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Abstract

How do South African political parties frame immigration policies and concerns regarding the integration of immigrants? This essay examines this question by analyzing seventeen manifestos of five political parties, covering five national elections from 1994 to 2014, to understand how the parties conceive and represent what is commonly known as the “immigration issue.” The study applies a new international measure of the parties’ perspectives on immigration, based on manifesto data. Four of the five parties do not give much attention to immigration and the integration of immigrants into society. This comes as a surprise in a country with strong anti-immigrant sentiments but also a shortage of critical skills which could be reduced through immigration. When parties have framed the issue, they have focused most of their attention within the cultural dimension. Parties sometimes have combined positive and negative outlooks, but other times they have projected only negative, although sometimes only positive, perspectives.
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South Africa has a long history of international migration and, since 1994, the country has been a preferred destination for people from all parts of the world, especially from the rest of Africa. Although immigration has not shaped electoral competition in South Africa as it has in the United States and Europe, the increase in the number of international migrants has been accompanied by widespread xenophobia. Citizens display negative attitudes toward foreigners and physically harm them. Xenophobia is an ongoing problem and seems to be
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worsening since the spate of violent attacks in April 2015 in which at least eight people were killed and thousands of people displaced in and around Durban and Johannesburg. These attacks followed similar xenophobic violence in May 2008, in which sixty-two people were killed, hundreds injured, tens of thousands displaced, and much property destroyed.¹

Immigration and the integration of immigrants is a broad policy domain involving a large variety of subconcerns.² Immigration and related topics are commonly referenced as the “immigration issue.” Immigration in South Africa covers matters such as rules of entry and the residence status of various categories of noncitizens, which are defined by the Refugees Act of 1998 and the Immigration Act of 2002. These categories include: asylum seekers, refugees, temporary residents, permanent residents, and undocumented foreigners. Immigration also can involve illegality, family reunification, and acquisition of citizenship. Immigrant integration involves matters of access to social services and social welfare as well as migrant rights, identity, and assimilation. Integration is closely associated with the socio-economic rights contained in South Africa’s constitution of 1996, which are guaranteed to both citizens and noncitizens.

Immigration and related integration tend to be contentious because questions of national identity, belonging, and security underlie them. Various perspectives exist about how immigration should be addressed, shaped largely by how migration itself is viewed—positively or negatively. This author has argued that one of the reasons why xenophobia is so prevalent in South Africa is because the public and political discourse regarding immigration is mainly negative, and Africans, who are the majority of migrants, are seen as reaping benefits meant for previously marginalized black South Africans.³ Xenophobia is thus a salient topic in South Africa that is linked to immigration policy and the integration of immigrants. It is important, therefore, to examine the positions of South African political parties on immigration, as parties are key institutions in a democracy. Some political leaders have projected negative perceptions of migrants and even instigated xenophobic violence through their public utterances. Various politicians have made positive or negative public statements in reaction to specific attacks on migrants. However, it is not clear whether they have expressed their personal views or the positions of their political parties. Thus, although members of political parties make statements

about immigration which are reported by the media, these statements are not a reliable means by which to assess the views of South Africa’s parties on immigration. The same applies to parliamentary debates in which members of parliament have discussed immigration. Consequently, this study analyzes party election programs, or their election manifests.

Election manifests are regarded as the main authoritative policy statements of political parties and serve as indicators of parties’ policy preferences at a given point in time. These documents should capture the critical issues of the day, as elections take place within a particular socio-political context. In South Africa, these issues include: poverty, inequality, corruption, HIV/AIDS, economic growth, unemployment, crime, and xenophobia. Manifestos should shed light on how parties perceive such issues during a specific period as well as over time. Furthermore, analyzing manifestos which have been uniformly coded makes it possible to conduct a comparative assessment of party policy positions across elections and countries within a common framework. It is for these reasons that manifestos have been selected as the subject for a quantitative content analysis on matters related to immigration.

This essay examines seventeen election manifestos developed by five political parties since South Africa’s first democratic elections of 1994, in an effort to understand how parties frame matters related to immigration and the integration of immigrants. The five parties are the African National Congress (ANC), the Congress of the People (COPE), the Democratic Alliance (DA), the Economic Freedom Fighters (EFF), and the Inkatha Freedom Party (IFP). These parties are regarded as the main political parties of South Africa, although the ruling ANC is dominant. Their election programs have been collected and coded in the Manifesto Project dataset. This research applies the classification of Pola Lehmann and Malisa Z. Zobel to the Manifesto Project coded manifestos of five South African political parties, which has not been done previously or in a longitudinal manner.

