

Twaweza (Yes We Can)!
Building AIDS Resilient Democratic Societies in Sub-Saharan Africa
Harry C. Boyte, Ph.D.
Center for Democracy and Citizenship, University of Minnesota

Resilience [from L. *resilire* to jump back]: A dynamic process of behavioral adaptation that people exhibit when they encounter significant adversity or trauma. Resilient: Readily recovering from shock, depression, etc; buoyant (*Oxford Reader's Digest*)

*We never know how high we are
Till we are called to rise
And then, if we are true to plan
Our statures touch the skies*

Emily Dickinson 1870

Most people live, whether physically, intellectually, or morally, in a very restricted circle of their potential being...Great emergencies and crises show us how much greater our vital resources are than we had supposed.

William James 1906

Resilience is the demonstrated capacity to “bounce back” from crises and traumas, often with greater strength and energy than before. It is associated with characteristics such as

- The identity of a resourceful survivor rather than a passive victim
- A sense of collective or civic agency – people’s confidence in their capacities to direct their lives, individually and collectively, to solve public problems together, and to shape their environment
- Cultural norms that reinforce community, mutual aid, the value of each person, and appreciation for the assets of individuals and communities
- Capacities to find positive meanings in trauma and to learn from difficulties
- Opportunities to contribute to the wellbeing of others and the society

The concept of resilience, often employed in psychology, education, youth development, and other fields, has enormous potential use in addressing the HIV/AIDS pandemic. Resilience in the HIV/AIDS field is best concerned with how to grow civic muscle -- processes through which communities build on their assets to develop adaptive coping skills and capacities for civic agency. It emphasizes values and practices in the public culture that reinforce such capacities. It encourages patterns of governance which promote more just and equitable societies and which encourages civic agency. Expanding the GAP definition in order to incorporate characteristics of resilience and principles developed at the Bosberaad 17-20 November, 2008, in Cape Town, we can define an “AIDS-resilient democratic society” as

A society that recognizes individual and community assets, that develops civic muscle -- the capacities of communities and citizens for powerful self-directed public work on common challenges such as HIV/AIDS -- and that promotes social

and economic justice. To create such a society requires positive cultural change. It entails creation of collective learning cultures in GAP and in community settings, not simply formal education. It depends on patterns of democratic governance which strengthen and support citizen agency rather than displace it.

An “organising” approach more than a “mobilising” approach is essential to generating AIDS resilient democratic societies. The following concept paper elaborates these ideas.

Elaborating the key principles developed in the GAP 2008 Cape Town Bosberaad

1) Civic Agency

AIDS-resilient democratic societies point toward a shift from a top down to a bottom up paradigm of action, a paradigm in which people are agents of their own development and problem solving, with support from larger structures based on deep respect for people’s capacities for self-directed action. In top down approaches people are “helped” or “saved” by others, often with the best of progressive and redistributive intentions (see discussion on 2nd Principle, respecting assets). Agency can be defined as our own navigational capacities to negotiate and transform the world around us, which is understood to be fluid and open. As Mustafa Emirbayer and Ann Mishe have observed in their detailed treatment, “What Is Agency?,” through most of the 20th century attention to agency “has been overshadowed by an emphasis upon clear and explicit rules of conduct, concepts that permit relatively little scope for the exercise of situationally based judgment”.¹ Civic agency adds a collective action dimension. It is the capacity not only to direct one’s life and shape one’s environment but also to interactively collaboratively with others across differences to address common challenges and to shape the larger environment.

