: ‘Africa is a large market with growth potential … South Africa will be the driving force for Puma’s growth in Africa’. Puma expects sales in Africa to increase 400% as a result of 2010. And as of 2007, FIFA had already secured $3.2 billion in corporate deals with national and global corporations. This compares favourably with the $2.8 billion raised by the 2006 World Cup in Germany.

On the domestic front, it is projected that 2010 will boost the local economy. For example, the anticipated arrival of 500,000 foreign visitors during the World Cup should benefit the hospitality and tourism sectors in the nine host cities. In addition, a televised audience in the billions may help to market the country and the continent worldwide. All the tendering processes related to 2010 projects must be in accordance with the Black Economic Empowerment (BEE) policy, which is aimed at
generating business for small- and medium-sized enterprises, and black entrepreneurs more generally. According to the state, this is ‘part of the way in which government will ensure the World Cup contributes to the country’s growth and development goals’.10

As a result of constant messaging by politicians, soccer officials and big business, many South Africans have come to believe in the ‘development narrative’ of 2010. For example, a 2010 document recently released by the Government Communication and Information System (GCIS) made the following assertion:

The hosting of 2010 will be a catalyst for faster economic growth and the achievement of development goals. South Africa has already met some of the millennium development goals for 2014 set by the United Nations (UN) in 2000. Being the 2010 host will give the country a significant boost towards its target growth rate of at least 6% by 2010. The timing of the World Cup is significant for South Africa as it coincides with the maturing of key government interventions such as the Accelerated and Shared Growth Initiative for South Africa (AsgiSA).11

In addition, a study by the accounting firm Grant Thornton predicts that 2010 will contribute R55 billion to South Africa’s Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and create 415,000 new jobs; and about R19 billion in tax revenue will pour in. Most of the economic benefits are expected to be in the tourism sector.12

David Masondo, Chairperson of the Young Communist League (YCL) does not share the optimism of 2010 organizers regarding the ‘trickle down’ effects of the event. On the contrary, he identifies a growing ‘disturbing ruling class culture’ that justifies extravagant government projects, such as the 1999 rearmament programme and the Gautrain,13 ‘whose ‘poverty alleviation’ components deliver few if any benefits to the poor. Masondo expressed deep concern over what he described as 2010’s ‘false expectations’ and their potential repercussions. How will poor South Africans react upon realizing that the World Cup brought them no significant tangible benefit? Who will they vent their anger and frustration on? Who will be the soft target? Masondo noted how these deeply rooted anxieties formed the backdrop to the 2008 xenophobic violence against, mainly, African foreign nationals.14

Masondo’s unsettling comments suggest how a broader and deeper analysis of 2010 must take into account the current political and economic conjuncture in South Africa and globally. The past ten years of economic growth have resulted in neither a ‘trickle down’ effect, nor the creation of decent work with a living wage for the mostly black working poor. Masondo doubts the World Cup will change this dynamic. In this grim context, there is a strong sense among commentators on the left that the World Cup is poised to further enrich the wealthy and that the event’s much talked about ‘resounding success’ will come at the expense of the disadvantaged who will be exploited, expected to work longer hours to meet deadlines, evicted from unsightly shack settlements; and deprived of their livelihoods.

Mnikelo Ndabambi and Zodwa Nsibande, leading activists in the militant Abahlali Basemjondolo (AbM), or simply Abahlali, a movement for shack dwellers in Durban – support this view and reject the official claims about 2010’s anticipated social benefits. In response to the World Cup, and to highlight their plight, Abahlali have formulated the slogan ‘2010: free from shack fires, free from evictions, houses for all!’ The activists are adamant that the ‘pro poor’ statements are merely rhetorical and aimed at rallying public support for 2010 while diverting attention from massive government spending. Nsibande believes South African organizers view the poor as a potential
'embarrassment' in the face of hundreds of thousands of foreign tourists, and identifies South African soccer officials as amongst the likely beneficiaries of 2010.\(^{15}\)