Until now, studies that have analyzed party manifestos in South Africa
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5 Ibid.
6 The DA contested the 1994 and 1999 elections as the Democratic Party, then changed its name in 2000 when the party merged with the New National Party and the Federal Alliance.
7 South Africa is the only African country represented in this growing dataset that contains the national election manifestos of fifty-six countries, mostly Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), Central, and Eastern European countries, since 1945. See Andrea Volkens, Pola Lehmann, Theres Matthiess, Nicolas Merz, Sven Regel, and Annika Werner, *The Manifesto Project Dataset—Codebook, Manifesto Project (MRG/CMP/MARPOR)*, version 2015a (Berlin: Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozial-forschung [WZB], 2015).
have examined a single manifesto for a particular election and focused on specific aspects such as gender mainstreaming,9 violence against women,10 and service delivery.11 All these analyses are related to the 2011 local government elections. Phindile Ntliziwyana and Conrad Bosire also have examined the main themes of seven political parties which participated in the same 2011 elections.12 Research based on national election manifestos has not been conducted previously. In addition, there are no prior studies of the positions of South African political parties on immigration, nor have prior studies of migration examined the outlooks of political parties. (Based on an analysis of newspaper reporting between 1994 and 2002, studies have investigated how the South African media have framed xenophobia.13) This study therefore adds a new strand to the South African literature on political parties and migration.

The next section briefly conceptualizes frames and how they are used by parties during electoral contests. The essay then describes the research design and methodology. Thereafter, the findings are presented, followed by a concluding discussion.

**Party Frames, Positions, and Electoral Contests**

Framing theory is located within the field of political communication, which is an interdisciplinary field involving a variety of disciplines such as political science, mass communication, journalism, sociology, and psychology.14 According to Robert Entman, to frame is to “select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating context, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation for the item described.”15 Framing concerns “selection and highlighting, and use of the highlighted elements to construct an argument about problems and their causation,
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evaluation, and/or solution.”16 The framing process, according to Jörg Matthes, is concerned with (1) the construction of information by political elites, (2) the process through which messages are communicated by the media, and (3) how individuals respond to these messages.17 Matthes summarizes frames as “selective views on issues—views that construct reality in a certain way leading to different evaluations and recommendations.”18 Lehmann and Zobel argue that the link between the categories of the Manifesto Project and their immigration classifications can be understood as a frame for investigating how parties articulate immigration and concerns about the assimilation of immigrants.19

Parties compete for votes on the basis of policy commitments or pledges.20 But they also seek to persuade voters by emphasizing certain issues over others and by presenting different interpretations of a problem and how it could be solved.21 In other words, electoral contests are based on how parties define a particular problem and what justifications they employ to defend their positions.22 Parties typically select frames that they believe will resonate with their core constituencies.23 They also avoid sensitive matters. Examining how parties frame issues sheds light on how they perceive them, why they adopt particular positions, and whether they are consistent regarding these subjects over time. It also shows salience, which is “the relative importance of particular issues to some parties.”24 Analyzing frames also reveals whether the way in which a party frames issues is compatible with the party’s ideology. Indeed, “ideological positions on a left-right scale are the major variables for the explanation of party competition.”25

Studies that have examined party positions on immigration in Western Europe have grouped parties into party families along a left-right continuum.26

16 Ibid., 53.
17 Matthes, “Framing Politics.”
18 Ibid., 249.
20 Akkerman, “Immigration Policy and Electoral Competition in Western Europe,” 57.
According to Simon Franzmann and André Kaiser, political competition is structured by parties’ proactively taking and changing positions on the left-right scale. In the case of South Africa, it is difficult to tell where parties and party positions lie on the left-right spectrum. Steven Friedman and Tšoeu Petlane argue that these categories are not very useful for analyzing parties, as South Africa’s politics is primarily identity-based and parties often take positions that are incongruent with their ideological labels.

Other authors such as Letitia Rohanlall contend that there is a left-right dimension in South African political parties, if party positions are analyzed within three domains: political, socio-economic, and socio-cultural. For example, in her analysis, the ANC can be viewed as a center-right party on political issues, favoring liberal democratic elements more than left elements of participatory democracy, and traditional governance. On socio-economic issues, the party is positioned as center-left, favoring social welfare, redistribution and affirmative action. The party can be seen as not just a liberal but libertarian or far left party on social-cultural issues, especially on abortion and gay and lesbian rights.