There are signs of such a shift in many settings. The idea of bottom up agency is elaborated, for instance, in the collection of essays, *Culture and Public Action*, by scholars of development, drawing on UN Development Programme and World Bank experiences, based on pragmatic interests – “what works” to address challenges of development, especially on complex public problems. As the editors, Vijayendra Rao and Michael Walton, put it:

“Although there are disagreements stemming from different paradigms...there is broad agreement that [we need] a shift from equality of opportunity to ‘equality of agency’... creating an enabling environment to provide the poor with the tools, and the voice, to navigate their way out of poverty”.²

Agency is increasingly recognized as a basic driver of human behavior. Richard M. Ryan and Edward L. Deci, writing in the *American Psychologist*, summarized a considerable body of research that showed while social-contextual conditions dramatically facilitate or forestall the natural tendencies toward self-motivation, such self-direction is a basic tendency across cultures. “Whether people stand behind a behavior out of their interests

¹ Mustafa Emirbayer and Ann Mishe, “What is Agency?” *American Journal of Sociology* Vol. 103:4, (1998) pp. 994-1095

² Vijayendra Rao and Michael Walton, “Introduction,” in Rao and Walton, Eds., *Culture and Public Action* (Stanford University Press, 2006), pp. 259, 261

and values or do it for reasons external to the self, is a matter of significance in every culture and represents a basic dimension by which people make sense of their own and others' behavior".³

Circumscribed in the 20th century, civic agency was kept alive in community organising and popular education movements in the Global South, as well as in parts of Europe and the US. Moreover, in the early years of the new century the re-emergence of civic agency is the product of several factors. These include the spread of organising approaches, described below, new structural changes like the global telecommunications revolution, and theoretical advances in social theory and also in complexity science.

Thus, for instance, in the scientific study of what are called complex adaptive systems, examination of "emergence," patterns of action in which the whole is more (often vastly more) than the sum of the parts, highlights the importance of agent-based systems. Agent-based systems involve actors who are not centrally controlled or directed, but who interact with each other and, in the most generative of cases, continuously learn from these interactions. The concept of agent-based systems has a wide reach – from ant colonies to the central nervous system cells of the body to behavior in stock markets and many other cases. John Holland, a leading scholar of emergence, argues that flexibility is key to emergence: "The possibilities for emergence increase rapidly as the flexibility of the interaction increases." And learning is at the heart of such flexibility. "The possibilities for emergence are compounded when the elements of the system include some capacity for adaptation, or learning".⁴

In practical terms, an agency based approach surfaced in the U.S. presidential election in the campaign of Barack Obama. Obama declared from the outset of his campaign that he wanted a "community organising approach." This meant, in particular, translating the civic agency themes that he learned as a community organiser in Chicago into larger political terms. "I'm asking you not only to believe in my ability to make change; I'm asking you to believe in yours," read his web site. The concept is expressed in campaign slogans such as "yes we can," and "we are the ones we've been waiting for," drawn from a song of the freedom movement of the 1960s.

Broad based organising of the sort that shaped Barack Obama as a young man rests on a strong concept of civic agency, the citizen as generative agent, or co-creator of a democratic society. Theorists of collective action who stress its public and productive dimensions have explored the culture-changing dimensions of organising work with public qualities. In particular, the concept of work with public meanings – public work – is based on respect for the productive potentials of everyone, regardless of income or educational level. It is a sharp contrast with the dominant images of neediness prevalent in modern service societies, with their accompanying ideas of citizenship as service.⁵

³ Richard M. Ryan and Edward L. Deci, "Self-Determination Theory and the Facilitation of Intrinsic Motivation, Social Development and Well-Being," *American Psychologist* Vol. 55:1 (2000), p. 69.

⁴ John Holland, *Emergence: From Chaos to Order* (Cambridge: Perseus Books, 1998), pp. 7, 5.

⁵ See Craig Calhoun, Ed., *Habermas and the Public Sphere* (MIT Press, 1992); Harry C. Boyte, *CommonWealth: A Return to Citizen Politics* (Free Press, 1989); Sara Evans and Harry C. Boyte, *Free Spaces: The Democratic Sources of Change in America* (University of Chicago, 1992); Boyte and Nan Kari, *Building America: The Democratic Promise of Public Work* (Temple, 1996); and Boyte, *Everyday Politics: Reconnecting Citizens and Public Life* (PennPress, 2004).

