

Sampie Terreblanche

Next week the South African president from Tuynhuys will pay a visit to the American president in the White House. We do not know what will be on their agenda. But we can speculate about what ought to be on the agenda.

1. REGARDING A SUSTAINABLE DEMOCRACY FOR SOUTH AFRICA

The Americans would like to believe that the cradle of democracy did not stand in Athens or London, but on the virgin soil of America. In justification of their claim they allege that America fought six wars on behalf of democracy. British Colonialism and the yoke of King George III was thrown off in the War of Independence; in the Civil War the threat of slavery was removed; after the Second World War, Woodrow Wilson claimed that the Great War was fought to make the world safe for democracy; the Second World War defeated the threat of fascism and authoritarian regimes; the Cold War was "fought" to defeat the onslaught of communism, and the Civil Rights struggle was to remove the threat of racial discrimination.

Pres. Bush will be in the position to tell Pres. De Klerk that democracy is a very valuable wreath of laurel that must be conquered over and over again. It is something for which a country often must fight not a single war but several wars. It is something that demands untiring alertness and dedication.

Hopefully Bush and De Klerk will talk about the conditions to be fulfilled to enable South Africa not only to institutionalise a democratic system but also a sustainable democracy. The track record of democracies in Africa is a very poor one. Consequently it will not be easy to maintain - even if it can be institutionalised.

Hopefully Bush will warn De Klerk that any attempt towards an alliance between the National Party and the ANC (with or without

the co-operation of the South African Communist Party) will be doomed to failure. It will be rejected internally and externally as yet another attempt towards co-optation and as another version of sham democracy and boereverneukery (Afrikaner crookery).

If Bush is honest about democracy he should inform De Klerk that a truly democratic system in its 20th century manifestation is a luxury that often can only be afforded by highly industrialised countries. He should warn De Klerk that representative parliamentarianism can easily generate fiscal demands that can overload the tax capacity of even a rich country like the USA.

After this warning they could perhaps agree that a relatively poor country like South Africa with so much structural inequalities can ill afford the luxury of a thoroughly democratic system. None the less they must agree that South Africa has - after many decades of apartheid - no choice whatsoever but to institutionalise a democratic system. Without it South Africa has no chance of attaining legitimacy and international acceptability.

Perhaps De Klerk will claim that the USA does not in fact have a pure and thorough democratic system but a somewhat "skew" one. De Klerk can point out that a small state like Maine has the same representation in the Senate as California. Pres. Bush will probably have to grant him this point. But Pres. Bush can point out that this kind of "skew" representation is the result of an historic compromise and that it is tolerated because the "protection" it affords to Maine has nothing to do with racism and the protection of dubious minority rights.

One can expect that De Klerk will try to obtain the support of Pres. Bush for certain constraints to be built into the democratic constitution (for at least an agreed transitional period) to make democracy viable given the poor and vulnerable state of the South African economy. In this part of the argument De Klerk will have a difficult task to convince Bush that the constraints' only purpose will be to protect the tax capacity of

the economy against the kinds of overload a representative parliament may generate and that its purpose will definitely not be to protect the privileges of the already wealthy White group. Hopefully Bush will be successful in convincing De Klerk to relinquish his idea about minority protection because it will be correctly conceived as a disguised form of racial discrimination.

2. ABOUT SOUTH AFRICA'S POSITION IN THE INTERNATIONAL ARENA

The restoration of South Africa's position as a respectable country in the international commonwealth of nations is of decisive importance. Without it any attempt at creating a sustainable democracy will fail. And without it the growth potential of the economy cannot be restored.

Pres. Bush will hopefully make it crystal clear to De Klerk that a normalisation of South Africa's international relations will not be possible without a settlement to institutionalise a reasonably open and democratic system. But he should also tell De Klerk that visible measures to abolish the remnants of apartheid and compensation for the harm it has done will also be necessary. From a South African point of view it will be extremely valuable if Pres. De Klerk can acknowledge that an apartheid debt has accumulated on the books of the Whites and that the repayment of this debt - over a reasonable period of time and in non-disruptive instalments - has been accepted by the government. But unfortunately De Klerk will not do this. Hopefully Bush will pressurise him for such a commitment.

The real controversial question is, however, to what extent foreign countries (and especially the USA) will get involved - from a certain point in time - in the restoration of the economy and in making the democracy sustainable. To maintain an economic growth rate of 5,5 per cent in a say ten year Transformation Period, South Africa will need an influx of \$12 billion annually. Will Pres. Bush be prepared to commit the USA government to Official Development Aid of (say) \$1,5 billion annually? Will he be prepared to promote private sector investment in a

democratic South Africa? Or is it true that the USA has attained the reputation of putting relentless pressure on its "enemies" but that they are not prepared to cuddle potential democratic friends to the necessary degree? If it is true that the USA has attained this reputation, then it is really lamentable.