Using left and right in South Africa therefore may not always make much sense as party positions tend to vary depending on the point in question. This is likely to be the case with matters related to immigration and the integration of immigrants. However, it is not the intention of this essay to classify parties’ immigration frames into ideologies, as has been done in much of the Western European literature, but rather to examine the positions of parties on a topic irrespective of their ideologies and party families.

**Research Design and Methodology**

This study applies a methodology developed by Lehmann and Zobel which uses an existing dataset of coded manifestos—the Manifesto Project—and builds on its coding scheme by introducing a new measure to determine how
parties frame immigration.\textsuperscript{31} The coding scheme “combines the Manifesto Project category scheme with a new immigration classification.”\textsuperscript{32} The seventeen analyzed manifestos of the five South African political parties are contained in the Manifesto Project database. Of the seventeen, five belong to the ANC, five to the DA, and four to the IFP. These parties have contested each national election since 1994. However, the IFP did not have a manifesto for the watershed 1994 elections. There are also two COPE manifestos and one EFF manifesto. COPE and the EFF are newer parties that have contested two and one national election, respectively. All five parties have seats in parliament. All the manifestos were coded into quasi-sentences by the Manifesto Project. The unit of analysis is therefore the quasi-sentence (defined as a single sentence or part of a sentence containing a single statement or message),\textsuperscript{33} and the methodology is quantitative analysis.

In the first step of coding, the quasi-sentences of the seventeen manifestos were categorized into the three dimensions derived from Lehmann and Zobel: the cultural dimension (twenty possible categories), the economic dimension (twenty-four possible categories), and the political authority dimension (nine possible categories). The fifty-three categories consist of the Manifesto Project variables. Within the three dimensions, Lehmann and Zobel have identified twelve frames which make it possible to categorize the variables in terms of immigration-related topics.

The cultural dimension has five frames, of which three are supportive of immigration and the integration of immigrants, and two are critical (see figure 1). The supportive frames are the internationalist frames, universal or rights-based frames, and multicultural frames. The internationalist frames include sentences that express positive foreign relations and the promotion of peace by the state, as well as negative references to military takeovers and armed conflict. The universal/rights-based frames refer to democratic values and universal human rights. These include freedom, equality, dignity, and support for minorities. Multicultural frames are identity-related and consist of statements that celebrate cultural diversity and favor cultural openness as well as the peaceful coexistence of various cultures within a society. The two frames critical of immigration and the integration of immigrants are nationalistic and law and order frames. Nationalistic frames seek to preserve an exclusive national identity, mention international relations and multiculturalism in negative terms, and convey xenophobic attitudes. Law and order frames include arguments relating to law enforcement in the context of internal and external security threats.

\textsuperscript{31} Lehmann and Zobel have created a dataset on parties’ frames of immigration for thirteen OECD countries, using crowd coding.

\textsuperscript{32} Lehmann and Zobel, “A Question of National Pride or Universal Rights,” 1.

\textsuperscript{33} Werner et al., \textit{Manifesto Coding Instructions}, 6.
The economic dimension includes free-market economy frames, protectionist economy frames, welfare-state retrenchment frames, and welfare-state expansion and social rights frames (see figure 2). Free-market frames support labor immigration, which contributes to economic growth.
Protectionist economy frames, on the other hand, raise fears of decreasing wages and unemployment and thus are critical of immigration. Welfare-state retrenchment frames express concern about straining the social security system and therefore negatively frame the subject, while the welfare-state expansion frames support inclusive social rights and the expansion of education.

The political authority dimension consists of three frames—contested authority frames (negative), own competency or ownership frames (positive), and delegate authority frames (positive)—which revolve around the source of decisions regarding immigration and the integration of immigrants (see figure 3). The contested authority frame contains statements that discuss immigration with negative references to regional integration and constitutionalism, and support centralized decision making on immigration. Ownership frames contain sentences addressing the competency of the bureaucracy regarding immigration. The delegate authority frame uses constitutional arguments in support of immigration and calls for decentralized decision making concerning immigration.

In the second step of the coding process, the seventeen manifestos were manually recoded so that they could be analyzed using Lehmann and Zobel’s framework. In this round of coding, Lehmann and Zobel’s question was asked as the researcher read each quasi-sentence: “Is the sentence (or partial sentence) provided concerned with the issue of immigration and/or immigrant integration?” Lehmann and Zobel provide three possible answers:

- Yes, it addresses the issue of immigration and/or immigrant integration;
No, it does not address the issue of immigration and/or immigrant integration; and
It might possibly address the issue of immigration and/or immigrant integration.