Groups like the Gamaliel Foundation, Obama's former network (with a number of affiliates in South Africa) contrast *organising* and *mobilising*, a distinction first developed in the American civil rights or freedom movement.⁶ Organising involves intense focus on the individual in narrative terms. Each person is unique, immensely complicated, and multidimensional. Organising builds on this core view of human beings by developing public skills of participants to work across differences on common challenges. Members of broad based organisations are taught to understand the stories and motivations of others of different income, religious, cultural or partisan backgrounds. They become skilled at building what are called "public relationships" across such differences for effective action. They learn to think in long term and strategic ways. They pay close attention to local cultures and networks. They aim to foster people's "public growth".⁷ And they build thriving communities. "We learned after the first year that the issues are the desert, not the main meal," said Andres Sarabia, first president of the Mexican American Communities Organized for Public Service group in San Antonio founded in 1973, a model for broad based organising. "The main meal is the renewal of our communities".

Organising shaped not only Obama's message of a different kind of politics but also the campaign operation. The goal was preparing organisers and leaders to take self-directed action in neighborhoods instead of looking to the central campaign for guidance. 'We decided that we didn't want to train volunteers,' said [campaign field director Temo] Figueros. 'We wanted to train *organizers* – folks who can fend for themselves.'" The campaign field operation was based on values ("respect," "empower," and "include"), not the conventional issue language of progressive politics, which produces silo cultures of activism. It educated organizers and leaders in public narratives and one on ones, local cultures, social networks, and the building of public relationships, not the mobilising approaches of recent Democratic Party contests.

There are rich, buried roots of this politics around the world which it is useful to surface. For instance, the precursors of Obama included leaders in the American freedom movement such as Ella Baker, Myles Horton, Septima Clark, Bayard Rustin, and Martin Luther King. These, in turn, had strong affinity with South African political activists such as Nelson Mandela in the Freedom Charter Movement and Steve Biko in the Black Consciousness Movement. All saw themselves as in opposition to mass liberal or left wing politics which makes sharp distinctions between educated elite or vanguard and mass and which conceives of the person as a deracinated, uprooted consumer (see below). All had what historian Charles Payne has called an "expansive" concept of democracy and a "developmental" understanding of politics. As Payne summarized, "Above all else...they stressed a developmental style of politics, one in which the important thing was the development of efficacy of those most affected by a problem." This meant that "whether a community achieved this or that tactical objective was likely

⁶ Charles Payne, *I've Got the Light of Freedom: The Organizing Tradition and the Mississippi Freedom Struggle* (University of California/Berkeley: 1995).

⁷ See for instance Mark Warren, *Dry Bones Rattling: Community Building to Revitalize American Democracy* (Princeton University Press, 2001); and Richard Wood, *Faith in Action: Religion, Race, and Democratic Organizing in America* (University of Chicago Press, 2002).

to matter less than whether the people in it came to see themselves as having the right and the capacity to have some say-so in their own lives.”⁸

A focus on developing people’s capacities for productive work and civic agency can create a prism for assessing action plans of every GAP SO. For instance, a focus on civic agency shifts the emphasis of SO 3, Local Government, to emphasize the catalytic and partnership roles of government, not simply a service delivery paradigm that conceives of citizens primarily as customers or clients. For SO 1, Research, advocacy, and network building, it suggests more emphasis on *qualitative research methods* such as participatory action research that encourage communities’ self-directed learning activities, rather than over-reliance on expert-centered research models. It also highlights potentially crucial *research topics* such as case studies of community organizing experiences on HIV/AIDS.

2) Respect for social and cultural assets

The seemingly innocuous second GAP principle, “respecting social and cultural assets,” if taken seriously is radical in its implications. This is because it cuts sharply against the grain of contemporary societies in Africa as elsewhere which use a framework of formal education, mass politics, and technocratic service delivery that devalues the capacities and resources of communities and poor people.

Specifically, conventional formal education, mass politics and technocratic service delivery operate within a state-centered model of democracy in which citizens are seen as primarily as needy consumers. This paradigm has its roots in post-WWII North Atlantic conceptions of democracy, with effects on patterns of governance across Africa and also around the world. Thus Seymour Martin Lipset defined democracy as free elections in his canonical 1960 work, *Political Man*. “Democracy in a complex society,” wrote Lipset, “is a political system which supplies regular constitutional opportunities for changing the governing officials, and a social mechanism which permits the largest possible part of the population to influence major decisions by choosing among candidates. . .”⁹ Politics, similarly, came to be located in the state, according to wide agreement.