For many years the South African government alleged that, if necessary, they will go it alone economically. Fortunately the De Klerk government now acknowledges that it is not possible at all. But a new bone of discontent has arisen: can South Africa go it alone constitutionally? Probably not. The government, however, is not yet prepared to acknowledge this. It regards South Africa as a sovereign independent country. It claims that South Africans will solve the constitutional problem between themselves.

A very important related question can be asked: who is going to be the chairman during the negotiations? Is it reasonable of the NP government to be the governor of the country, to be one of the senior partners in negotiations and to be the chairman? Probably not. Perhaps it will be valuable for Pres. Bush and De Klerk to discuss the sensitive issue of a foreign referee or foreign referees? If they could reach agreement on this issue, it may hasten the process of finding a constitutional settlement.

3. ABOUT A NEW ECONOMIC STRUCTURE

To create conditions conducive to a sustained democracy, the South African economy will have to undergo severe structural changes. The inequalities in property, economic power, control and opportunities will undoubtedly prove not to be reconcilable or compatible with a democratic system. Unfortunately the De Klerk government is not prepared to acknowledge the very close interaction between constitutional and economic reform.

In spite of the close interaction experienced in the USA since the Great Depression between economic and political events, Pres. Bush is perhaps not well-placed to give De Klerk advice regarding this interaction. In accordance with his Reaganomics approach, he still likes to believe that economic and political activities ought to take place in separate compartments! White businessmen in South

Africa also like to believe this freemarketeer nonsense. Both the White government and the White business community will have to be convinced that a South African democracy can only be sustainable if the concentration of economic power and control which are presently in the very few White hands, can be democratised to the necessary degree - even if it happens in a gradual way.

The new line of defence of the White Capitalist sector is that they are prepared to accept the largest responsibility for re-distribution-if the (White) goose that lays the golden eggs can remain undisturbed. Pres. Bush should advise De Klerk to tell the business community to stop the transparent escapism.

4. ABOUT A NEW SOCIAL STRUCTURE

One issue on which Pres. Bush can supply De Klerk with invaluable advice is how indispensable a well-integrated social structure is for the maintenance of a democratic system. The USA attained the remarkable accomplishment of creating through the melting-pot process a new nation and an integrated society with the necessary cross-cutting cleavages. This ensures a high level of stability and togetherness in the American people. It may be true that the melting-pot process has not yet been completed and that it has not always been as successful as it should have been. But it is nonetheless a remarkable accomplishment.

In contrast to the USA, South Africa remains very much a divided, group-organised and group-orientated country. One of the main purposes of the Apartheid policy has been to maintain the so-called identity of the different ethnic, colour and language groups. Especially over the last forty years deliberate measures were enacted to "roll back" the melting-pot process-

The group character of the South African "society" has been the main cause of the chronic strife and conflict and the endemic violence characteristic of the South African history over the last 340 years. Unfortunately the De Klerk government is still not prepared to relinquish its "group" concept. It is still committed to negotiating a future constitution which will provide built-in protection for the privileged White group and other minority groups. Hopefully Pres. Bush will reprimand De Klerk

on his "group" approach and will warn him that with this approach conflict will not only remain a chronic element of the body politic but will also create conditions not conducive to a sustainable democracy.

The extremely difficult Catch-22 situation on the socio-political level becomes evident when the present high level of violence is taken into account. Any measures to bring about a deliberate or forced integration over a short period of time in an attempt to create a single South African society, can easily cause a terrible escalation of (group) conflict. But if, on the other hand, the group character of the population should be maintained and protected, group conflict may be perpetuated indefinitely. In such an atmosphere a democratic system will definitely prove to be unsustainable.

5. ABOUT CLOSED SCHOOLS

Pres. Bush should also take De Klerk to task about the new school models published recently which will open schools only marginally and which will retain the discriminatory system according to which SIX times more in per capita terms is spent on White than on Black children. Pres. Bush should remind De Klerk that the Civil Rights struggle was not completed before "bussing" was used to compensate for that which went wrong with the melting-pot process.

6. ABOUT UNIFYING SYMBOLS

Pres. Bush can also give De Klerk valuable advice on how indispensable unifying symbols are for a sustainable democracy. When, oh when, will South Africans have symbols like for instance Washington, the American flag and anthem and monuments like the Vietnamese Wall with which EVERYBODY can identify with enthusiasm? Most of the symbols in South Africa are closely connected with the Afrikaner history. The sooner we can get rid of these, the better.

Oct 1990