Thereafter, the data were analyzed manually. Due to the small sample size as compared to that of Lehmann and Zobel, qualitative statements are used to present the results of the analysis in contrast to Lehmann and Zobel’s quantitative analysis.

Findings

The results of the study are presented for each political party across the three dimensions—cultural, economic, and political authority—and within frames over different elections. It is important to highlight at the outset that the analyses of the party election programs that follow are based on very limited data as only a few quasi-sentences in these documents concern immigration topics. The data reveal that four of the five parties, the exception being the DA, do not pay much attention to immigration and the integration of immigrants. It is no surprise that subjects such as service delivery, corruption, poverty, HIV/AIDS, unemployment, and crime are emphasized, given the governance, socio-economic, and security context of South Africa. However, it is both surprising and concerning that not all the major political parties have articulated their positions on immigration. South Africa has strong anti-immigrant sentiments, yet also a shortage of skills in the education, health, and infrastructure sectors, which are critical to driving sustainable economic growth. Manifestos that recognize the skills shortage mostly propose inward-looking strategies.

The African National Congress (ANC)
The ANC is South Africa’s ruling party. The former liberation movement has been in power since 1994 and has retained its dominance by winning over 60 percent of the votes in all five national elections since the advent of democracy over two decades ago. The ANC’s 2009 election manifesto was the first to address immigration and the assimilation of immigrants. Previous manifestos used internationalist, universal/rights-based, and multicultural frames of the cultural dimension to support relations between South Africa and other states, foster a democracy which upholds human rights, and celebrate the racial and cultural diversity of South Africans. However, they did not directly address immigration. The 1999 election manifesto makes what could be considered an indirect link to immigration within the cultural dimension by noting the need to improve the policing of South Africa’s ports of entry to curb the smuggling of goods and people. This is more related to illegal trade and organized crime, however, than to immigration. Another possible frame, one that falls under the economic dimension and for which there is no elaboration, refers to
encouraging foreign investment to promote economic growth.

In the ANC’s 2009 election manifesto, migrants and xenophobia are explicitly mentioned by means of the cultural dimension in the context of universal/rights-based frames. The manifesto notes the need to fight xenophobic violence and hate speech, reflecting a broad understanding that xenophobia is manifested not only by physical violence but also verbally and attitudinally. It further states that awareness campaigns could help prevent the vice. The document also supports efforts to integrate migrants into local communities and recognizes that noncitizens contribute to the economy, without providing any elaboration. While taking a stand on a major concern of the day, the ANC’s response to the 2008 xenophobic violence nonetheless appears to have been reactive, suggesting that the party viewed xenophobia as episodic rather than longstanding and ongoing.

Immigration is also directly addressed in the ANC’s 2014 election manifesto using negative frames within the cultural dimension. The document emphasizes border controls, border security, and immigration management, thus framing immigration in terms of national security. According to Maggie Ibrahim, there has been a global trend toward considering migration in the light of security concerns, which normalizes the view that migrants are a threat.34 The 2014 ANC manifesto is also consistent with the party’s 2012 policy discussion document, which advocated measures to crack down on asylum seekers already in the country and make it difficult for new asylum seekers to enter South Africa.35 The 2014 manifesto also makes use of internationalist and rights-based frames that might possibly address immigration without directly doing so, similar to the ANC’s previous manifestos.

**The Congress of the People (COPE)**

COPE, formed in 2008, was the first breakaway party from the ANC following 1994. COPE’s 2009 and 2014 election manifestos do not make any direct statements about immigration and the integration of immigrants. However, the party’s use of internationalist frames and universal/rights-based frames, which both fall within the cultural dimension, might possibly address these issues, as these are positive frames. COPE’s two manifestos emphasize the importance of foreign relations and regional integration, as well as South Africa’s role in advancing Africa’s interests on the global stage. The documents also highlight the promotion and protection of human rights and the creation of a human rights culture. The use of these frames, although not with specific reference to immigration, to some observers might imply that COPE would frame immigration in terms of equality and justice. This is doubtful, however, because
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the 2009 manifesto was drafted in the aftermath of the 2008 xenophobic violence, and the party did not include a single statement on immigration.