This view took ideological shape in “mass politics,” the main strand of much progressive action in the 20th century. Mass politics emphasizes universal claims, distributive justice, a consumer view of the citizen, and individual rights. It is organized around a conception of the person that holds people to be concerned primarily with individual, material acquisition and fulfillment of their needs, not with questions of purpose, or civic contribution. As the philosopher Michael Sandel has put it, “A politics based on consumer identities...asks how best – most fully, or fairly, or efficiently to satisfy [needs and wants]”. The historian Steve Fraser has described the foundation of mass politics as the concept of “a new man—existentially mobile, more oriented to consumption than production, familiar with the impersonal rights and responsibilities of industrial due process”. Mass politics, Fraser observes, “was inconceivable apart from a political elite in command of the state, committed to a program of enlarged government spending,

⁸ Charles Payne, *I’ve Got the Light of Freedom: The Organizing Tradition and the Mississippi Freedom Struggle* (University of California/Berkeley), p. 68.

⁹ Seymour Martin Lipset, *Political Man* (Doubleday, 1960), p. 45.

financial reform, and redistributive taxation, presiding over a reconstituted coalition in the realm of mass politics”.¹⁰

Mass politics is understandable within the “world as it is,” and it has won significant gains for poor and marginalized populations in the face of enormous concentrations of power and privilege. But mass politics also reproduces, sometimes inadvertently, a technocratic professional approach in which “merit” counts as individual achievement in formal educational systems and the capacities and talents of communities are devalued.

Thus, African schools, like those in the North Atlantic countries, focus almost singularly on students’ own individual success in formal and often standardized knowledge acquisition and slight other, equally important dimensions of learning such as character, knowledge of locale, apprenticeships, and the skills of collaborative work for the common good. The dominant focus generates what might be called “the disease of credentialitis”, excessive reliance on formal degrees and officially authorized marks of recognition. It devalues knowledge gained through experience, local knowledge, and wisdom passed down from elders in rooted cultural communities. Dominating in research universities, this pattern has spread widely through the ecology of higher education and the professional systems of our time around the world including Africa. It is at the root of what Mamphela Ramphele has described as the “delinking” of modern African leadership poor people and home communities. Often, ironically, this delinking began in the fight for freedom, either in exile or through alienation from families and communities. Against the background of North Atlantic condescension and the vast humiliations of colonial rule, “Making it [became] associated with leaving the village, the township, even the language of one’s community”. Too often African leaders have continued looked to Western models for education after independence.¹¹

The power dynamics of contemporary education and mass politics are disguised by the fact that dominating progressive leaders are often full of egalitarian, if condescending, intentions to “help.” A 1989 lecture at the University of Illinois by Donna Shalala, then chancellor of the University of Wisconsin, soon to be Secretary of Health and Human Services in the Clinton administration, vividly illustrated this pattern. Shalala made an impassioned plea for public service and justice, for struggles against racism and sexism, for environmentalism and global peace. She called for universities to engage the world. Her good intentions were palpable -- and tied to technocracy. For her, “the ideal [is] a disinterested technocratic elite” fired by the mission of “society’s best and brightest in service to its most needy”. The imperative was “delivering the miracles of social science” to fix society’s problems “just as doctors cured juvenile rickets in the past”.¹²

However suffused with good intentions, the rescue approach -- in the HIV/AIDS field as elsewhere -- is the opposite of an agency approach for both professionals and nonprofessionals. Most people have little to do except to give thanks (or to complain if

¹⁰ Michael J. Sandel, *Democracy’s Discontent: America in Search of a Public Philosophy* (Harvard, 1996), 225; Steven Fraser, “The Labor Question,” in Fraser and Gary Gerstle, Eds., *The Rise and Fall of the New Deal Order: 1930-1980* (Princeton University Press, 1989), p. 70.

¹¹ Mamphela Ramphele, *Laying Ghosts to Rest: Dilemmas of the Transition in South Africa* (), p. 301.