Makoma Lekalakala, former Chairperson of the Social Movements Indaba (SMI),\(^ {16}\) agrees with Nsibande’s sentiments. About the promised employment opportunities, she states that: ‘There was so much euphoria with the bid; very few questioned the validity of the statements and promises that were made. The jobs that were promised are likely to be short term and not paying a living wage.’\(^ {17}\) At its 2008 annual meeting, the SMI questioned the government’s spending priorities. It located 2010 within the inherently ‘anti poor’ process of corporate globalization and adopted a resolution denouncing the project as a serious misdirection of scarce resources for pressing social needs.\(^ {18}\)

Lekalakala also raises the interesting issue of World Cup volunteerism – an increasingly important part of mega-events – to call attention to the neo-imperialism of the World Cup finals. The call for ‘patriotic volunteers’ to assist with a number of aspects of 2010 is gaining momentum. The Preliminary Draw held in Durban on 25 November 2007 attracted about 500 volunteers. These men and women received no remuneration except meagre per diems and were ‘rewarded’ with event t-shirts, caps and jackets as a token of appreciation. For the 2009 FIFA Confederations Cup, a ‘precursor’ to the World Cup, about 6,000 volunteers will be required, about 9,000 fewer than in 2010.\(^ {19}\)

For Lekalakala, heavy reliance on volunteer labour in the context of massive public spending and job creation rhetoric connected to 2010 exemplifies ordinary workers’ vulnerability and exploitation. In her words:

> Volunteerism is seen as part of South Africa’s hospitality. Volunteers will get to see some games for free and will receive certificates. Volunteerism is more exploitation of our people. Our people are being taken for a ride. The government is also encouraging people to volunteer. Where will the skills gained ever be put to use again?\(^ {20}\)

Building on Lekalakala’s insights, David Masondo added that it is irrational to think volunteerism is done for altruistic reasons in a country with a 40% unofficial rate of unemployment. ‘Volunteerism in the society we live in should never be compared to volunteerism in societies not marred by the vast inequalities we have in ours’, said Masondo.\(^ {21}\)

Human trafficking and 2010 is another major concern for some activists. Lekalakala, for instance, believes the public should ask the government what measures are being put in place to prevent this pernicious commerce. South Africa is seen as a ‘regional centre of trafficking’ and lacks legislation to effectively deal with the problem.\(^ {22}\) The suspended National Commissioner of Police, Jackie Selebi, raised eyebrows when he suggested to the parliamentary Safety and Security Portfolio Committee that sex work, as part of a ‘safety campaign’, should be decriminalized for the duration of the World Cup and ‘red light districts’ should be introduced in host cities.\(^ {23}\) A year later, George Lekgetho, ANC Member of Parliament, echoed Selebi’s words at a meeting of the parliamentary Portfolio Committee on Arts and Culture. He suggested, to the dismay of women’s rights and feminist activists, that legalizing sex work during the World Cup will add to the success of the tournament and limit the number of rapes. And the tax revenue derived from this initiative ‘would improve the lives of the unemployed’.\(^ {24}\) Such proposals are clearly not out of concern for the many women who, for one reason or another, have been forced into sex work, but should be located within the framework of the dominant narrow engagement with 2010 which is
merely concerned with pleasing the expected soccer, mainly male, tourists; and seeing the event succeed at all costs. This approach is what social movements and other critical voices have sought to move beyond in their engagement with the World Cup.

The re-emergence in the late 1990s of community-based organizations in South Africa campaigning for basic necessities and the decommodification of basic services was related to the failure of the post-apartheid government to meet the expectations of the black majority. Social movements have used provisions in the Bill of Rights to mobilize communities and demand constitutionally guaranteed access to the most basic of necessities, including, water, electricity and housing. The ‘enabling’ post-apartheid conjuncture, including the removal of ‘repressive’ legislation by the democratic government, has also been a factor in facilitating the rise of social movements located in ‘the broader landscape of civil society’. However, there have been several attempts – some reminiscent of the white supremacist past – by the security establishment and politicians to interfere with and thwart legitimate and legal protests against macro-economic policies that have not improved the lives of the majority of the people. Overall, the social movements represent a wide range of constituencies, but due to the interconnected nature of some of the issues they are concerned with, there are overlapping memberships.