The Democratic Alliance (DA)
The DA is the official opposition to the ANC in parliament and the governing party of the Western Cape Province, the only province not governed by the ANC. The DA is the only party whose percentage of votes has increased successively with each election since 1994. The party has consistently and directly addressed immigration and immigrant integration in its election manifests since 2004, and done so using cultural, economic, and political frames. In its 1994 and 1999 election manifestos, the then Democratic Party was vague about its position on immigration. However, its use of universal/rights-based frames and multicultural frames to indicate that the party respects human rights and supports diversity, as well as of the law and order frame to convey the need to protect the country’s borders, could be viewed as possibly addressing matters of immigration. The use of rights-based frames, without specific reference to immigration, was repeated in the 2004 manifesto.

The DA promotes the immigration of skilled workers to spur the country’s economic growth, using positive free-market economic frames (economic dimension) and ownership frames (political authority dimension). In its 2004 election manifesto, the party advocated the abolition of immigration quotas and other restrictions on skilled workers. It specifically mentioned in its 2009 manifesto the need to make it easy for health workers who gained their qualifications in another country to work in South Africa. In the same manifesto, the DA proposed to allow foreign students and workers living in the country who meet certain criteria to qualify for permanent residence.

The DA uses universal/rights-based frames (cultural dimension) to support the assimilation of migrants into South African society by providing training to immigrants on South Africa’s diverse cultures and languages. The DA also frames immigration using law and order frames that seek to restrict immigration. For instance, the 2009 manifesto states that the party will compel the country of an illegal migrant’s citizenship to bear his or her repatriation cost instead of South Africa. The document also mentions tightening security border patrols to curb illegal migration to ensure that migrants do not make use of social services. This implies that the DA tries to strike a balance between an open immigration policy for certain groups of migrants and a restrictive policy for illegal migrants who are seen as straining public services.

The Economic Freedom Fighters (EFF)
The EFF is the most recent party to be formed by former ANC members. The EFF contested its first national elections in 2014, performing better than COPE and the IFP. The party frames immigration positively within the cultural dimension in its 2014 election manifesto. It uses universal/rights-based subframes, specifically “equality positive” and “civic mindedness.”
The party promotes equal labor rights for local and international workers, without discriminating based on immigration status. This signals support for open borders for labor migration. In addition, the party contends that allowing migrant labor to become organized will unite the working class and combat xenophobia. Perhaps this is in recognition of the competition that exists in the unskilled and casual labor market, which is very aggressive in South Africa because of an oversupply of low-level skills, a legacy of apartheid. It is believed that migrants undercut citizens domestically on farms, construction sites, and in the hospitality and informal sectors, where they are willing to work for less pay and for longer hours. This makes migrants vulnerable to attacks by unemployed locals and opens the way for employers to exploit their nonunionized migrant staff. The EFF’s inclusive policy, however, could potentially alienate the party from its mainly working-class constituency, whose members may feel that foreigners take away jobs from locals. However, it could be a strategy to strengthen the working class and the unions themselves, as the latter have become fragmented by globalization which has brought with it retrenchments, labor brokering, and casualization of work.36 The EFF also proposes to criminalize racism and tribalism and to sensitize the public about national cohesion to combat xenophobia.

**The Inkatha Freedom Party (IFP)**

The IFP, which has been in existence since 1975, is rooted in the rural Zulu population of the Kwa-Zulu Natal Province. Despite efforts to reinvent itself as a more inclusive and national party, its electoral performance has been on a downward trend since 1994. The IFP makes no reference in its election manifestos to immigration in 1999 and 2004, but it does in 2009 and 2014. The party appears to be anti-immigration, as it directly uses negative nationalistic frames of the cultural dimension to address the integration of immigrants. In its 2009 manifesto, and perhaps in reaction to the 2008 pogroms, the IFP links immigration to crime by attributing the existence of xenophobia to an influx of migrants who allegedly are able to enter South Africa illegally because of its porous borders. The manifesto further lists xenophobia as one among other signs of moral degeneration that include violent crime and drug abuse.

The IFP’s 2014 election manifesto also frames immigration negatively under the cultural dimension. The link between immigration and crime is repeated from 2009, showing a consistent position over consecutive polls. However, unlike the 2009 election manifesto, law and order (positive) frames are used instead of nationalistic frames to contextualize immigration within national security. The party claims that the country’s porous borders facilitate

the unchecked entry and exit of foreigners. It is interesting to note that the views of the IFP in the 2009 and 2014 manifestos are no different from those of their party leader, Mangosuthu Buthelezi, when he was Minister of Home Affairs between 1994 and 2004. Buthelezi used negative nationalistic and law and order frames to draw links between migrants and crime and was ill-famed for his xenophobic utterances.