¹² Shalala, D. (1989). Mandate for a new century: Reshaping the research university’s role. Chicago: David Dodds Henry Lecture. Retrieved December 6, 2008, <http://www.uic.edu/depts/oa/ddh/ddhlectures/Lec11.pdf>

they don't like the cure), while professionals are burdened with the total responsibility. Technocratic professionalism undermines the reliance and confidence of people without credentials, degrees, and university training. It shapes a citizenry who are needy clients and it produces communities which are seen in terms of deficiencies, not assets. This process, eclipsing the abundant capacities to be found in even the poorest communities, infuses the service delivery paradigm in the HIV/AIDS field.

Since the 1970s, mass politics has crystallized in mobilising techniques of citizen action, familiar across the world. Mobilising approaches include protests and internet mobilisations, as well as issue campaigns in the public health field and elsewhere. All are understandable as efforts to activate large numbers of citizens on pressing social and economic issues. But mobilising comes at a severe cost, dumbing down the role of the citizen to that of consumer and passive follower. In sophisticated versions, mobilising is based on a formula: find a target or enemy to demonize, stir up emotion with inflammatory language, create a script that defines the issue in good versus evil terms and shuts down critical thought, and convey the idea that those who champion the victims will come to the rescue. Most NGOs and other progressive civic groups, as well as election campaigns, use the mobilising formula as a matter of course.

There are important resources to draw upon in developing an alternative based on robust respect for social and cultural assets and productive capacities of communities that challenge the dominate deficit mindset of mass politics and service delivery. These include the Asset Based Community Development Institute founded by John McKnight (one of Obama's intellectual mentors) and Jody Kretzmann, a group for which Barack and Michelle Obama long served as faculty members. An asset approach, like organising, has implications for each SO of GAP. For instance, it could lead SO 4, Human Rights and Democratization, to identify and emphasize traditions and practices of inclusion in African communities that can be built upon for challenging stigma and discrimination. It can also powerfully align SO 2 with what Ramphela calls "connected" models of African leadership to generate far more collaborative and catalytic patterns of governance, discussed below.

3. Production of a new public culture

"The writers among us bemoan the triviality of the mass media, but why...do they allow themselves to be used in its silly routines by its silly managers? These media are part of *our* means of work, which have been expropriated from us...we ought to repossess *our* cultural apparatus and use it for our own purposes".

C. Wright Mills¹³

In the 2005 South African film *Drum* by Zola Maseko, Henry Nxumalo (played by Taye Diggs) an investigative reporter, is murdered by the apartheid regime in 1955. Set in the vibrant interracial district of Sophiatown, in Johannesburg, before it was demolished, the film recounts a fascinating process of "civic education" that produces a new, positive public culture. In bars and newsrooms, street scenes and prize fights whites develop respect for blacks, blacks learn not to hate all whites, and the characters develop political consciousness and seriousness about themselves and the world. The final scene is a funeral march where ordinary people – including government workers, journalists, and

¹³ Quoted from Michael Denning, *Cultural Front* (Verso, 1997), p. 113.

people gathering from streets and shops -- walk with dignity and determination to the baffled rage of apartheid officials. It intimates the “power of publics” that will eventually topple the seemingly impregnable system of apartheid. It also illustrates the cultural organizing of the past – pivotal media like the Drum – as well as the role of film in contemporary political and civic life.

As in the case of civic agency and respect for assets, there are rich traditions of cultural organising like these to draw on in the Third principle, producing a new public culture. The idea that professionals’ work should aim at creating a new public culture is key to every major broad democratic struggle. In the US, for instance, in the 1920s and 1930s a range of professionals -- artists and poets, labor organizers, teachers, ministers and musicians, to list a few -- saw themselves as having a civic obligation to make visible and to develop the capacities of ordinary people, eclipsed in the larger society. James Weldon Johnson, an architect of the Harlem Renaissance, put it this way, “Harlem is more than a community; it is a large-scale laboratory experiment. Through his artistic efforts the Negro is smashing immemorial stereotypes”. He saw blacks “impressing upon the national mind the conviction that he is an active and important force in American life; that he is a creator as well as a creature”. The Harlem Renaissance meant that the black American was to be seen as “a contributor to the nation’s common cultural store; in fine, he is helping to form American civilization”.¹⁴