While it has been difficult to bring together a rich diversity of single-issue social movements, Dale McKinley, a leading activist in the Anti-Privatization Forum (APF), told me in an interview that as the World Cup kick-off, approaches various activities may coalesce into one major united response. McKinley, an independent researcher and writer, stressed the importance of unity and solidarity amongst South African ‘progressive’ forces and not just for the World Cup. ‘The left’, he said, ‘should unite and formulate a broad programme of action. Had this been in place, mobilization and reaction to 2010 would have fallen within such an agenda.’

The APF has incorporated 2010 within its ongoing programme and struggles for people’s basic needs. A number of multi-pronged interventions leading up to and during 2010 have been discussed. These include media statements, pickets, mobilization and protest marches, which McKinley and other activists suspect the authorities may try to ‘outlaw’. The APF intends to problematize the construction of so-called ‘world class’ stadia and other infrastructure under the rubric of the pride of host cities and the nation. McKinley says,

The aim thus far has been to expose the contradictions. The beautiful and extravagant stadia being built around impoverished communities … Prior and during the World Cup we will be organizing ‘People’s inspections’, as during the WSSD when foreign visitors were taken to Alexander and other impoverished communities to see a different picture all together. An APF Youth cadre development programme is in place and it makes connection between the plight of the youth and lack of opportunities and sporting resources in many townships and indigent communities, and the 2010.

McKinley expresses similar sentiments in an article which makes a connection between the continued lack of development of soccer infrastructure and material resources amongst poor communities and the democratic government’s ‘market friendly’ policies. While the South African Football Association recorded a R87 million profit for the year 2005/06, just R3 million was allocated towards the development of the game.

The community struggle advocated by the APF aims to present the ‘hidden’ side of South Africa to the world and to the South African public in order to broaden the
debate around the 2010 national project. There are also plans for well coordinated campaigns to put pressure on the authorities to deliver on the expectations and promises they have created. McKinley sees a problem with boasting ‘state of the art’ infrastructure in indigent communities that does not significantly contribute to improving the material lives of the people.

**Stadiums and shacks: the Slums Clearance Act in Durban**

It is widely acknowledged that the ANC government’s housing programmes have, thus far, failed to eradicate the massive housing backlog bequeathed by the legacy of apartheid. Many families lack adequate and proper housing and live in sub-standard conditions. On the eve of the launch of a damning 2006 United Nations Development Report, Desmond D’sa of the South Durban Community Environmental Alliances stated that the city of Durban with a population of about three million is home to more than 180,000 shack dwellers with no access to basic necessities, including water and sanitation. This is a crucial fact given that a new 70,000 seat stadium under construction in Durban carries a price tag of about R2.6 billion. Evidently, these massive funds are being diverted from other social needs in the province of KwaZulu-Natal (KZN). By way of example, KZN Education MEC, Ina Cronje, revealed in 2008 that her department was allocated a paltry R1.2 billion for the 2008/09 financial year, despite the department’s need for, among other things, R30 billion to pay for the backlog of 10,000 classrooms, 17,000 bathrooms and 700 fences.

It is also important to note how nearly R20 billion budgeted nationally for stadium construction and refurbishments over a period of four years equals the cost of an additional 90,000 low cost houses a year. Political economist Stephen Gelb believes South Africans need to start debating whether the country’s priority is 90,000 houses a year for four years or the 2010 World Cup. Gelb argues in favour of greater discussion about the misdirection of human and organizational resources associated with 2010.

Abahlali Basemjondolo in Durban ‘has been fighting 2010-related urban development’. The movement’s president, S’bu Zikode explained that ‘The soccer World Cup is a threat to our communities, in a sense, because it is putting pressure on the city to get rid of shacks … The eThekwini [Durban] Municipality’s idea that they want to develop a world-class city for the 2010 World Cup is sending a clear message to the poor – we are not wanted, and the illegal evictions, threats and brutalisation our communities are facing on a daily basis are proof of that.’ According to Zikode, ‘The seven thousand residents of Kennedy Road Informal Settlement depend on just five communal standpipes for their water supply, and one hundred and six pit latrines and three chemical toilets for sanitation.’