The IFP manifesto possibly addresses immigration indirectly through universal/rights-based frames, specifically freedom/human rights and multicultural frames. The party proclaims that it respects human dignity, is inclusive, and promotes multiculturalism. However, it is not clear whether these positions relate only to citizens and their multiple cultures, or also to noncitizens.

The IFP’s 2014 manifesto criticizes the government for allegedly not having a plan to accommodate people who migrate to towns and cities. While this could be coded as possibly addressing immigration using a positive frame within the political authority dimension, this researcher inferred that this is not likely to be the case, as the party already had taken a hard line on immigration and probably is referring to rural-urban migration over which there is a major political debate. According to Tara Polzer, the scale of internal migration among provinces and municipalities is by far the most numerically significant form of movement in South Africa, which poses challenges to government planning and social cohesion.37

Synthesis

It emerges from the preceding that the cultural dimension is the most dominantly used among others by the political parties to directly address immigration and the integration of immigrants. Within this dimension, the most commonly used frames are universal/rights-based frames (ANC, DA, and EFF), which are categorized as pro-immigration, followed by law and order frames (ANC, DA, and IFP) and nationalistic frames (IFP), which are regarded as anti-immigration. Based on the quasi-sentences, which are uneven across parties, the ANC and DA use both positive and negative frames, indicating that immigration policy is a delicate balancing act. The EFF uses only positive frames, while the IFP, only negative frames.

In terms of the economic dimension, used only by the DA, the party frames immigration within the positive free-market frames to express its support for labor migration as a contribution to economic growth. The political authority dimension also is used only by the DA. The party emphasizes reforming the immigration bureaucracy using the “efficiency” subframe under the positive

own competency/ownership frame.

All party manifestos use internationalist frames to convey to the electorate the party’s commitment to building relationships with other states. Thus, these frames possibly deal with immigration. The manifestos also embrace universal/human rights and multicultural frames, which are categorized as positive frames by Lehmann and Zobel. However, use of these frames in the South African context is misleading regarding immigration for three reasons.

First, the frames typically are used in relation to South Africans, whose votes the parties solicit. Migrants are a minority and estimated to make up less than 4 percent of South Africa’s population of fifty-four million. By law, they are not eligible to vote, and consequently are not regarded as a key political constituency. However, because of the entrenched xenophobic discourse in the country which depicts migrants as a threat to the security, health, economy, and jobs of citizens, they often are used as scapegoats for the socio-economic ills of South Africa.

Second, the human rights frames used in the party election programs in support of South Africa’s liberal constitutional democracy seem to be narrowly interpreted in terms of citizens, even though the constitution also protects noncitizens. Finally, the third reason is that parties celebrate multiculturalism which makes them appear cosmopolitan. However, this is done in the context of portraying South Africa as a “rainbow nation” of multiple races. Therefore, although the use of these frames could be coded as possibly addressing immigration, this would not correctly capture the local context. One also could argue that these indirect framings mean that parties that do not directly address immigration are indifferent or have moderate positions about immigration. However, this is not convincing, as xenophobia has become deeply entrenched in the two decades of South Africa’s democracy. Migrants, especially those from elsewhere in Africa, continue to be marginalized and brutalized. Yet, the laws grant them generous rights and protections, although they often are not realized or enforced in the day-to-day lives of migrants.

Conclusion

This essay has examined how South Africa’s main political parties have framed immigration topics in their election manifestos in five national elections since 1994. The research has used a new analytical framework of party frames on matters of immigration, conceptualized by Lehmann and
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Zobel. The framework, which builds on the Manifesto Project dataset and has been applied to parties in thirteen OECD countries, was adopted to examine the South African context. The analysis of the seventeen manifestos found that the political parties’ framing of immigration is generally minimal (ANC, EFF, and IFP) or nonexistent (COPE), with the variance being the DA, which, compared to the other four parties, provides the most detailed position on immigration. The DA also is the only party that uses the cultural, economic, and political dimensions. The ANC and DA combine both positive and negative frames in their documents, while the EFF uses only positive frames and the IFP, only negative frames. It is surprising that, in a country with strong anti-immigrant sentiments yet a shortage of critical skills that could be reduced by immigrants, most of South Africa's main political parties do not engage or frame immigration in their manifestos.