In sub-Saharan Africa, vital local public cultures and political and civic professional practices were crucial in African independence struggles. In South Africa, for instance, whole professions and cultural institutions, from schools to theaters and the press, became politicized. Communities like District Six in Cape Town, Sophiatown, Ginsburg in the Eastern Cape, and Cato Manor in Durbin were famous for their leadership role, well known for their multi-cultural vitality and public life sustained by many occupations – clergy, teachers, musicians, businesspeople and others.

This suggests that the work of SO 5, Political Communication involves in part educational efforts with journalists and other cultural workers that recall and reinvigorate once vibrant cultural organising work. It also points to the importance of network building for what Anne Githuku-Shongwe calls “communities of practice” of similar orientation across Africa, relating HIV/AIDS work to other arenas. Links with groups like Twaweza!: The East African Citizen Agency Initiative, which stresses cultural organising and media partnerships as a central strategic priority, are a priority.

4. Social Justice

“When men know they are working on what belongs to them, they work with far greater eagerness and diligence. They learn to love the land cultivated by their own hands.”

Pope Leo XIII, *Rerum Novarum*, 1891

The fourth principle from the Bosberaad, Social justice, raises questions of equal access to public and economic goods including medicines and treatment for HIV/AIDS, improvement of health systems, normalization of HIV/AIDS and a new level of respect for traditional healers, not as a substitute for modern medicine but in partnership.

¹⁴ Harold Cruse, *The Crisis of the Negro Intellectual* (Quill, 1984), p.34.

An organising approach emphasizes that in pursuit of these, *process* is as important as *product*. In particular the insight into economic life voiced by Leo XIII in the classic social justice statement of the modern Catholic church, *Rerum Novarum*, applies in community organising: Benefits which people win by their own efforts are far more appreciated than what is “given” by purportedly benevolent government or professional systems. As the American organiser Gerald Taylor put it in an Idasa/GAP roundtable on organising held in Pretoria, 7 August, 2007, “A cardinal principle in organising is never do *for* folks what they can do for themselves”.¹⁵

A civic agency focus sees citizens outside of government not as needy recipients but as problem solvers and co-producers of public goods, a robust civic role vividly embodied in efforts like the Treatment Action Campaign. It re-conceives political leaders and public servants as citizen professionals who energize and inspire public work and who work as collaborators, organizers and educators with communities to develop capacities for collaborative, self-directed action. It further points toward new conceptions of health providers as citizen professionals. As William Doherty, a professor of family social science at the University of Minnesota and director of the Center for Citizen Professionalism has observed, “A mountain of research demonstrates that the major contributors to health are under the control of ordinary people. The big three health risks—smoking, poor diet, and lack of exercise—occur outside of the organized health care system. Care of the chronically ill is done mostly by families. What if we reboot our thinking about health care as primarily the work of individuals, families and communities, with health care professionals and institutions as partners, consultants, and sometimes interveners in this important communal task?” Doherty describes a local Minnesota example of community activation in the American Indian community in St. Paul. Grass roots leaders partnered with the Citizen Health Care Program of the University of Minnesota and health professionals to create a project that involves diabetes-friendly communal meals, blood sugar and foot checks done by local people, and educational programs planned by the community. Preliminary data shows that the project significantly improves diabetes control in the participants.¹⁶

Such patterns of democratic governance have spread under the surface of the dominant paradigm of service delivery. For instance, Frank Benest, based on his experiences as city manager in Palo Alto, California, contrasts catalytic local government —government as what he calls “barn-raising,” drawing on old American rural traditions of mutual aid— with the model of government as a vending machine, based on customer service. In the vending-machine model, the dominant approach, citizens put in their money in the form of taxes and scream and yell if they don’t get what they want.¹⁷ He suggests four strategies for a catalytic, barn-raising approach:

- Government needs to bring together diverse interests to envision a future.

¹⁵ Adapted from Harry C. Boyte and Marie-Louise Ström, “Citizen Work—Building Democratic Societies,” an Idasa report, 2007.