There are enough reasons to believe claims, such as the one made above, that leading up to the World Cup, the poor have become a ‘nuisance’ and are ‘unwanted’. The Mayor of Durban, Obed Mlaba, said of about 1,200 evicted street vendors: ‘It is happening everywhere. We have cleaned many areas in the city and also townships. This is a wonderful opportunity for us to clean up areas that have become unsavoury. It has also come to our attention that people steal and sell goods in the same market, which is few minutes away from the city hall (sic).’ Vendors were evicted from the Soldiers Way Flee Market to make way for the construction of what is suspected to be a 2010-related structure. Mlaba’s comments earned him a listing on the World Class Cities for All Campaign (WCCA) ‘Red Card’ list.
Abahlali has used its legal and constitutional rights to fight the local authorities. In February 2008, they filed papers with the Durban High Court arguing for the unconstitutionality of the provincial government’s ‘Elimination and Prevention of Re-Emergence of Slums Act, Act 6 of 2007’. Abahlali contend that the Act is ‘an attack on the poor’ and its section 16 (which provides for ‘eviction of unlawful occupiers’) is ‘inconsistent with section 26(2) of the South African Constitution. Abahlali argue that the ‘Slum Clearance’ policies are part of municipal ‘beautification’ schemes aimed at getting rid of ‘undesirable’ people and making them invisible during the 2010 World Cup. This hardline approach is of vital importance to Durban, which has invested heavily in 2010 and is due to host seven matches, including one semi-final, at the new Moses Mabhida Stadium.

Callous disregard for the poor in the build up to 2010 in Durban was further evidenced during the 2010 FIFA Preliminary Draw in November 2007. Street children were given ‘free lodging and housing’ at the overcrowded Westville Prison, thus exposing them to violent attacks, including rape and possible infection with HIV. The youths and some adults with small children were charged with loitering and punished with fines they could not afford to pay, thus facilitating the arrests. Moreover, the 2010 Draw took place against a backdrop of countrywide service delivery protests, a damning report by the South African Institute for Race Relations (SAIRR) revealing that South Africa’s poor have become poorer since 1996, and, most notably, amidst strikes by construction workers at various 2010 related sites, as will be shown below.

Abahlali liken the Slums Clearance Act to the colonial era 1934 Slums Act and the apartheid era 1951 Prevention of illegal Squatting Act; and they see similarities with Robert Mugabe’s ‘Operation Murambatsvia’. The shack dwellers see it as a means to facilitate forced removal of slum residents to ‘transit camps’, far away from their places of employment and the city. Marie Huchzermeyer, associate professor in the School of Architecture and Planning at Wits University, describes the Slums Clearance Act as a perverted South African interpretation of the UN Millennium Development Goals, which include the eradication of shacks. Huchzermeyer shares Abahlali’s concern about the eerie similarities between the new Act, passed in August 2007, and the cruel forced removal policies of the apartheid regime.

The Special Measures Act of 2006 makes a number of commitments to FIFA, including the creation of ‘designated areas’ into which only persons with a valid access card may enter. These commercial spaces are defined as ‘zones surrounding or adjacent to a stadium, venue, place or facility that the LOC, after consultation with the role players … identifies as an exclusion zone in which prescribed commercial activities by any person other than persons identified by the LOC are prohibited’. Mnikelok Ndbambi, Abahlali’s public relations officer, fears this provision will be applied against street vendors in favour of multinational fast food outlets who have signed sponsorship deals with FIFA. Even so, Ndabambi is certain that 2010 will not interfere with Abahlali’s programme for social justice. He says ‘our struggle is a lifetime one and cannot be disrupted by a month long tournament. If the government wants to avoid possible humiliation in the eyes of the world during 2010 they should provide us with houses.’

On Tuesday 27 January 2009, KwaZulu-Natal Judge President, Vuka Shabalala of the Durban High Court, not only dismissed Abahlali’s submission but he also applauded the KZN local government department for having adopted such a ‘progressive’ measure in getting rid of slums. Some observers believe this decision has
paved the way for the introduction of similar measures throughout the country. Following the decision, Abahlali immediately filed an application to appeal and has vowed to pursue the matter all the way to the highest Court in the land: the Constitutional Court.51

With signs that some form of ‘Anti-Slum’ legislations may be introduced nationally; and that street vendors and other disadvantaged groups will be marginalized from World Cup sites, McKinley of the APF hopes for a joint response by progressive forces across the ideological divide.52 Such a shift may be already happening. The World Class Cities for All (WCCA) campaign, involving two-dozen organizations of the urban poor, street vendors and traders, hawkers, sex workers, social movements and labour unions, was launched in 2006 in Johannesburg. StreetNet International’s international Coordinator, Pat Horne played a key role in attempting to mobilize a broad progressive movement around the issue of the 2010 World Cup’s impact on poor communities in South Africa.

That both Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU) (the largest trade union federation) and the APF attended the WCCA media launch in Johannesburg seemed auspicious. Prompted by the government’s ambitious ‘World Class Cities’ plan, this grassroots campaign adopted the slogan ‘Nothing for us without us! Walala Wasala!’ (‘you snooze, you lose!’ in Zulu). It challenged what it termed the ‘traditional elitist first world approaches’ to 2010-related urban renewal and development plans. Specifically, WCCA opposed a vision of cities in which the poor and marginalized people, including street vendors and the homeless, were to be chased away as part of a ‘beautification’ process. The activists pointed out that women and immigrants are usually among the ‘most vulnerable and lose their livelihoods in most plans for world class cities’.53 It is interesting to note how WCCA is a South African branch of an international campaign initiated by StreetNet International in 2006. The latest example of this emerging global movement is the formation of a similar operation by the National Alliance of Street Vendors of India in connection with Delhi’s hosting of the 2010 Commonwealth Games.54

Construction Workers

The exploitation of construction workers in 2010 building projects is exposed in a booklet dedicated to ‘the construction workers of South Africa who have died, been injured and who endure ongoing hardship and super-exploitation to build the transport infrastructure to ensure that South Africa hosts a successful 2010 Soccer World Cup’.55 The booklet contains information on ‘Proudly South African’56 corporations and their foreign counterparts in the ‘booming’ local construction sector, most of which have a very strong BEE element. The data include remuneration figures for top management and ordinary labourers. While the latter are expected to demonstrate a spirit of ‘patriotism’ and to appreciate being ‘part of making history’, the former and the shareholders make significant profits for themselves. For example, in 2006 the CEO of Group Five, a construction firm heavily invested in 2010 projects (e.g. Moses Mabhida Stadium) earned R5.9 million while the company registered a 73% increase in profits compared to 2005.57 ‘It would take a general worker 139 years to earn the average income of a construction sector executive in one year!’ noted The Campaign for Decent Work; ‘It would take a skilled artisan 56 years to earn the average income of a construction sector executive in one year!’58
Workers at 2010 construction sites have been far from passive. Many have downed tools in discontent over working conditions and low wages. Revealingly, 2010 organizers view workers’ protests as ‘inconveniences’ that threaten South Africa’s ability to meet FIFA deadlines. Masondo thinks this process exposes the myth about BEE’s wider social benefits and suggests that the newly empowered blacks are just as money hungry as their old counterparts, if not worse since they are an emergent ‘capitalist class’.59

One of the most dramatic construction workers’ protests occurred in June 2008 in Nelspruit in Mpumalanga. Construction workers at the Mbombela Stadium downed tools (not for the first time) over bonuses, night shift allowances and the sectoral classification of the stadium which impacts on wages. Workers demanded the intervention of President Mbeki who was due to visit the site. Management stressed that in order to ‘catch up’ the workers would have to work double shift after the strike was over. A spokesperson for the National Union of Mineworkers (NUM), which represented the workers, was quoted as saying that, ‘Management is saying it (the stadium) falls under the building industry and therefore the wages are calculated in terms of the bargaining council [for that sector]’.60 When the workers were dismissed by the Mbombela stadium Joint Venture constructing the arena for partaking in an ‘illegal’ strike, amongst other things, the Building and Wood Workers International (BWI), which is an affiliate of CDW, condemned the dismissal and highlighted the BEE element of Basil Read – forming part of the consortium constructing the stadium. Particularly, because of this, through its spokesperson, Cottle, who as stated above also coordinates CDW, BWI described the ‘drastic decision’ as ‘shameful’.61