¹⁶ William Doherty, “Advice for Obama: Reinvent Government as partner, not parent,” *St. Paul Pioneer Press*, November 28, 2008

¹⁷ Frank Benest, “Serving Customers or Engaging Citizens: What Is the Future of Local Government?” This article was originally published as part of a special insert in the International City/County Management Association Journal, November, 1996. It is on the web at <http://www.vcn.bc.ca/citizens-handbook/benest.html> accessed December 7, 2008.

- Government needs to join with others in developing community leadership.
- Government needs to work through mediating institutions such as civic groups and religious organizations.
- Government needs to have a strong focus on empowering neighborhoods to take action on common concerns.

An important literature has developed out of such democratic governance.¹⁸ All have implications for effective action in the field of HIV/AIDS. The GAP publication by Marie Ström, *Citizens at the Centre* (Idasa, 2005), was a pioneering statement.

In addition to SO 3, Local government, an approach to social justice infused with an organising, civic agency framework has strong implications for other GAP strategic objectives. For instance, it raises the question for SO 2, how might budget researchers work with communities to develop their own “right to know” campaigns? It suggests for SO 4, Human Rights and Democratisation, the possibilities of organising initiatives like that outlined by Gerald Taylor during the 2007 Pretoria roundtable on HIV/AIDS. In response to people’s widespread sense of hopelessness, Taylor argued, “The first thing an organiser must bring is hope, a new sense of possibility. An organising campaign needs to have a leadership role from people with the virus or disease, claiming their rights to first class citizenship. Shame makes people invisible,” he said, comparing people with AIDS to the untouchables he met in India. “People have to be willing to no longer be invisible, to claim their full citizenship. The fight must be won with leadership from those who are infected, not just those who ‘stand with them’. A cardinal principle in organising is never do *for* folks what they can do for themselves”. Participants found the idea of developing a broad citizen campaign to make the status of those with HIV and AIDS a *constitutional question* compelling.

Conclusion

An enormous challenge of our time is to generate approaches and knowledge that can build vital, healthy and caring societies in the Global South, as the alternative to despair and fatalism, violence and poverty – approaches that also recognize and build upon the potentials of these societies to take global leadership in democracy-building.

GAP’s new mission and vision position the Programme in exceptional ways in this regard. A cardinal principle of organising is it is best to see work on particular issues as embodying and creating learning laboratories for larger patterns of civic innovation. As it begins to act on its vision of AIDS-resilient democratic societies, GAP holds potential to develop examples, learning, and models that will have wide implications and applications on many other health issues, and far beyond.

¹⁸ See Carmen Sirianni and Lew Friedland, *Civic Innovation in America* (UC Berkeley, 2001); Anne M. Khademian, *Working With Culture: The Way the Job Gets Done in Public Problems* (CQ Press, 2002); Archon Fung, *Empowered Participation: Reinventing Urban Democracy* (Princeton University Press, 2004); Harry C. Boyte, “Reframing Democracy: Governance, Civic Agency, and Politics,” *Public Administration Review* (September/October, 2005); Matt Leighninger, *The Next Form of Democracy: How Expert Rule Is Giving Way to Shared Governance* (Vanderbilt, 2007); and Sirianni, *Investing in Democracy* (Brookings, 2009 forthcoming).

Appendix 1

	Representative democracy (democratic state)	Participatory democracy	Developmental democracy (democratic society)
Who is the citizen?	Voter, consumer, rights bearing individual	Community member	Co-creator – solving problems, co-creating public goods
What are the main tasks?	Fairly distributing rights and services	Strengthening social capital, communicating	Developing civic agency
What is the method?	Mobilizing	Deliberating	Organizing
What is government's role? Tag line	Delivering the goods “for the people”	Promoting community and participation “of the people”	Catalyst, resource, convener “by the people”
Who is the government worker?	Service provider	Facilitator	Civic partner, organizer, catalyst
How are self interests understood?	In consumer terms	Put aside for the common good	Integrated and expanded with civic purposes through work
What is power?	Power over	Power with	Power to