At the Moses Mabhida Stadium construction site in Durban, workers went on strike in November 2007 over bonuses and remuneration. The Campaign for Decent Work, an initiative of the BWI revealed some shocking information about the construction sector, including a juxtaposition of wages earned by ordinary workers with that of top management and the general working conditions. The South African government and business sectors’ typical response to these strikes has been to criticize the workers for being insensitive, and even ‘unpatriotic’, and for failing to realize the larger significance of 2010. During an inspection visit to Durban’s Moses Mabhida Stadium, FIFA President Sepp Blatter pleaded with construction workers ‘not to wreck 2010’.62 By blaming the victim, some organizers have overlooked or downplayed the legitimacy of construction workers’ grievances. In sum, despite the rhetoric from the Local Organizing Committee and its supporters, ordinary workers have not shared in the profits generated so far, as shown above.

In his 2009 State of the Nation address to the joint sitting of parliament, President Motlanthe mentioned the 2010 World Cup but omitted dealing with the critical issues relating to the exploitation of desperate workers and the violation of the rights of the disadvantaged. Instead, Motlanthe waved the nationalist and Pan Africanist flags. ‘The true legacy of this spectacle’, said the president, ‘will be in our ability to showcase South African and African hospitality and humanity – to change once and for all perceptions of our country and our continent among peoples of the world. That depends on all of us; and to that we can attach no price!’63

While it is clearly elites, particularly within the political, business and soccer fraternities that stand to score big from 2010, the burden for a successful World Cup is placed on society at large. Struggling construction workers, the poor and the disadvantaged have been called upon to make the biggest sacrifices, such as volunteering, working long hours under terrible conditions for meagre wages in the name of
‘national interests’ and ‘patriotism’. Comparable demands have not been placed on the elites and private corporations. The overwhelming majority of those who have been negatively affected by the preparations for 2010, including ‘beautification’ and urban gentrification efforts, come from the ranks of the African poor. Conversely, some of the main beneficiaries of 2010, such as sponsors and those involved in lucrative government-funded infrastructure projects, are headquartered overseas. Such ironies raise questions about the much touted African, national and development potential of the mega-event. Ultimately, the measure we should use to gauge the ‘poverty alleviation’ and development outcomes of 2010 should be the number of poor South Africans whose lives will be improved as a direct result of the country having hosted the World Cup.

Conclusion

The 2009 election manifesto of the African National Congress, the country’s governing party, recognizes the growing inequalities and the worsening socio-economic conditions of the poorest of the poor and proposes ways in which the situation might be reversed. However, the ANC made no connection between poverty alleviation and the massive public funds allocated towards project 2010. Instead the World Cup is portrayed as a ‘top priority’ due to its ‘unifying’ potential – not only among South Africans but Africans across the continent. Over the next five years the ANC intends to

Ensure that the 2010 FIFA World Cup leaves a proud legacy that our children and our communities will enjoy for many years to come, and contributes to the long-term development of the country. The ANC government will work with all stakeholders to ensure that this world event contributes to create decent work opportunities, particularly for the youth, women and street traders.64

Only time will tell if concerns about 2010’s social and economic impact in South Africa will coalesce in a formidable united response by social movements and other critical voices as envisaged by McKinley. A critical engagement with 2010 that moves beyond narrow nationalist and Pan Africanist terms is necessary, especially because it is almost absent from ongoing mainstream debates and daily discourses. This conversation should be conducted in the same spirit as that which characterized the country’s successful liberation struggle. It is naive to think that a one month long tournament will lead to sustainable unity and reconciliation in a sharply divided South Africa. While these divisions have deep historical roots in the white supremacist order of the past, in recent years class inequalities have widened within racial groups more than between them. Within this context, South Africa needs to consider and debate the extent to which ‘Project 2010’ may perpetuate or challenge existing social and economic cleavages.
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